The Primary Review

... children, their world, their education

INTERIM REPORTS

Research Survey 8/2

# PRIMARY SCHOOLS AND OTHER AGENCIES

Ian Barron, Rachel Holmes
and Maggie MacLure
Manchester Metropolitan University

Katherine Runswick-Cole
Sheffield Hallam University

For other interim reports in this series, and for briefings on each report, go to www.primaryreview.org.uk

This report has been commissioned as evidence to the Primary Review. The analysis and opinions it contains are the authors' own.



Esmée Fairbairn FOUNDATION

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
Faculty of Education

The Primary Review

... children, their world, their education

PRIMARY REVIEW INTERIM REPORTS

# PRIMARY SCHOOLS AND OTHER AGENCIES

Primary Review Research Survey 8/2

**Ian Barron, Rachel Holmes, Maggie MacLure and Katherine Runswick-Cole**

October 2007

This is one of a series of 32 interim reports from the Primary Review, an independent enquiry into the condition and future of primary education in England. The Review was launched in October 2006 and will publish its final report in late 2008.

The Primary Review, supported by Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, is based at the University of Cambridge Faculty of Education and directed by Robin Alexander.

A briefing which summarises key issues from this report has also been published. The report and briefing are available electronically at the Primary Review website: www.primaryreview.org.uk. The website also contains Information about other reports in this series and about the Primary Review as a whole. (Note that minor amendments may be made to the electronic version of reports after the hard copies have been printed).

We want this report to contribute to the debate about English primary education, so we would welcome readers' comments on anything it contains. Please write to: evidence@primaryreview.org.uk.

The report forms part of the Review's research survey strand, which consists of thirty specially-commissioned surveys of published research and other evidence relating to the Review's ten themes. The themes and reports are listed in Appendices 1 and 3.

This survey relates to Primary Review theme 8, **Beyond the School**.

Ian Barron is Principal Lecturer and Academic Leader of Early Years and Childhood Studies at Manchester Metropolitan University Institute of Education. Dr Rachel Holmes, Senior Lecturer and Researcher in Early Years/ Childhood Studies, and Professor Maggie MacLure, Professor of Education, are based at Manchester Metropolitan University Education and Social Research Institute. Dr Katherine Runswick-Cole is Senior Lecturer in Early Childhood Studies at Sheffield Hallam University.

**Suggested citation: Barron, I., Holmes, R., MacLure, M. and Runswick-Cole, K. (2007) *Primary Schools and Other Agencies* (Primary Review Research Survey 8/2), Cambridge: University of Cambridge Faculty of Education.**

Published October 2007 by The Primary Review,
University of Cambridge Faculty of Education,
184 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB2 8PQ, UK.



British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data:
A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-1-906478-07-0

# PRIMARY SCHOOLS AND OTHER AGENCIES

**Abstract**

This report examines the shifting relationships that have obtained over the past four decades between education and the various agencies with which primary school children in the UK may come into contact. The report deals primarily with agencies concerned with health, social care and the law. Based on an analysis of key policy texts, legislation and primary research studies, the report describes the changing configurations of provision for children deemed to be in need of support or intervention from agencies beyond the school. It identifies major shifts of policy and practice, culminating in the wide-reaching reforms of the post-1997 Labour governments. However the report also notes that two key assumptions have persisted across the decades. Firstly, the role of external agencies has consistently been construed as one of compensating for the deficits of the '*insufficient* child' or family, although definitions of such deficits have varied over time. Children and families who have recourse to agencies continue to be tacitly defined as deficient with respect to an idealised, if invisible, 'normal' child or family who does not need additional support. Secondly, the desire for *improved co-ordination* amongst schools and other service providers has been a goal of policy from the 1960s onwards. Yet, while the 'joined-up' architecture of the most recent reforms represents a major move towards 'extended' provision and fuller collaboration, its effectiveness in serving the interests of children remains to be established. Early research suggests that barriers to communication and collaboration across professions are deep-seated and resistant to change.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 The child in need of services

This report covers the period from the mid-1960s, around the time of the publication of the Plowden Report (CACE 1967), to the present. However the first two decades of the period, the 1960s and 70s, are dealt with more summarily than the remaining decades to allow for more detailed discussion of the significant volume of legislative and policy initiatives that have emerged since the early 1980s.

The changing picture of engagement with agencies to be described below can be summarised, with inevitable over-simplification, in terms of changing constructions of the child in need of services. These include the '*deprived* child' of the 1960s and the Plowden Report, prevented from following her proper developmental path by adverse social circumstances; the '*vulnerable* child' of the 1970s and the Maria Colwell Inquiry (DHSS 1974), in need of protection from threat from within as well as outside her own family; the individualised '*market* child' of the 1980s and early 90s, whose opportunities are shaped for good or ill by the consumerist choices of her parents, and the '*distributed* child' of the present, hooked up to Labour's integrated services, her educational and economic potential linked to physical, mental and emotional well-being, protection from harm and neglect, and social and financial stability.

### 1.2 The scope of the report

The number of agencies potentially impacting upon schools is vast. In choosing to focus on

agencies operating in the key areas of health, social care and the law, the report does not deal in detail with other agencies: for instance those which provide additional support for music or arts, or sporting organisations. It should also be noted that, especially in the current context of integrated services, boundaries between schools and other agencies may be blurred, both at the level of policy and of personnel. Boundaries may be becoming more permeable as a result of cross-professional arrangements, with responsibilities – for example for special needs – distributed amongst a wide array of practitioners in different locations such as schools, local authorities, not-for-profit organisations, charities *et cetera*. This brings implications in terms of finance, employment conditions and management. While some of these implications are discussed in the final section of the report, it must be acknowledged that relationships between schools and 'other agencies' may be nuanced and mobile in ways that cannot be fully represented here.

### 1.3 The 'insufficient' child

While constructions of the child in need of services have changed over time, all have relied to some extent on a notion of 'insufficiency'. In western societies, the labels we learn to associate with the idea of childhood tend to define children as incompetent, unstable, credulous, unreliable, and emotional (Mayall 2002), and these are very often the same notions that lead agencies within and beyond the school into contact with children. For much of the twentieth century and beyond, developmental psychology has dominated the ways in which children (and provision for them) have been conceived. Lawyers, doctors, social workers, educationalists and academics have all come to depend on child development theory as a basis for their work on, for, and with children. Whilst, within sociology, there is a growing awareness of the different ways in which agencies construct children, the image of the child as an 'incomplete' or 'inadequate' being often persists within the agencies themselves and within schools.

### 1.4 Otherness in primary education

This means that recourse to services beyond the primary school is often characterised by a kind of *'otherness'*, at least with respect to agencies concerned with health, social care and the law. The intervention of such agencies in the lives of primary schools and the children who attend them is almost always concerned with deviation from notions of 'norms', which recently have tended to be established through testing and be based on the developmental paradigm. Where pupils do not measure up to the assumed or tacit norm, pupil effectiveness and well–being are called into question, and professionals other than teachers begin to enter children's lives: educational psychologists; health professionals; social workers; and those to provide support for children with special educational needs, children from the working and non-working classes, ethnic minority children and children with English as an additional language.

## 2. THE 1960s AND THE PLOWDEN REPORT

### 2.1 Introduction: the 'deprived' child

The child of the mid-1960s, depicted in the Plowden Report (CACE 1967), was the active, 'natural' child of Piagetian psychology and liberal humanism, who would find her own path to maturity and knowledge at her own rate, within the nurturing embrace of the school. Ideally, therefore, children in mainstream schools would have little need of other agencies: the discerning teacher would address the individual needs of each child and identify difficulties early enough to avoid the need for external support (paragraph 230). However the Report recognised that schools could not offer everything that certain children needed,

and indeed envisaged *increased* funding and restructuring of the many agencies and personnel that such children might encounter. These included educational psychologists and psychiatrists, speech therapists, guidance officers, social workers, probation officers and education welfare officers, in addition to the health provision available to all children through the Schools Health Service. While identifying shortages across almost all services, the Report gave strong emphasis to a need for more social workers, to cope with increasing school rolls, decrease in numbers of children in care, fragmentation of neighbourhood and family ties as a result of job mobility and slum clearance, and increasing numbers of children from immigrant families (paragraph 226).

The commitment to a broad array of services reflects one of the main emphases of Plowden, namely *social amelioration*, as reflected in its most notable outcome, the establishment of Educational Priority Areas (EPAs). The social improvement agenda of the Report, which envisaged education as a vehicle of redistribution, involved 'some unremarked conflict' with the progressive vision that the Report also championed (Kogan 1987: 14). The psychological notion of the child fulfilling her innate potential, nurtured by the school, did not entirely fit with the interventive project of 'positive discrimination' embodied in the EPAs and extra services for the needy. However a kind of bridge between the social and the progressive agendas of the Report was established in the notion of 'the environment' (chapter 3). Children from certain kinds of background (or certain kinds of families) might be prevented from following their proper developmental path because of adverse social circumstances. Social interventions and additional services were needed to provide all children with 'an equal opportunity of acquiring intelligence' (paragraph 85).

**2.2 Special educational needs**

Attitudes to special education began to change in the 1960s (Evans and Varma 1990). Behavioural and developmental psychology suggested that modification of children's behaviour and potential was possible, and might be undertaken by teachers. This opened up the possibility of including greater numbers of children with special needs in mainstream classrooms. By 1970, the Education (Handicapped Children) Act brought children who had previously been deemed 'ineducable', and therefore the responsibility of the health service, under the educational responsibility of LEAs. The Plowden Report, as noted, argued for increased provision of psychologists, psychiatrists, speech therapists and child guidance workers to support teachers in the education of 'slow learning', 'backward', 'maladjusted' and 'educationally sub-normal' children.

**2.3 Lack of co-ordination of services**

Concern about the lack of co-ordination amongst agencies, and about barriers to communication amongst the professionals involved, were already being expressed at the time of the Plowden Report: cf also the Seebohm Report (1968), Ingleby Report (1960), and Younghusband Report (1959). The aspiration, as expressed in the Seebohm Report, was to provide 'one door to knock on'. Children's services were incorporated into Social Services in 1971. However, co-ordination remained an issue over the coming decades and provision continued to be patchy.

**2.4 Parental involvement and a discourse of 'insufficiency'**

A discourse of insufficiency or deficit runs through Plowden: the ideal child is one who does not need specialist support outside of what the school can provide for her individual needs. That ideal child is implicitly constituted as a white, middle-class child whose family are able to provide not only material and physical resources, but also the kind of emotional, intellectual and linguistic environment that the child needs to move smoothly along her developmental path. It is children from areas of social deprivation, or from immigrant

families, who are generally seen to lack such support, and to be most in need of 'compensation' from school or extra services. 'The educational disadvantage of being born the child of an unskilled worker is both financial and psychological', the Report states (paragraph 85). The tendency to locate the deficit not only in social inequality, but in (associated) *family* practices is reflected in another of Plowden's notable emphases: namely, the endorsement of parental involvement in education. Support for parental involvement, and the discourse of familial deficit which it frequently includes, has been a recurring feature of policy throughout the intervening years.

### 2. 5 Culture and class

The Plowden report demonstrated relatively little understanding of cultural and sub-cultural difference, and of the complex inflections of class and ethnicity, in shaping children's lives in the home and community. Broad assumptions about the family lives of children of unskilled or manual workers, broad characterisations of social deprivation by geographical area, and undifferentiated perceptions of the needs of 'immigrant families' proved insufficient to address complex and fast developing social and economic conditions. 'On matters of race and culture in the inner city, it beat the drum tentatively and seriously underrated the issues' (Winkley 1987: 45).

## 3. THE 1970s: CRISIS AND BLAME

### 3.1 Introduction: the 'vulnerable' child

As the confidence and prosperity of the 1960s gave way to economic and political crisis, and the intensification of social problems associated with racial tensions and unemployment, Plowden's optimistic vision of child-centred education coupled with social intervention came under criticism from both the right (Cox and Dyson 1971) and the left (Simon 1985). The perceived success of the welfare reforms of the decade looked, in retrospect, exaggerated (Parton 1999). The fairly crude categorisations of Plowden, which associated class and ethnicity with geographical location, as reflected in EPAs, started to be replaced by 'positive discrimination in favour of special groups or those with special needs' (Smith 1987).

Among the agencies providing support for school-age children, *social services* became a focus of particular attention. In contrast to the empowered child (in principle at least) of the Plowden era, children increasingly came to be seen as *vulnerable.* Concern about 'child abuse' escalated, leading to a succession of circulars and guidance. (Cannan 1992; Hallett and Birchall 1992). This concern reached a peak with the inquiry into the death of Maria Colwell at the hands of her stepfather (DHSS 1974), which was strongly critical of social work practices, interagency working, and lack of communication between education and social services departments (Stevenson 1999).

### 3.2 Family practices

The location of a 'deficit' in certain families continued throughout the 1970s. Pringle (1974) argued that parental inadequacy was a key cause of delinquency, and was likely to be transmitted to successive generations. Parental attitudes were seen as key determinants of the child's progress (Cannan 1992). The tendency to identify family practices as integral to children's progress at school intensified with the move from Piagetian models of development, based on the notion of the staged progression of the individual child, to the interactional and ecological models of development that became influential in educational thinking in the 1970s and 80s (Bruner 1983; Vygotsky 1978; Bronfenbrenner 1979; Donaldson 1978). Theories of a 'mismatch' between cultural practices of home and school (for example Wells 1981; Bernstein 1971; Tough 1977) were frequently interpreted as deficits to be

remedied by schooling or, at worst, by family services, social work or speech therapy. And as critics have noted, the perceived deficits were often associated with differences of class, ethnicity or (later) gender (for example Brice Heath 1983; Edwards 1976).

Perceptions of children's vulnerability within their own families, coupled with class- or culture-based assumptions of deficit, tended towards a dichotomy between 'proper' and 'deviant' families, the latter falling under the scrutiny of welfare supervision (Cannan 1992).

### 3.3 Special educational needs

From 1971 disabled children were no longer placed in long-stay institutions, contributing to the need for more productive partnerships with parents, argued by the Warnock Report (DES 1978) and codified in the 1981 Education Act. The Warnock Report rejected the prevailing categories of 'handicap', and adopted a definition of 'special educational needs', recommending that provision for special education should 'wherever possible' occur within mainstream settings. These recommendations and their implications are discussed in more detail in the next section.

### 3. 4 Lack of co-ordination of services

Ongoing concerns about poor co-ordination of services were, as noted, heightened by the death of Maria Colwell and the severe criticisms made by the ensuing inquiry. The report led to the development of Area Child Protection Committees (ACPCs) in England and Wales, to co-ordinate local efforts to safeguard children at risk. Despite attempts at improvements in communications with schools, Fitzherbert (1980: 349-50) characterised the involvement of social and health services as somewhat like 'rogue meteors diving in and out of the school atmosphere at odd times'.

## 4. THE 1980s AND BEYOND

### 4.1 Introduction: from the 'market' child to the 'distributed' child

The 1980s, 1990s and early twenty-first century are characterised by market-driven policies and practices in relation to the responsibilities of schools and their relationships with other agencies. These policies assume that state agents, whether they be central bureaucrats or individual teachers, tend to act in their own interests and against those of their clients (in this case usually conceived as parents rather than children themselves, because children are seen as 'deficient' by virtue of their immaturity), this being the natural effect of state systems where market discipline is absent. Such systems across the 1980s, 1990s and early twenty-first century have been, and largely remain, underpinned by neo-liberal conservative ideologies. These have, latterly, incorporated some aspects of socialist and social democratic ideals, along with an integrative vision of the child, whose educational and economic potential is linked to physical, mental and emotional well-being, protection from harm and neglect, and social and financial stability.

### 4.2 Special educational needs: children with physical and learning disabilities

In 1974, as noted above, the Warnock Committee was established to look at the educational provision for 'handicapped' children in England, Scotland, and Wales (DES 1978). By 1974 the number of pupils attending special schools in England had risen to 128,410, representing 1.3 per cent of the school population. The Warnock Report, which shaped the 1981 Education Act, was ground-breaking in a number of ways. First, the report rejected the concept of eleven categories of 'handicap' and adopted instead a definition of special educational needs to take in all children who may have individual educational needs. Using this definition, it was suggested that 20 per cent of children were likely to need special educational provision

of some kind at some time during their school careers. This figure has gone largely unchallenged since 1978 (Croll and Moses 2004).

The Warnock Report also recommended that provision for special education should 'wherever possible' occur within mainstream settings. This was a key change, as under the 1944 Education Act LEAs were expected to provide for 'handicapped' pupils in special schools and were only allowed to place children in mainstream schools if the 'circumstances permitted.' The 1981 Education Act was an exact reversal of the 1944 Act because the expectation, following the 1981 Act, was that special education provision should be in mainstream, not special schools.

However the next key development in special education policy did not emerge until the 1993 Education Act, which brought about the creation of a key document for the practice of special education: *The Code of Practice for the Assessment and Identification of Special Educational Needs* (DfEE 1994). For the first time, practical guidance was given to LEAs, social services, health services and to the governing bodies of all maintained schools about their responsibilities for all children with special educational needs. Schools and LEAs and all those who are involved with children who have special educational needs, including the health service and social services, were obliged to adhere to 'The Code'.

In 2001, a revision of the *Code of Practice* replaced the original. The basic principles of the new *Code of Practice* remained the same but there are key differences between the old and the new versions. New rights and duties were introduced by the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act (SENDA) (2001). Changes as a result of SENDA have been taken into account and these include: a stronger right for children with special educational needs to be educated at a mainstream school; new duties on LEAs to arrange for parents of children with special educational needs to be provided with services offering advice and information and a means of resolving disputes; a new duty on schools and relevant nursery education providers to tell parents when they are making special educational provision for their child; and a new right for schools and relevant nursery education providers to request a statutory assessment of a child. In general, the aim of revising the Code of Practice was to streamline the process and make the responsibilities of different professionals and the roles of different agencies clearer.

**4.3 Inclusion**

The legislation and guidance which underpins the Government's policy for inclusion is referred to as 'the inclusion framework' and has been in place since 2002 – this includes the 1996 Education Act, SENDA, *The Code of Practice for Special Educational Needs* (DfES 2001b), the National Curriculum Statutory Inclusion Statement (National Curriculum Online, no date), and statutory guidance *Inclusive Schooling: Children with special educational needs* (DfES 2001a).

*Removing Barriers to Achievement* (DfES 2004b) is government guidance that aims to strengthen 'the inclusion framework'. The Audit Commission (2002) and Ofsted (2004) have found mixed responses to 'the inclusion framework' in their monitoring. Ofsted (2004) found that there was a growing awareness in schools of the benefits of inclusion, but that this had had little impact on the numbers of pupils in mainstream schools with special educational needs, nor on the range of entitlements the mainstream caters for. Indeed there has been an increase in the number of pupils in Pupil Referral Units and in independent special schools. The proportion of pupils in Pupil Referral Units rose by 25 per cent between 2001-2003 (Ofsted 2004). In 2004, 89,540 children had full-time special school places in special school and a further 2,200 children were attending special schools part-time (DfES 2006). The number of children with full time places at special school represented 1.1 per cent of the school population in 2004. The Audit Commission Report (2002) also questions what

is meant by the claim that provision for pupils with special educational needs in the mainstream is inclusive. Children with special needs may often be on the site of a mainstream school, but their opportunities for interaction with their peers are limited. Ofsted found that pupils at mainstream schools with units attached often had very limited opportunities for interaction with children in the mainstream. Ofsted also found that most mainstream schools are now committed to meeting special needs, but that pupils with social and behavioural difficulties are still considered to be 'difficult' to include.

Armstrong (2005) refers to the way in which provision for children with SEN can be seen to be about controlling a part of the population and draws attention Slee's contention (2001: 117) that New Labour's view of SEN involves 'a deep epistemological attachment to the view that special educational needs are produced through the impaired pathology if the child'. Armstrong goes on to argue that the proliferation of SEN initiatives was conceived by New Labour as a means of finding efficient and cost effective ways of managing individual pupils' needs.

> Nowhere does the strategy talk about the barriers that create educational disadvantage; nowhere does it talk about the institutional and social discrimination experienced by pupils from certain minority groups … nowhere does it talk about the principles of an inclusive society and the role of education as a tool of social policy for supporting social cohesion and inclusion.
>
> (Armstrong 2005: 138–9)

Armstrong suggests that there was some sign of a shift in recognition from individual to school failure underlying New Labour's agenda, but that addressing individual deficit remained at the centre of government policy. Armstrong further suggests that the 2001 *Code of Practice* (DfES 2001b) continued to provide a convenient means of dealing with children who did not respond as expected to the demands of a centrally defined notion of suitable learning and behaviour and could perpetuate 'long standing and institutionally embedded practices such as racial and gender stereotyping' (page 141). Armstrong argues that discrimination may arise from the Code, and that it has no provisions for supporting the rights of children in the face of such discrimination. In short, it does not recognise that SEN are socially constructed responses to behaviour and ways of being that are seen as problematic.

*Removing Barriers to Achievement* (DfES 2004b) locates SEN within a broader framework of disadvantages and seeks to intervene early, remove barriers to learning, raise expectations and achievement, and improve partnership. Armstrong argues that the model lacks an adequate theory regarding 'cultural and social formations in relation to the construction and negotiation of individual identities as "normal" or "abnormal" and of how social power is exercised' (2005: 145). Boys of primary school age account for 72 per cent of all statements, and ethnic differences are also strongly marked, with Irish–heritage Traveller and Roma/Gypsy children having the highest percentage of statements. *Ethnicity and Education* (DfES 2006b) does, however, suggest that poverty and gender have a strong correlation with SEN, but that the link with ethnicity is less significant. Armstrong concludes that '... special education continues to fulfil its traditional function vis-à-vis the mainstream sector of containing troublesome individuals and depoliticising educational failure through the technologies of measurement and exclusion' (2005: 147). Armstrong goes on to contend that New Labour's concern to attach to SEN the notion of '*risk*' – whether it be around SEN, child protection, poverty or family circumstances – means that interventions are justified in order to address the needs of inadequate individuals to allow them to contribute to the greater social good.

**4.4 Children from the working and non-working classes: poverty and lack of opportunity**

In the late 1990s primary schools condemned as failing were overwhelmingly those in areas with high levels of poverty, according to figures from the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (1998, cited on National Literacy Trust website[1]). In this respect the picture has changed little from the time of the Plowden Report. Poverty is still the best predictor of inspection grades, according to an analysis of more than two years of figures from Ofsted, which found that the poorest 10 per cent of schools in the country were eight times more likely to fail their inspections than schools with average levels of poverty or better. The poorest third of primaries account for 70 per cent of failing schools. The poorest tenth makes up nearly 40 per cent. Those who teach many pupils on free school meals are statistically unlikely to get a favourable inspection grade. The figures show that only 4 per cent of schools where more than a third of pupils received free school meals were given the top grade for quality of education. This clear link between poverty and failure contradicts claims by Chris Woodhead, chief inspector at the time, that deprivation only affects a minority of schools placed under 'special measures' (*Times Educational Supplement*, July 31 1998). The independent Rowntree Report on child poverty (1999) points to continuing, and possibly worsening, inequalities in education. The report's assessment of poverty and exclusion over the previous two years found 4.4 million children below the official poverty line (less than half of average income after housing costs). Two million children were living in houses where there was no one in paid employment. The report reveals significant differences in the performance of primary children in schools with 35 per cent or more of children on free meals, compared to pupils in all schools. It also points to an increasing concentration of poorer children in particular schools - leading to a polarisation within the primary sector (*TES*, 10 December 1999).

Loeber and LeBlanc (1990) and Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) suggest that characteristics of human, social, and cultural capital include poverty, educational attainment, employment, family size, and family structure, and parental involvement in crime, deviance, and substance use. They claim that familial circumstances, typically denoted by characteristics of the parental life course, produce vastly different child-rearing environments that are commonly seen as either placing children at risk for, or insulating them from, antisocial behavior. Drawing on the notion of linked lives, a study undertaken by Macmillan, McMorris and Kruttschnitt (2004) examined the effects of stability and change in maternal circumstance on developmental trajectories of antisocial behavior in children 4 to 7 years of age. They conclude:

> The study demonstrated that early maternal circumstances influences early antisocial behavior, whereas stability and change in these circumstances both exacerbate and ameliorate behavior problems. Of particular note, meaningful escape from poverty attenuates antisocial behavior whereas persistence in poverty or long-term movement into poverty intensifies such problems.
>
> Macmillan, McMorris and Kruttschnitt (2004): 205

The findings highlight the importance of considering the dynamic features of family lives when trying to understand notions of disadvantage and deprivation, and the central role poverty and health issues seem to play in parenting and successful child development. They also suggest that important gains might emerge from programmes that limit children's exposure to poverty and enhance conditions, for example raising awareness of health issues, under which parenting can maximise positive child development.

[1] www.nationalliteracytrust.org.uk/Database/stats/poorexam.html#ofstedfigures

**4.5 Poverty and health**

Mayall and Storey (1998) draw attention to a concern with children's health being evident from the very beginning of state education in the UK in the 1870s, because it was offered to the poorest children and made their health issues apparent. Initially the school health service was provided by education authorities, but from 1974 was made the responsibility of the health service. Finch (1984) describes three rationales offered over the years for the school health service: *efficiency* – in that health problems are seen as needing addressing so that children can benefit from education; *convenience* – a school–based service means it is accessible by all children; *complementarity* – because children are required to attend school and leave the care of the parents, the state has a duty to care for their health and welfare whilst they are there. The NHS Act 1977 placed a duty on the Secretary of State to provide for the dental and medical examination of children of school-age but the precise nature and extent of this was left to local determination. Mayall and Storey (1998) note a drift from universalist to selective services, based on particular 'needs'. There was also a 20 per cent reduction in school nurses from 1979 – 1991 brought about by marketisation and devolved budgets.

In 1977 the then-Labour government had commissioned the Black Report (DHSS 1980), which was published in 1980. It identified many health inequalities as the result of social and economic circumstances, and called for elimination of child poverty during the 1980s. Whilst there was little coverage of child health issues according to Macintyre (1997), Blane (1985) suggests that Black explained differences in child health in terms of class inequalities. The report was rejected by the Conservative Government as too costly and because they rejected the notion of health inequalities. Exworthy *et al* (2003) argue that inequality was ignored or referred to as 'variation' under the Conservatives – the result of individual choices rather than structural inequality. The 1980 Education Act removed the nutritional requirements from the school meals service and the subsequent privatisation of school meals led to price and choice being the determinants of what children ate in school. Subsequent marketisation in the NHS led to school health services being the subject of purchase agreements. Saxena *et al* (2002) note that death rates for children from the lower social classes were five times higher than those from the higher social classes in the 1970s and 1980s.

*Health of the Nation: a strategy for health in England* (DoH 1992) was concerned with reducing death from a range of diseases, and with reducing unhealthy lifestyle choices. It mentioned poverty and inequality only briefly. Liaison between health and education authorities was primarily focused on meeting the needs of children with special educational needs under the terms of the 1993 Education Act and the 1994 Code of Practice (DfEE 1994). Education authorities were encouraged to ensure that there was a health service contact for each school and to agree procedures for providing specialist equipment.

Mayall and Storey (1998) draw attention to the way in which education and health responsibilities were divided between different government departments until the late 1990s and this did not support collective responsibility for children's health and well-being. They also draw attention to the way that the *Health of the Nation* led to a view of child health promotion as an individual responsibility, without any clear means of providing children with the relevant skills and knowledge, and to a lack of co-ordination in the provision of services for children. Until 1996, joint service planning was needed only for children in need. They draw attention to the Health Visitors' Association and the British Paediatric Association calling for the school health service to move beyond screening and referral to health promotion work and to providing for children's rights to a healthy environment, in line with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN 1989) and the 1989 Children Act. They also draw attention to a centralised curriculum and testing system and the

financial constraints of local management of schools as meaning that schools were no longer fulfilling the pastoral role as fully as they once had. They note that

> underlying debates on the character and functions of the school health service are issues about the appropriate division of labour between groups of adults for the health and welfare of children during their daily life at school and, more broadly, across their school career. The health care of children during their days at school has been neglected by policy makers … parents remain the principal people deemed responsible for child health care.
>
> Mayall and Storey (1998): 88

Their research found that the school health service made very little contribution to health education. A key finding was that consultation between school and health staff was lacking.

The election of the Labour government in 1997 brought about renewed attention to child poverty and health inequalities. The Acheson Report (1998) recognised how individual characteristics, ethnicity, gender, early childhood, social, economic and cultural contexts result in complex health outcomes and behaviours. It recommended: additional resources for schools serving children from less well off groups to enhance their educational achievement; further development of high quality pre-school education to meet the needs of disadvantaged families in particular; the development of 'health promoting schools'; and further measures to improve school nutrition. A series of documents, such as *Saving Lives: our healthier nation* (1999), *Tackling Health Inequalities: cross-cutting review* (DoH 2002) and the Wanless Report (Wanless 2004) identified key policy themes that have had a bearing on the relationship between schools and health: lifestyle choices, life course factors (for example childhood experiences influencing adult behaviours), and health inequalities.

A particular focus, as noted earlier, has been on children perceived as being 'at risk'. This has included children whose health is affected by socio-economic and socio-cultural factors, as well as those with welfare and special educational needs. The inclusion of children with SEN in mainstream schools has meant that those with special health needs becoming more prevalent than previously. Lightfoot *et al* (2001) note that teachers, local education authority learning support staff, school care assistants, administrative and catering staff, school nurses and doctors, therapists and medical consultants may all have a role to play, which poses challenges of co-ordination. They refer to school staff not knowing whom to contact in the NHS and receiving variable responses from medical staff, usually because of concerns over confidentiality.

Sure Start developed as a major government programme aimed at closing the gap in outcome between children living in poverty and the wider population, and was set up after the 1998 Comprehensive Spending Review on services for young children. The Review found that children living in poverty were more likely to underachieve at school, to get involved in the criminal justice system as they went into adolescence, and to become parents as teenagers, and were less likely to be employed in young adulthood. Services for young children were found to be geographically patchy, uncoordinated, and of mixed quality (with most money spent on children over 4). It was concluded that early, co-ordinated and sustained support could make a difference to child outcomes (Eisenstadt 2002). Sure Start's objectives include to: improve health; improve the ability to learn; improve social and emotional development; and to strengthen families and communities. Emphasis is placed on the notion of co-ordination to add value, as the Spending Review had revealed that effort was wasted because providers did not talk to each other.

The Children Act (2004) seeks to increase co-ordination of health, social care and education. It enshrined five outcomes specified in the national *Every Child Matters* framework (DfES 2004c) in law. These outcomes are: being healthy, staying safe, enjoying and achieving, making a contribution to society and achieving economic well-being). The 2004 Act also gave

wider roles for GPs, health visitors, school nurses and midwives in promoting child and family health. All services for children in England except for health are now the responsibility of one department in each local authority, Children's Services, and one central government department, the DCSF.

**4.6 Co-ordination of services related to health provision**

Co-ordination is a key theme that runs through all current policy initiatives. The White Paper *Choosing Health: making healthy choices easier* (DoH 2004b) has a particular emphasis on health promotion, whole school approaches to health in all arrangements (including travel, meals and snacks) reducing health inequalities, and the co-ordination of services in one location as part of integrated services. It provides encouragement to schools to become extended schools and calls for the modernisation and expansion of school nursing services, providing by 2010 for every cluster of schools to have access to a team led by a qualified nurse. 'Healthy Schools' are expected to use a whole school approach involving the whole community. This involves providing for personal, social and health education; healthy eating; physical activity; emotional health and well-being. A similar focus on multi-agency working, improving access to services for children and tackling health inequalities is at the heart of the *National Service Framework for Children, Young People and Maternity Services* (DoH/DfES 2004), a ten year programme to stimulate long–term and sustained improvement in children's health and places emphasis on. Further attempts at co-ordination are apparent in the *Chief Nursing Officer's Review of the Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting Contribution to Vulnerable Children and Young People* (DoH 2004a) which recommended: increasing the number of school nurses; strengthening the public health role of midwives and nurses; and greater integration and co-location of practitioners within children's centres. *Working Together to Safeguard Children* (DoH, HO and DfES 2006) sets out health service and health professional responsibilities in safeguarding children and promoting their well–being and welfare.

The *Common Assessment Framework for Children and Young People* (DfES 2006a) attempts to provide an integrated and holistic structure for assessing children's development. Key principles are to assess and intervene early. Assessments are to be undertaken by a range of specialists and be co-ordinated and shared. The Framework is designed to be used with unborn babies, children and young people with additional needs – covering areas relating to education, health, social care, behaviour and emotional development. Assessments cover three domains – how well a child is developing, including health and progress in learning; how well parents or carers are able to support their child's development and respond appropriately to his or her needs; and the impact of wider family and environmental elements on the child's development. Assessments are to be carried out by children's centres, schools and in health settings. Common assessments will enable health visitors and midwives to take a broad view of issues affecting unborn and new born infants as part of Child Health Promotion Programme and principles will be used at health drop-in centres in schools.

The Childcare Act (2006) places a duty on local authorities to improve the well-being of young children and to reduce inequalities in relation to the five outcomes of the *Every Child Matters* agenda, and provides the statutory basis for the Children's Centre model by combining childcare, education, health, some social services tasks and job centres on one site.

Exworthy *et al* (2003) characterise recent health policy as concerned with the early childhood years as part of a life-course approach (as evidenced in Sure Start and a focus on the reduction of child poverty); with disadvantage in specific communities; with redistribution; and with the integration of health-supportive services. Primary Care Trusts have been given a central role in commissioning services, developing primary health care and tackling health

inequalities. Exworthy *et al* also note the development of target-setting and a performance culture in the health and other social services. Public service agreements determine the link between social policy and finance, within a framework that attempts to provide joined up government.

**4.7 Exclusion, law and public order**

The Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) was established in 1997, recognising that children and young people are especially vulnerable to the effects of social exclusion. The unit began with the premise that some children living in poverty are exposed to crime as victims, or drawn into early drug or substance misuse and offending. Such children may be faced with multiple problems, skip important stages of their education and face illiteracy and unemployment. Given this backdrop, it was assumed that some children's long-term prospects might include homelessness, mental health problems and chronic debt. The Social Exclusion Unit has led a number of significant projects with the aim of breaking this cycle of disadvantage by providing support from the early years through to adulthood (cf. http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/seu/index.html). The cross-departmental Green Paper, *Children at Risk* (2003) set out new arrangements for delivering an integrated and preventative approach to promoting the life chances of vulnerable children. The Paper looked at measures to reduce the levels of educational underachievement, offending, antisocial behaviour, teenage pregnancy and ill health among children and young people (aged 0 – 19). The Social Exclusion Unit published a practice guide to coincide with the Green Paper, *A Better Education for Children in Care* (2003). This highlighted the issues that were raised through the SEU development work and gives good practice examples from local authorities.

The Excellence in Cities (EiC) programme was launched in September 1999 to raise standards and promote inclusion in inner cities and other urban areas (see DfES 2007). It focused on leadership, behaviour, and teaching and learning. Initially based only in secondary schools, the programme quickly expanded to include primary schools and worked closely with the Primary National Strategy. By April 2006, over 1,300 secondary schools and 3,600 primary schools in 57 Local Authorities had been involved in the EiC programme. The programme aimed to tackle underachievement in schools through specific strands, including the development of Learning Mentors, the development of Learning Support Units, Provision for Gifted and Talented pupils and the building of City Learning Centres. The programme also ran alongside the Leadership Incentive Grant and the Behaviour Improvement Programme. EiC Action Zones were set up in urban areas where there was a mixture of social disadvantage and under-performance in schools, typically focusing on the needs of one or two secondary schools and their feeder primary schools. The Action Zones focused particularly on improving the quality of teaching and learning, on social inclusion, on the provision of support to pupil and families, and on working in partnership with businesses and other organisations. Eighty Excellence Clusters were also set up in smaller areas to focus on the provision for Gifted and Talented pupils, the development of Learning Mentors and Learning Support Units. According to DfES (2007), there is continuing evidence of a 'partnership dividend' in EiC schools. Because of increased and sustained work with primary and secondary schools, the rate of increase in GCSE performance for EiC areas is around twice that of non-EiC schools for the fourth consecutive year. This means there has been a narrowing of the achievement gap between EiC and non-EiC areas from 12.4 per cent in 2001 to 6.9 per cent in 2005. Funding changes in April 2006 meant that the targeted funding and support for EiC partnerships that hitherto had come through Local Authorities changed. The funding now goes directly to schools within EiC areas as part of their School Development Grant. This gives schools the freedom to decide on

the most appropriate and effective ways to address school improvement and pupil achievement, but also creates geographical variations in how, when and why schools engage with services and practices in different regions of England.

A report entitled *Tackling Truancy and Exclusion in School* (The Poverty Site, http://www.poverty.org.uk/policies/truancy%20and%20exclusion.shtml) suggested that the ways agencies were able to deal with truancy and exclusions from school had to change. The report identifies that changes were made in the form of the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act, which gave new powers to police. LEAs set new targets for schools in 1999; in 2002 the national truancy sweeps began; and 2005 saw the introduction of new Education Regulations. In 1998 Supporting Families was published, a Government consultation paper drawn up by the Ministerial Group on the Family (Home Office 1998). The paper aimed to find ways of supporting all parents in their role to provide 'strong and stable families' and asserts that the policy of support for families will be assisted by 'measures to strengthen the institution of marriage' with its 'extra rights and also extra responsibilities'. This consultation paper contains 5 key themes: ensuring that all families have access to the advice and support they need; improving family prosperity and reducing poverty through the tax and benefit system; making it easier for families to balance work and home; strengthening marriage and reducing the risks of family breakdown; and tackling the more serious problems of family life, such as domestic violence, truancy, exclusions and school-age pregnancy.

**4.8 Behaviour and attendance**

Gallimore (1977) examines the role of Education Welfare Officers (EWOs), suggesting that schools have, historically, varied widely in their perceptions and definitions of their role and function, perhaps due to two major factors. Firstly, changing conceptions of the role of EWOs were successively introduced by the 1944 Education Act, the Plowden Report (CACE 1967) and the Seebohm Report (1968), accompanied by changes in nomenclature from 'board man' to 'truancy officer' to 'education welfare officer'. Secondly, Gallimore argues, there has been a lack of effective publicity from the education welfare service, which has meant that not only the general public but even headteachers are often unclear about the nature of the EWO's services. *Every Child Matters* (DfES 2003) brings the work of the EWO under the remit of multi-agency working, specifically within the Behaviour and Education Support Team.

Blyth and Milner (1997) discuss the role of Education Social Workers (ESWs) and suggest that, although practice varies considerably across Local Authorities, ESWs are always involved in a wide range of welfare activities, including child protection. However there seems to be general agreement that dealing with school attendance is a central responsibility. Carlen *et al* (1992) found headteachers critical of social services for seeming to lack action and continuity in relation to dealing with truancy. 'Circles of blame' emerged where agencies held other agencies responsible for problems encountered. Normington and Kyriacou (1994) suggest 'a general lack of understanding by each agency of the aims and roles of the other agencies […] the records maintained by schools and agencies differ markedly, and none reflects the full picture of the child's problems nor gives a clear picture of the multi-disciplinary work occurring' (1994: 14).

In December 2002 the Government set out to improve behaviour and attendance in schools. The Behaviour Improvement Programme (BIP) is a key part of the National Behaviour and Attendance Strategy (DfES 2007b). It represents the Government's commitment to tackling behaviour and attendance and targeting resources where they are needed most. Behaviour and Education Support Services have been established to work in partnership with schools, as part of the local authority and within a framework of inclusion, to help them promote positive behaviour, and to provide effective support to pupils, parents and schools where behaviour is a concern and may have an effect on achievement. The precise nature of the

services provided by a local authority's behaviour support service will vary between authorities, as will the composition of staffing, contractual arrangements with schools and arrangements for local referral routes. However, all are likely to provide both preventative services and direct support services for children with behavioural difficulties. Behaviour and Education Support Teams (BESTs) are multi-agency teams bringing together a complementary mix of professionals from the fields of health, social care and education. The aim of a BEST is to promote emotional well-being, positive behaviour and school attendance, by identifying and supporting those with, or at risk of developing, emotional and behavioural problems. BESTs work with children and young people aged 5-18, their families and schools to intervene early and prevent problems developing further. They are strategically placed in targeted primary and secondary schools, and in the community, alongside a range of other support structures and services. According to the DfES (2007b), successful BESTs bring together the skills, perspectives and experience of a range of practitioners forming an effective multi-disciplinary team. Also working more broadly to address the issue of antisocial behaviour is the youth justice system, as set out in section 37 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, which has the aim of preventing offending by children and young people aged 10 to 17. Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) are currently the main vehicle by which that aim and its supporting objectives are delivered. Working with young offenders aged 10 to 17, YOTs were introduced in April 2000 to coordinate action at a local level, bringing together professionals with a range of disciplines. Statutory involvement is required from local authority social services and education departments, the police, probation service and health authorities. Other agencies, such as housing and youth and community departments, are also encouraged to contribute resources to YOTs.

Sure Start is, as noted, another UK government initiative that aims to tackle child poverty and social exclusion through integration and co-ordination of services in early education, childcare and health and family support. It aims to 'deliver the best start in life for every child' (www.surestart.gov.uk). According to Edgley and Avis (2007), Sure Start has hitherto operated exclusively in neighbourhoods with high levels of deprivation, as measured by the Index of Multiple Deprivation (DETR 2000), attempting to find innovative ways of working, and providing additional services to improve the quantity and quality of services to disadvantaged families and preschool children (aged 0–4 years). According to McLaughlin (2004), Sure Start represents a central feature of government policy to modernise education, health and social care services through the promotion of inter-professional collaboration, via partnerships and interagency working. Local Children's Centre programmes draw together education, health and social care provision to move across professional and agency boundaries, between government departments, local authorities and professional groups, and across the private and the voluntary sector, working with those who deliver services and those who receive them. Government policy is committed to further entrenching this collaborative model by 'mainstreaming' Sure Start services: that is, by ensuring that in future those planning early years childcare, health and family support services use the experience from Sure Start to adapt statutory services to become more integrated and responsive to children's and families' needs. A more collaborative and integrated model underpins a range of recent policy initiatives, from the Children Bill (House of Lords 2004), to *Every Child Matters* (DfES 2003), as well as the National Service Framework for Children, Young People and Maternity Services (DoH and DfES 2004), all of which aim to improve public services so that they better meet the needs of children and young people. Sure Start, then, is one element in a broader context of policy developments designed to cultivate collaborative and integrated service provision.

### 4.9.1 Children, race and ethnicity

Whilst the 1976 Race Relations Act established the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE), which was concerned with eliminating racial discrimination, and promoting equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different racial groups generally, it had comparatively little impact in schools. Gillborn (1997) argues that until the 1960s and 70s (and beyond) minority ethnic groups were seen largely as a 'problem'. Meeting their needs was conceived largely in terms of children needing to learn English as an additional language – a programme which was strongly advocated by the Plowden Report. Whilst, more recently, more attention has been paid to the value of diversity and to cultural and religious issues, 'multicultural education' for all children has often been seen in a negative light, being associated with a political correctness seen as unnecessary and a distraction (see, for example, Cole 1998). The National Curriculum statutory inclusion statement (National Curriculum Online, no date), which makes specific reference to the Race Relations Act 1976, sets out principles that are essential to developing a more inclusive curriculum. Teachers are required to 'ensure they meet the full range of pupils' diverse needs' and to 'be aware of the requirements of the equal opportunities legislation that covers race, gender and disability'.

Gillborn (2005) argues that the Thatcher government in the 1980s removed racial and ethnic equality issues from consideration, adopting a 'colour blind' approach on the grounds of supposed fairness. The Major administration in the early 1990s continued this approach. This led, Gillborn argues, to a lack of co-ordinated agency approaches to providing for the entitlements of minority ethnic groups. Such support as was available, through Section 11 funding, was short term and could be seen as exacerbating feelings of marginalisation. Gillborn (1997) also refers to the 'scaling down' of resources and support despite continued underachievement of certain groups – especially the (then) more recently established Bangladeshi communities. He also comments that the UK government had focused only on language issues without considering other factors. Gillborn (1997) argues for social class as a key factor affecting the opportunities and achievements of children from minority ethnic groups. He comments that a study was set up to look at multicultural education within the National Curriculum but its findings were never published. 'Education reforms are posited in a deracialised discourse that, while never mentioning race, constructs a particular version of the nation, its heritage, and traditions that excludes any serious engagement with minority issues' (Gillborn 1997: 387). Little serious consideration has been given until recently to the complex relationship between ethnicity, race, socioeconomic circumstances and gender. Scott and Sylva (2002) suggest that studies often consider, individually, gender, ethnicity or age but rarely tackle the complexities of overlapping and interrelated aspects of disadvantage.

Leung (2001) points to the marginal place of English as an Additional Language (EAL) within the National Curriculum where it is treated as being concerned with teaching strategies and approaches when, it could be argued, it should be a subject specialism. Over the past 20 years a key debate has been about withdrawal and in-class teaching. Government guidance has emphasised meaningful and interactive language situations and the need for audio-visual support for learning – in essence approaches that all seen as appropriate for all pupils. Pupils are expected to experience English as a subject in the National Curriculum at the same time as learning to speak and understand the English language. This is not the only approach: in the state of Victoria in Australia (Department of Education, Victoria 1998), pupils follow a specific EAL curriculum before studying English as a curriculum subject. The Plowden Report stressed the importance of immigrants learning English, but said little about how this was to be achieved. The Bullock Report (DES 1975) again emphasised the importance of teaching English to immigrants at a time when this was usually achieved by withdrawal or special class or school methods with the pupils

then being reintegrated. This, however, was at odds with the emphasis on first hand experience, discovery learning and language as a means to an end. Bullock warned of the dangers of separate teaching leading to children of immigrants being isolated from other pupils and of their teachers not communicating with those in mainstream education. Leung argues that this is when EAL as subject gave way to EAL as process. The Swann Report (DES 1985) argued for a pluralist and inclusive approach that brought EAL learning into the mainstream. Leung argues that the low attainment of some minority ethnic groups suggests that this is not wholly successful and questions whether it is appropriate to have the only form of assessment of English one that has been developed to assess children speaking English as their first language.

Consistent with Conservative governments' denial of ethnicity as a factor in terms of achievement, little data exists regarding ethnicity prior to the election of the Labour government in 1997. If children did badly, then this had generally been seen as the fault either of the school or of the individual and so information about ethnicity was not systematically collected. Tikly (2004) argues that until 2003, when the DfES introduced the Pupil Level Annual Census (PLASC) categories for recording ethnic groups, data collected varied between local authorities and between local and national government. Some groupings were very broad and there was little account of dual and mixed heritage in the recording. This could mean that differences within African, Middle Eastern and White minority ethnic communities may not have been evident, and data was missing for Somali, Tamil, Iranian, Turkish, Turkish Cypriot, Turkish Somali and Traveller and Gypsy/Roma pupils. Rarely was information available that dealt with ethnicity and gender despite evidence of differences in attainment. National data was difficult to collate until 2003 because of the differences in the categories used. Very little data was also available regarding nursery–aged children and the uptake of nursery education by ethnic group. The PLASC system is intended to standardise the collection of data. Scotland and Wales now have national systems but not Northern Ireland. Additional information is available from reports by Ofsted and Excellence in Cities projects.

Since 1997, more attention has been paid to ethnicity, race and EAL as factors which impact upon attainment. The Government is, as noted, energetically pursuing an agenda of family-focused early intervention, with policy initiatives such as Every Child Matters (DfES 2004), and the Respect Action Plan (Home Office 2006) which proposes parenting classes to help families improve child behaviour and achievement. According to Scott, O'Connor and Futh (2006), parents from minority ethnic groups may have particular burdens to address. Those who are well established may experience discrimination across several contexts, while those who have arrived more recently may additionally struggle with language difficulties, lack of information about how to access services and benefits, and isolation.

The 2000 Race Relations (Amendment) Act meant that for the first time all schools were required to have a race equality policy and to pay attention to the rights and entitlements of all groups. Ofsted took on a major role as the agency responsible for monitoring the new legislative requirements. Tomlinson (2005) cites Figueroa (2003) who argues that Labour policy has emphasised 'citizenship', which 'does not include diversity, conflict resolution, international or global issues or gender and ethnic diversity and anti-racism' (page 166). Support for EAL and to improve the attainment of minority ethnic groups is provided through the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG), which replaced Section 11 funding in 1998. Tomlinson (2005) argues that whilst there had been resources for expert EAL teaching and research under Section 11 funding, this was dispersed by the EMAG. Gillborn (2005) comments that the Five Year Strategy (DfES 2004a) mentions minority ethnic pupils only once in a brief paragraph headed 'low achieving minority ethnic groups'.

The establishment of Education Action Zones (EAZs) was intended to support those in the inner city, with a focus on attainment (and special programmes for gifted and talented children) and behaviour (with the provision of learning mentors and more Learning Support Units for the disruptive). The success of EAZs has, however, been disputed by Power et al (2003). Tomlinson (2005) states that Sure Start has been seen as more successful, but that there has been no substantial research to date that has looked at its effects on minority ethnic groups.

According to the publication *Ethnicity and Education* (DfES 2006b), pupils from groups including Travellers of Irish heritage, Gypsy/ Roma, Black Caribbean, White and Black Caribbean, Black Other and Pakistani heritage pupils make less progress at primary school than White British pupils with the same prior attainment. Children of White UK heritage comprise the highest attaining group. Pupils of Indian and Chinese heritage perform above average. Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Black African children are the lowest attaining, but differences between groups are not as significant when account is taken of parents' education and occupation. There appears, again, to be a link between social class, deprivation, ethnicity and educational attainment. Gypsy/ Roma and Traveller children are also marginalised. This reflects the second-class citizenship status of the Gypsy/ Roma and Traveller communities. Although they are invisible in the statistics, there is evidence to suggest that this is a group of children at particular risk of poverty. This, Cemlyn and Clark argue, reflects their 'wider relationship with the dominant settled society and the discrimination and denial of human rights across a range of aspects of day-to-day living' (2005: 154). The children of asylum seekers constitute an even more neglected group. Save the Children have published a series of reports detailing the difficulties faced by children seeking asylum either with their parents or on their own. One of these reported on a study of children who had been detained for purposes of immigration control. It revealed the damaging effects on the children's health and education and particularly emphasised the point that 'the greatest negative impacts are on mental health' (Crawley and Lester 2005: ix).

The complex relationship between ethnicity, poverty, class and disability began to be recognised in legislation through the 2005 Equality Bill (House of Commons 2005) which makes provision for the establishment of the Commission for Equality and Human Rights. It dissolves the Equal Opportunities Commission, the Commission for Racial Equality and the Disability Rights Commission. The Bill makes provision about discrimination on grounds of religion or belief and imposes duties relating to sex discrimination on persons performing public functions. It also amends the Disability Discrimination Act 1995.

**4.9.2 Race relations, asylum and refugee families**

There are many interesting questions continuing to emerge from the policies and practices of neo-liberal ideologies. For example, is the notion of 'class' beginning to be defined more widely to embrace other interwoven socio-cultural issues? If 'race', gender, religion and other factors are inscribed at the heart of class, how can Government policies and practices sensitively support such complex sociological inter-relationships? Sayyid (2003) reviews current theoretical perspectives on diversity and the construction of identity. He acknowledges that the academic work on the nature of identity presents some difficulties in application to public services but notes that the way that we understand identity to be constructed has changed significantly from the 1970s, when there was a strong drive implicit within public policy and services to 'fit' people within a fixed, dominant cultural model. It is no longer possible to build public policy on this model in a world where belief systems, social codes, cultural allegiances and group identities are in a constant state of flux and change. According to Sayyid, individual narratives are constructed on

difference - 'not on who we are but who we are not'. This model of the construction of identity is therefore a relative process with individuals living out the representational model of their own personal narrative in contrast to those who are different, drawing upon social and cultural tools that are available to them to do so. He also claims that the emergence of a global culture has had a significant influence upon the construction of identity. Internet, television, ease of travel and increased methods of interaction across cultures and continents create societies in which there are not fixed, cultural identities and where one is more likely to find 'differences within differences within differences'. There is no universal model and to talk of a sharp distinction between the 'host' country and the 'immigrant' is no longer accurate. This complexity is a challenge for contemporary public policy, which needs to be flexible and responsive to change and diversity.

In contrast practitioners work with individuals or families in contexts where discriminatory outcomes cannot be separated into separate strands labeled sexuality, race or class. Scott and Sylva (2002) suggest that this is an illustration of a significant gap between research and practice.

Scott, O'Connor and Futh (2006) suggest that parenting styles that fit familiar circumstances in the country of origin may be challenged by and found unacceptable in the new settings in Britain. For example, some disciplinary practices may be frowned upon, and might even instigate referral to social services. Equally, families from minorities may bring parenting styles that are considered advantageous in the new settings, for example greater social cohesiveness and closer supervision of children that helps the well-being of the parents and protects children in higher risk urban conditions.

Research undertaken by the Race Equality Foundation (2006) found inequitable experiences of black and minority ethnic communities in health, education and social care services. It also highlighted limited usage of mainstream services by these communities, and the reliance of many on services provided by BME voluntary and faith-based organisations. Scott, O'Connor and Futh (2006: 3) similarly state: 'many public services are under-used by minority parents – the services are failing them by not being acceptable and accessible. There is little information whether programmes based on Western ideas are acceptable to, and work for, minority families'. Voluntary, community and faith organisations provide a range of invaluable services to Asian, African and Caribbean communities both directly and indirectly as commissioned by mainstream providers. According to the research, there has been growing interest in including faith organisations in the development and delivery of local services, for example in urban regeneration, but there is little information about the extent of health and social care services provided by this sector or indeed by black and minority ethnic voluntary organisations in general. There is now considerable national information on the experience of poverty of black and minority ethnic families and children. Outreach is important with all black communities, and maybe the only way to contact newly-arrived communities. Black and minority ethnic mothers identify health visitors as a particularly valuable source of information. The research has shown that there is an association with black and minority ethnic workers being present in a service and the use made by these communities. Beyond being able to communicate effectively, workers' knowledge and skills in encouraging participation have been highlighted. The study concludes that any research concerned with gender, race and religion needs to place particular emphasis on the interrelationship of diversity rather than focusing on one single aspect of difference, beginning from the premise that inequality and prejudice will be prevalent. One of the challenges to the current research agenda is the need for future studies to be more multi-dimensional in their approach in order to have

an impact on inequality and disadvantage. Finally there needs to be an emphasis on the integration of these research agendas into the existing processes that are part of the planning and provision of public social services.

**4.10 Professional partnership with parents**

Since the Warnock Report (DES 1978), the term 'partnership with parents' has become widespread in special education policy **(**DfES 2001a; DfES 2004b), and it has also been the focus of much debate within research (Dale 1996; Murray 2000; Todd 2003). The Audit Commission Report (2002) states that involvement of parents in the education of children with special needs in the United Kingdom is considered not only a right, but also a necessary component of the delivery of effective and efficient provision. Parents are seen to provide an important source of information on the working of the systems designed to meet their child's needs (Dockrell, Peacey and Lunt 2002).

Armstrong (1995: 18) states that partnership implies mutual respect, complementary expertise, and a willingness of partners to learn from each other. However, the term 'partnership' is often so loosely defined within policy and research that it tells us little. And despite the frequent rhetoric about the importance of parenting, little practical recognition has been given to the weight and, indeed, the usefulness of parents' expertise and experiences (Dale 1996). Dale puts forward an analysis of parent-professional relationships, which identifies different models of professionals working in partnership with parents in very different ways. The focus on partnership with parents can partly be understood as a Government response to the increasingly confrontational relationships many parents experience as they engage with the special education system. Yet the vagueness of the rhetoric and the lack of commitment to minimum standards mean that a 'partnership model' can contribute to adversarial and conflict ridden relationships, which often result in partnership breakdown (Dale 1996).

The aim of recent policy has apparently been to soften the boundaries between parents and professionals by encouraging teachers to treat the concerns of parents in the same way as if they had been raised by a professional. The guidance in the DfES Code of Practice (2001b) asserts:

> Partnership with parents plays a key role in promoting a culture of co-operation between parents, schools, LEAs and others […] All parents of children with special educational needs should be treated as partners.
>
> DfES (2001b): 16

However it remains the case that whoever makes decisions about the level of support available to a child in school is *de facto* in control of the relationship, and this is usually the education professional (Armstrong 1995). Armstrong has questioned whether the 'parents as partners' model should really be seen as a genuine attempt to work in partnership with parents. He suggests that the real intention is simply to incorporate parents into the bureaucratic procedure and so remove the 'genuine' power of parents. Some support for such an interpretation can be found in the Code of Practice, which implies that the key role envisaged for parents in this 'partnership' might be understood as that of **'**informant**'**:

> Parents hold key information […] They have unique strengths, knowledge and experience to contribute to the shared view of a child's needs and the best ways of supporting them.
>
> DfES (2001b): 16

The notion of professional partnership with parents is therefore a contested one. It may represent a genuine desire to give parents a greater and more equitable share in decisions about their children's well-being and progress. But it may also be intended to recruit parents to the school's purposes, or to enable the smooth operation of 'bureaucratic' procedures. At

times, partnership with parents may even function as a method of passing the child's 'problems' back to the parents.

#### 4.11.1 Child protection and safeguarding children

The 1960s was the decade of the 'discovery of child abuse', according to Hendrick as cited in Boyden (1997). Subsequently, mounting concern about child abuse has led to a stream of circulars and guidance (Hallett, cited in Stevenson 1999a) and a number of high profile public inquiries such as the Maria Colwell Inquiry (DHSS 1974) and the Victoria Climbié Inquiry (Lamming 2003). According to Boyden (1997), child protection issues have been underpinned by theories of an adult society which is perceived to undermine childhood innocence, causing children to become segregated and protected from the adult world and the social dangers within it. Boyden suggests that as a consequence of this approach, child protection strategies have been both nurturing and constraining and have reflected particular images of children, childhood and the child. Mayall (2002) argues that children in the UK are subsumed under 'family' and that policies for children are in fact targeted at families, often focusing on parents. Childhood is seen as a preparatory stage for adult life and, as such, the perceived dangers presented by unfamiliar adults justify the social exclusion of children from public places, and the measures that schools have undertaken in order to secure their premises and 'police' their staff. Mayall contrasts this situation with that in Finland, where children are seen not as citizens *in potentia* but as citizens in their own right, and children's rights to use public spaces override concerns about the perceived threats to their safety.

Policies for child protection in the UK also seem to reflect the wider tensions underpinning images of childhood (James and Prout 1997). On the one hand, children are seen as passive, suffering, innocent victims, and on the other they are seen as unsocialised, anti-social, deviant, and deficient (Boyden 1997). Research suggests that children themselves place a high priority on the importance of play and access to safe public spaces (Save the Children, cited in Lister 2006). However, in the UK's 'social investment state' (Lister 2006) where children are valued for what they will become and how they will contribute to the economy, rather than as citizens in their own right, play and access to safe public spaces is accorded relatively low priority.

The inquiry into the death of Maria Colwell (DHSS 1974) re-focused the spotlight on children's perceived needs (Stevenson 1999a). The report following Maria's death highlighted a serious lack of coordination among services responsible for child welfare. The lack of interaction between education and social services departments emerged as particularly unsatisfactory, as it became clear that Maria's junior school teacher failed to get her concerns heard (Stevenson 1999a). The report into Maria's death resulted in the creation of Area Child Protection Committees (ACPCs) in England and Wales to coordinate local efforts to safeguard children. This led to a series of legislation in the 1980s, which included the Child Care Act 1980; Foster Children Act 1980; Children's Homes Act 1982; *Social Services Committee Report on Children in Care* (DHSS 1984); Child Abduction and Custody Act 1985; Local Government Act 1988.

The Children Act (1989) marked the culmination of a period in which child welfare policy had become a major political concern. The central principles of the act stressed the importance of an approach to working with families based on negotiation and involving parents and children in agreed plans. However, the Act focused the support of the state on those families considered to be 'in need'. The Children Act, then, made the assumption that 'normal' families should not need public services (Cannan 1992). The Act gave every child the right to protection from abuse and exploitation and the right to inquiries to protect their welfare within a new framework for care and protection of children. Part two of the Act

stresses the importance of inter-disciplinary and interagency work as an essential process in the task of attempting to protect children from abuse. Within the Children Act, the education service is not considered to be an investigative or interventionist agency but it is considered to have an important role to play at the recognition and referral stages. All teachers are required have an awareness of their duty to report concerns about a child's welfare.

**4.11.2 Social Services, social work and child protection**

The Social Work in Primary Schools (SWIPS) project (Webb and Vulliamy 2001), carried out in schools in the north-east of England, sought to gain a detailed understanding of the extent and nature of the social work dimension of primary teaching. Earlier research undertaken by Webb and Vulliamy (1996) explored the impact of the Education Reform Act (1988) on primary schools, which revealed that an extremely time-consuming aspect of the role of many of their sample of headteachers was interaction with parents, involving the provision of counseling and social work. It also found that there was a neglect of a consideration of the primary headteacher as social worker. In the 1989 Children Act, child protection was identified as a vital area of inter-agency responsibility, requiring schools and local education authorities (LEAs) to co-operate with social services. A number of agencies, including LEAs and their schools, were obliged to assist social services departments acting on behalf of children in need or investigating child abuse (David 1994). However, although school staff were deemed essential partners in ensuring both that children are properly protected from potential abuse and, when problems have arisen, that clear inter-agency plans are carried through to offer the child continued protection, there seems to be only minimal guidance written for schools. For example, Circular 10/95 (DfEE 1995) offered funding in the form of Grants for Education Support and Training (GEST) for child protection training for 1995– 6, after which training requirements had to be met from mainstream funding. Circular 10/97 (DfEE 1997b) introduced the requirement for specific coverage of child protection in initial teacher training. However Baginsky and Hodgkinson (1999) state that this provision varied between HE institutions, and was adversely influenced by the demands of the National Curriculum for primary initial teacher training, leading to increasingly reduced and more superficial coverage of the issues. The Teacher Training Agency (1997) suggested that training in child protection could be usefully included in a school's induction profile and/or identified as an area for development in a beginning teacher's career entry profile.

Government guidance (DoH 1991) and Circular 10/95 (DfEE 1995) specified that there should be a designated member of staff in every school who is responsible for child protection issues, and LEAs were required to keep a list of such named persons. According to the SWIPS project (Webb and Vulliamy 2001), some schools decided to conflate the roles of the Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator (SENCO) and the child protection co-ordinator as the situations and experiences that often rendered children 'at risk' were also likely to induce learning difficulties and/or behaviour problems, and so the two roles intertwined.

The Child Protection Register was established as a central record, usually maintained by social services, of all children in a given area for whom support is being provided via inter-agency planning. Generally these are children considered to be at risk of abuse or neglect. Child Protection Conferences were formal meetings attended by representatives from all of the agencies concerned with the child's welfare. Their purpose was to gather together and evaluate all of the relevant information about a child, and to plan any immediate action that might be necessary to protect them. Circular 10/95 (DfEE 1995) points out that every school should develop a child protection policy, which should reflect its statutory duties and pastoral responsibilities and refer to the procedures to be followed. LEAs are also

required to identify a senior officer with responsibility for co-ordinating child protection policy and action across the authority's schools.

Other legislation also became involved in the relationship between education and social care in relation to child protection/safeguarding children, including the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. This convention applies to all young people under 18 (or the age of majority if earlier). The UK is a signatory, but the Convention's provisions were not initially enforceable in UK courts. Signatories undertook to ensure that the courts and other public bodies make the best interests of the child a primary consideration in all actions concerning young people.

Despite the focus on Child Protection in policy, since the death of Maria Colwell another child death led to the publication of Lord Lamming's report into the death of Victoria Climbié in January 2003 (Lamming 2003). Lord Lamming found that police, health and social services had missed 12 opportunities to save her. In June 2003, Margaret Hodge was appointed the first children's minister and in September of that year the government's green paper *Every Child Matters* (ECM) was published. *Every Child Matters* (DfES 2003) defines 'child safety' as being safe from maltreatment, neglect, violence and sexual exploitation; being safe from accidental injury and death; being safe from bullying and discrimination; being safe from crime and anti-social behaviour in and out of school; having security, stability and being cared for; and ensuring that parents, carers and families provide safe homes and stability (DfES 2003: 9). *Every Child Matters* stated that 150 children's trusts needed to be set up by 2006, amalgamating health, education and social services, and involving a children's director to oversee local services, statutory local safeguarding boards to replace Area Child Protection Committees, and a children's commissioner for England. In 2005, Professor Al Aynsley Green was appointed as England's first children's commissioner.

## 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

### 5.1 Possibilities and tensions in the vision of integrated provision

The interaction of education, health services, law and social work has been conceptualised in this report as inter-agency intervention that seeks to connect previously disparate professional fields in order to engage, support and invest in particular 'types' of (problematic) families, and specific 'kinds' of 'insufficient' or 'incomplete' children, in an attempt to maximise each child's potential within the education system (and future market economy). Agencies are mobilised at different points, in different ways and for different reasons to provide guidance, resources and support for children and families constructed as being 'in deficit' and/or expressing aspects of 'otherness' within, and to some extent, across differing political ideologies. Commonly, both Thatcherism and New Labour's 'Third Way' seem to perpetuate notions of an 'ideal-typical', non-nuisance family that is sustained as 'productive' and therefore 'invisible' in terms of service engagement, one which embodies traditional male/female roles, is white, middle-class and constituted by a heterosexual partnership. The nature and thrust of differing interpretations of neo-liberal ideologies over the past three decades seems to form a shifting basis, upon which the provision for 'nuisance' families is premised. The extent to which different agencies construct the family, interact with each other and seek to offer 'seamless' provision differs between political eras, but also has elements in common. For example, interesting perspectives emerge from ways different agencies have become re-defined by their 'modernising' remits, their renewed roles and the changing responsibilities of the professionals working within them, as well as the ways agencies are mobilised in response to families and children who have become confined by their class, race and ethnicity, abilities and disabilities.

Market-driven policies and practices were precipitated by Thatcher's Conservative Government and re-cast, 'resurrected but with new attitudes' (Freeden 1999: 43) by Blair's New Labour Government. Movement across these entangled eras has involved some ideological shifts and tensions in relation to the family, accompanied by the more radical organisational re-configuration of services offered to the child 'in deficit' by different agencies. The Conservative neo-liberal position downplayed the barriers and complexities involved in enabling all children to access, and comprehensively participate in, education. Labour's Third Way orchestrated a shift in agencies' 'textures of contact and interactions with clients' (Jones 2001: 549), as the mantra of 'making a difference' intensified the politicisation and value-added commodification of inequalities. Agencies that proliferate support for families constructed as needing 'guided persuasion over coercion' (Freeden 1999: 46), or who were 'living in challenging circumstances' (Gewirtz 2001: 366) have become reorganised among market economies driven by the rhetoric and agendas of social inclusion.

According to Gilmour (1993), the Thatcher government started the neo-liberal transformation of the UK with its associated rise in inequality, social polarisation and increases in state centralisation and authority. Gilmour argues that 'the establishment of individualism and a free-market state is an unbending if not dictatorial venture which demands the prevention of collective action and the submission of dissenting institutions and individuals' (1993: 273-4). Thatcher took the position that economic and social phenomena can be explained by the actions of individuals:

> There is no such thing as society. There is a living tapestry of men and women and people and the beauty of that tapestry and the quality of our lives will depend upon how much each of us is prepared to take responsibility for ourselves and each of us prepared to turn round and help those who are unfortunate
>
> Thatcher (1987)

So, although the 1980s and 1990s were subsequent to and continued to embody mobilising social movements and collective action (including for example libertarian currents, women's equality, gay liberation, racial equality and disability politics), Thatcherism held that a child's 'belonging' to, or 'identifying' with different minority groups was relatively insignificant in terms of his or her opportunities to access, be included in and participate in mainstream education.

Certain tensions can be discerned within the flow of the 1980s and 1990s that pull between the appeal to traditional family ideals and to a market agenda. The concept of 'parental choice' straddles these two moments. Such tensions seemed to have promoted something of an individualised 'market' child, whose parents were perceived as consumers, and whose decisions were framed by the mantle of entitlement and rights. Inequalities in relation to class, poverty, race or ethnicity and special needs were primarily represented in terms of the inability to make the 'right' choices, or the propensity to carelessly fritter away equalities of opportunity offered to all. Issues of parenting and family 'responsibilities' towards children, and in support of the education system, were expressed in terms of choice, and policies advocated how the 'idealised' family *should* behave and *should* understand their roles and responsibilities. Given a national, standardised (and therefore seemingly 'equitable') curriculum, a child's inability to achieve, or behave, or progress was taken to indicate more about poor parental choices, inappropriate lifestyles and failing teachers than about other, more complex factors that permeate lived experiences within the education system.

From the late 1990s into the twenty-first century, the Labour Government's policies and practices have carved out a 'third way'; drawing from aspects of neo-liberal conservatism and socialist components as well as ideational imports from the United States, they have also, however, implemented policies that deviate from all of these positions in crucial areas

(Freeden 1999). Policies are characterised by tensions that move between community and professional cohesion on the one hand, understood in terms of services and agencies working together, and the quasi-market of parental choice and competition among schools and other services on the other. According to Jordan (2001), the Labour Government has 'tackled the legacy of Thatcher-Major years – issues of inequality, division and conflict – by redefining social justice in terms of "opportunity" and "community"' (Jordan 2001: 527). Freeden suggests that there has been a 'rediscovery of markets as tools of egalitarian choice, and an emphasis on the ethical virtues of participatory citizenship, dressed up in the mutually complementary and quasi-contractual language of rights and obligations' (1999: 44). According to Jordan (2001: 529), this 'involved a shift from generalised, mediocre, "one size fits all" public provision to an acknowledgement of the impact that social inequalities can have on a child's access to, and participation in the education system.' However this shift, according to Gewirtz (2001), nevertheless embodies an oversimplification of issues as a result of generalised and non-specific notions of community, and the homogenisation of particular groups. Labour's policies, according to Gewirtz, seem to be ideologically eclectic narratives of reinvention. Their particular imprint on social policy reform espouses 'tailor-made' services that have redefined the remits of statutory, non-statutory and voluntary agencies, involving new sets of qualificatory, regulatory and standard-setting systems to 'modernise' the whole approach to service delivery (cf DoH 1998).

Such an approach promotes public sector working in more cohesive and integrated ways, offering differentiated strategies of 'joined-up' services and intervention; constructing citizens as active, morally-autonomous individuals with high expectations of state services, but who in turn are expected to be self-responsible and hardworking (Crouch 2001). Blair (1996) claims that New Labour's policies and practices work to emancipate individuals from the vagaries and oppression of personal circumstance. According to Jordan, the 'promotion of "opportunity" and choice encourages mainstream citizens to be mobile in pursuit of "positive advantage" […] including access to the best possible schools, clinics, care facilities.' (2001: 528). However as Jordan and Jordan (2000) point out, this programme has to balance measures for inclusion, equality and empowerment with ones for enforcement. The phrase 'tough love' captures the spirit of its culture shift (Jordan and Jordan 2000: chapters 1 and 2). Freeden suggests that

> community is conjoined with an undertone of social sin, [where] failure is notably one of free will… made all the more culpable in a cohesive society which offers opportunities to individuals as long as they embody what Blair has called 'common norms of conduct' in a 'strong and decent' community'
>
> Freeden (1999): 48

As responsibilities for the child shift and compete between the family and the state, the courts and local authorities, education, social care and health, we witness the sustaining of market economy discourses among the rhetoric of the child as commodity, as low-cost or value-added, as in need of intervention and of parents as 'risk managers' (Ball 2004: 4). Children are seen as potentially irresponsible and as thoroughly commercialised. Government constructions of the child and of the family are articulated within policies and practices of integration and cohesion, producing the professionally 'distributed' child. 'Joined-up services', inter-professional and multi-professional working attempt to counteract the consequences of insular and non-communicative professional identities and practices. These policies and practices rest on conceptualisations of an ideal-typical family which, according to Gewirtz (2001), is constructed as a middle-class family. Such practices may fail to recognise the postmodern child as complex and diverse, resistant to tendencies to be homogenised, to cohere or be complete. Rather than accommodating this fragmentation and diversity, inter-professional and inter-agency work seems still to be located within a

compensatory discourse of cultural and social deficit. Ball (2004) suggests that this approach requires 'a disjunction between policy and preferred practice' (cf McNess, Broadfoot and Osborn 2003: 255). The result for many professionals and clients is a kind of 'bifurcated consciousness' or 'segmented self' (Miller 1983) or a struggle with 'outlaw emotions' (Jaggar 1989) as they try to live up to and manage 'the contradictions of belief and expectation' (Acker and Feuerverger (1997) quoted in Dillabough (1999): 382). There has, in Bauman's words, been a 'privatisation of ambivalence' (1991: 197).

**5.2 Shifting notions and 'realities' of collaboration**

The vocabulary of market economy and business, such as client, consumer, service user, manager and entrepreneur, increasingly has proliferated among education, health and social care services. Similarly, a shared inter-agency language has been developed in an attempt to shift sector-specific terminology. For example 'child protection' has been re-phrased as 'safeguarding children'; children who are 'at risk' are now constructed as potentially in danger of experiencing 'significant harm'; the 'EWO' (Education Welfare Officer) has become the 'BEST' (Behaviour and Education Support Team); EAZs (Education Action Zones) are now EICAZ (Excellence in Cities Action Zones); the 'Probation Officer' is now working within 'Youth Offending Teams' (YOTs); and 'inspections' are now referred to as 'JARS' (Joint Area Reviews). This shifting language seems to have gone some way to addressing ways to think about issues that traditionally reside within insular and sector-specific practices. However Payne (2000) suggests that 'power struggles about objectives, roles and responsibilities are major impediments to collaboration' (2000: 26). Glendinning *et al* similarly note the barriers to collaboration:

> inter-agency working is complex because professionals are differently situated and constrained institutionally by different policy frameworks. The notion of partnership is also problematic; partnerships are not always voluntary and there may be imbalances in the autonomy experienced by different partners
>
> Glendinning *et al* (cited in Harris 2003): 303

Interagency working was described in the Children Act (1989) as a complex process involving social services departments, police, medical practitioners, community health workers, the education service and others. *Every Child Matters: Change for Children* (DfES 2003) construes multi-agency working as essentially about bringing together practitioners with a range of skills to work across their traditional service boundaries, and claims that multi-agency working has been shown to be an effective way of supporting children and young people with additional needs, and securing real improvements in their life outcomes. ECM states that the lead professional is a key element of integrated support, whose role is to coordinate provision and act as a single point of contact for a child and their family when a range of services are involved and an integrated response is required. Within the Children Act 2004, co-operation is identified as necessary for improving each child's well-being, specifically in relation to physical and mental health and emotional well-being; protection from harm and neglect; education, training and recreation; the contribution made by them to society; and social and economic well-being. Webb and Vulliamy cite the view of collaboration presented by Lupton and Khan, as 'existing on three levels: the interpersonal, involving the interaction of individuals; the inter-professional, determined by the training, knowledge and skills of each agency; and the inter-organisational, concerning the internal structures, finances, time-scales and priorities of agencies' (Webb and Vulliamy 2001: 68).

Over the last three decades therefore, policy, legislation and terminology have continued to shift between differing notions of co-operation, inter-agency working and collaboration. However, practical application in terms of 'joined up services' remains complex and highly problematic. Moran, Jacobs, Bunn and Bifulco (2006) suggest that the implementation of

multi-agency working and the pace of service development still remain challenging for the agencies involved in frontline delivery.

### 5.3 Inter-organisational working

New Labour is clear that family support should be delivered on an inter-organisational basis. Guidance, such as *The Framework for the Assessment of Children in Need and their Families* (DoH, DfEE and HO 2000) and *Working Together* (DoH, HO and DfEE 1999), is intended to facilitate new opportunities for joint working between health, education and social services, formalised within the new children's services arrangements detailed in the 2004 Children Act. To strengthen the Government's intentions to promote collaborative and inter-organisational working, the *Every Child Matters* programme now includes a Common Assessment Framework (CAF) together with improved practice in sharing information. This is intended to enable practitioners in schools, health settings, children's centres and other early years services to identify what additional services a child may need. Usually this will be through additional support delivered in universal or targeted services. The Children Act 2004 stated that, from April 2006, education and social care services for children were to be brought together under a director of children's services in each local authority, allowing local authorities more flexibility in organising their children's services. A National Service Framework was also established with integrated standards and inspection and, as noted above, England's first children's commissioner was appointed in 2005.

### 5.4 Inter-professional working

Since the 1980s, the Government required agencies to work together in order to plan and implement 'joined-up solutions' to social problems (DfEE 1997a; 1998). However, despite this call for more integrated services and strengthened working relationships between schools, social services and parents or carers, the Children Act Report (DfES 2002) found that 'there was a reluctance of some agencies (including schools) to refer to social services and police' (page 33). Hallet and Birchall (1992) found that, with the exception of the police, agencies considered the role of teachers in child protection to be important, but found schools to be isolated and difficult to co-operate with. In a seemingly reciprocal standoff, Hayden (1997) found that teachers were often critical of the lack of urgency on behalf of social services to effectively support children 'in need' and were angry at the lack of consultation and follow-up in cases where the school had raised child protection concerns. The *Every Child Matters: Change for Children* programme (DfES 2003), as noted, put in place a national framework to support the joining up of services so that every child can achieve the five ECM outcomes. Social services are identified as playing a central role in trying to improve outcomes for the most vulnerable. The functions of social services as specified in the Children Act 1989 remain unchanged, but how they are delivered at local level is set to change radically. The Children Act 2004 requires local authorities to lead on integrated delivery through multi-agency children's trusts, to develop a children and young people's plan, and to set up a shared database of children, containing information relevant to their welfare. *Every Child Matters: Change for Children in Social Care* states that,

> Social workers and social care workers working with other agencies will have an important role in supporting universal services in meeting a wider range of needs. An example of how universal services can be strengthened is the development of a multi-disciplinary safeguarding children team in Sheffield, which provides advice on safeguarding children and young people to all services for children and young people in the city. This sort of initiative can, for example, help a school respond more confidently to children and young people affected by domestic violence. The duty on agencies to safeguard and promote

> children's welfare, Section 11 of the Children Act 2004, should help ensure safeguarding and promoting children's welfare becomes everyone's business.
>
> DfES (2004c): 4

With reference to early years, *The Five Year Strategy for Children and Learners* (DfES 2004a) set out the future direction of services for children, parents and families, including one-stop support at Sure Start Children's Centres, with childcare and education, health and employment advice and family support on offer together, within easy reach of every parent. The notion of 'extended schools' emerged, suggesting this service has an important role in addressing the needs of looked after children and children with disabilities:

> Extended schools are one way of integrating service delivery and ensuring that services are delivered closer to where children and their families spend much of their time. Extended schools could play a greater role for example in supporting looked after children through the development of individual support programmes within their school, or by assisting disabled children to gain access to mainstream leisure and out of school activities so that they have less need for specialist services. We will see more effective earlier intervention by a range of agencies working with social workers and social care workers. This will help to ensure that any child or young person identified as having additional needs, such as substance misuse or serious behaviour problems, receives the right multi-agency intervention early on to prevent the development of longer term problem.
>
> DfES (2004c): 4

**5.5 Interpersonal partnerships**

Freeden (1999) notes how Blair's vision of community, co-operation and cohesion are framed within an appeal to 'common norms of conduct' in 'a strong and decent community' (Freeden 1999: 48), as discussed above. By framing his vision around concepts of norms and decency, interpersonal partnerships become a vehicle of rectification for parents and those families who, for whatever reason, do not manifest these qualities. Interpersonal partnerships have become ways in which particular families are required to engage with different agencies as a result of their circumstances, lifestyle choices or predisposition to be labeled as, or fall into, the 'nuisance family' categories. Families are induced to engage (or not) with different professionals/individuals, including for example social workers, health practitioners or the police, and to access (or not) services that are informed and led by Government policy and legislation.

In relation to parents/carers, there are mixed responses to the interpersonal partnerships engendered through inter-organisational and inter-professional working. Pugh, De'ath and Smith (1994) note that the use of groups to train or educate parents began in the 1970s, predominantly in the USA, and has grown in the UK in the last decade. Lloyd (1999) suggests that types of programmes include the Parent Plus programme developed in Ireland; Mellow Parenting based on the work of Newpin; and PEEP, an education focused pre-school project that covers highly disadvantaged areas. Bell (2007) points out that,

> New Labour have given parenting a high priority. […] 'Good parenting' is seen as a solution to a range of social problems and its promotion is at the heart of preventive practice with children and families, as well as the focus of remedial and therapeutic interventions for families identified as problematic
>
> Bell (2007): 56

The Children Act Report (DfES 2002) states that school based interventions to support parents with young children at risk of behavioural problems can be effective. For example, a study commissioned under the Department of Health's Supporting Parents research initiative evaluated the SPOKES (Supporting Parents on Kids Education) Project in South London, which offered parents of five and six year-olds exhibiting early behavioural

difficulties a combined parenting course and reading workshop (Scott and Sylva 2002). Children who were assigned to the intervention group moved from being within the worst 15 per cent of anti-social children to being outside the most anti-social 35 per cent, and showed a seven month improvement in reading age compared to the control group (page 34). *Every Child Matters: Change for Children in Social Care* (DfES 2004c) acknowledges shortcomings in working with service users:

> A central part of the […] programme is addressing the weaknesses in how we work together including with children, young people and their parents and carers. We know that the picture on working together is inconsistent. Too much is dependent on local relationships and there is too little implementation of what we know is good practice. For example disabled children and their families often need services from a number of agencies or providers. Whether or not they are successful in working together can either add to or reduce family stresses and strains.
>
> DfES (2004c): 5

Bell (2007) notes that parenting programmes 'command a good deal of political support', but argues for universal access to programmes, rather than access based on perceived need – ie. on a deficit model of the needy family. Bell refers to evidence from Sanders *et al* (2003) that

> universal population level approaches do contribute to preventing child maltreatment because they normalize and destigmatize attendance at parenting programmes, […] because they provide opportunities for support networks to be established within communities and because they provide parents with a positive experience of professional help
>
> Sanders *et al* (2007): 56

### 5.6 Corporate parenting

The notion of 'corporate parenting' also brings the services and practices of social care, health and education together. 'Corporate parenting' emphasises the collective responsibility of local authorities to achieve good parenting for all children in their care – an essential part of which is to safeguard and promote their education. Section 4 of the joint DfES/DoH *Guidance on the Education of Children and Young People in Public Care* (2000) sets out some corporate parenting education principles, which include: prioritising education; high expectations and raising standards; inclusion and changing attitudes; early intervention and taking priority action; and listening to children. The joint guidance also sets out the range and number of individuals and agencies that may be involved in delivering 'corporate parenting'.

### 5.7 Concluding remarks

From the 1960s to the twenty-first century, the interface between education, the law and social care has focused on the child or family with 'issues'. Notions of inter-organisational, inter-professional and inter-personal collaboration seems to be nurtured within a deficit model of the 'nuisance', 'incomplete' or 'insufficient' child, set against an increasingly demanding backdrop for schools to reach targets and standards. Webb and Vulliamy suggest that 'a great deal more opportunity is needed for contact with other agencies so that both schools and agencies can understand each other's working cultures, values and priorities' (2001: 73). However, they also point out that the Government's inclusive education rhetoric is in danger of being submerged by the policy and practice of its Standards agenda: 'a strong emphasis is put on the academic side of the school at the expense of the pastoral side' (*Ibid.*: 74). In their Social Work in Primary Schools (SWIPS) project, Webb and Vulliamy suggest that their sample of schools felt under pressure to move from what Hargreaves (1995) terms a 'welfarist' school culture with its focus on 'individual student development within a nurturing environment' (1995: 27) and child-centred educational philosophy towards a 'formal' culture emphasising the achievement of 'learning goals', including homework, curriculum targets and test performance. Perhaps for all those who work on, for

and with children, the pressing question is how these issues could be re-conceptualised, as well as re-thinking their potential for operating in practice, in ways that could begin to disturb notions of children as incompetent, unstable, insufficient, credulous, unreliable and incomplete.

**References**


Acheson, D. (1998) *Independent Inquiry into Inequalities in Health (*Acheson Report), London: HMSO.

Acker, S. and Feuerverger, G. (1997) 'Doing good and feeling bad: the work of women university teachers.' *Cambridge Journal of Education* 26: 401 – 422.

Akbar, A. (2007) 'Social workers condemned over parents' abuse of disabled girl' *The Independent*, 9th February 2007.

Armstrong, D. (2005) 'Reinventing "inclusion": New Labour and the cultural politics of special education.' *Oxford Review of Education* 31(1): 135 – 151.

Audit Commission (2002) *Special Needs: A Mainstream Issue.* London: Audit Commission.

Baginsky, M. and Hodgkinson, K. (1999) 'Child protection in initial teacher training: a survey of provision in institutions of higher education.' *Educational Research* 14: 173 – 181.

Ball, S. (2004). 'Education for sale! The commodification of everything?', in Department of Education and Professional Studies Annual Lecture, Institute of Education, London (June 2004).

Barlow, J. and Stewart Brown, S. (2000) 'Behaviour problems and group based education programmes.' *Journal of Development Behaviour and Paediatrics* 21(5): 356–370.

Bauman, Z. (1991) *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Bell, M. (2007) 'Community-based parenting programmes: an exploration of the interplay between environmental and organizational factors in a Webster Stratton project.' *British Journal of Social Work* 37: 55–72.

Bernstein, B. (1971) *Class, Codes and Control, Vol 1.* London: Paladin.

Blair, T. (1996) *New Britain: My Vision of a Young Country*. London: Fourth Estate.

Blair, T. (1997) 'Why we must help those excluded from society,' *Independent*, 8 December.

Blair, T (1999) Speech to the Institute for Public Policy Research, London, 14 January.

Blane, D. (1985) 'An assessment of the Black Report's explanations of health inequalities.' *Sociology of Health and Illness* 7: 423-45.

Blyth, E. and Milner, J. (1997) *Social Work with Children: the Educational Perspective*. London: Longman.

Board of Education (1931) *Report of the Consultative Committee on the Primary School* (The Hadow Report), London: HMSO.

Boyden, J. (1997) 'Childhood and the policy makers: a comparative perspective on the globalization of childhood,' in A. James and A. Prout (Eds) *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood.* London: RoutledgeFalmer: 190 – 250

Brehony, K.J. (2005) 'Primary schooling under New Labour: the irresolvable contradiction of excellence and enjoyment.' *Oxford Review of Education* 31(1): 29 – 46.

Breslin, R., Brookes, H. and Marjolin, N. (2006) *Responding to Black and Minority Ethnic Children and Young People Affected by Domestic Violence*. A Conference Report organised by the NSPCC in partnership with Women's Aid; Ashiana Project; the Metropolitan Police; Centre for the Study of Safety and Wellbeing at the University of Warwick; and Women Acting in Today's Society. (4.10.06) NSPCC National Training Centre: Leicester.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979) *The Ecology of Human Development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1983) *Child's Talk: learning to use language.* New York: Norton.

Butt, J. and Mirza, K. (2001) *Social Care and Black Communities*. London: HMSO.

Cannan, C. (1992) *Changing Families, Changing Welfare.* London: Prentice-Hall.

Carlen, P., Gleeson, D. and Wardhaugh, J. (1992) *Truancy: The Politics of Compulsory Schooling*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Cemlyn, S. and Clark, C. (2005) 'The social exclusion of Gypsy and Traveller children,' in G. Preston (ed) *At Greatest Risk.The Children Most Likely to be Poor.* London: Child Poverty Action Group: 150-165.

Central Advisory Council for Education (CACE) (1967) *Children and Their Primary Schools* (The Plowden Report), London: HMSO.

*Child Abduction and Custody Act 1985* C. 60. London: HMSO.

*Child Care Act 1980.* C.5. London: HMSO.

*Childcare Act 2006* C. 21. London: HMSO

*Children Act 1989* C. 41. London: HMSO.

*Children Act 2004.* C. 31. London: HMSO.

*Children at Risk* (2003) Green Paper. London: HMSO.

*Children's Homes Act 1982.* C. 20. London: HMSO.

Cole, M. (1998) 'Racism, reconstructed multiculturalism and antiracist education.' *Cambridge Journal of Education* 28(1): 37-48.

Cox, C.B. and Dyson, A.E. (eds) (1971) *Black Papers on Education.* London: Davis-Poynter.

Crawley, H. and Lester, T. (2005) *No Place for a Child: Children in Immigration Detention in the UK – Impacts, Alternatives and Safeguards*. London: Save the Children www.savethechildren.org.uk/temp/scuk/cache/cmsattach/2414_no%20place%20for%20a%20child.pdf

*Crime and Disorder Act 1998.* C. 37. London: HMSO.

Croll, P. and Moses, D. (2004) *The Transmission of Educational Values*. End of Award Report to the ESRC.

Crouch, C. (2001) 'Citizenship and markets in recent British education policy,' in C. Crouch, K. Eder and D. Tambini (eds) *Citizenship, Markets and the State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dale, N. (1996) *Working with Families of Children with Special Needs.* London, Routledge.

David, T. (1994) 'Introduction: multiprofessionalism – challenges and issues,' in T. David (ed) *Protecting Children from Abuse: multiprofessionalism and the Children Act 1989*. Stoke-on–Trent: Trentham Books.

Department of Education Victoria (1998) *ESL Students: assessment and reporting support materials*. Victoria, Australia: Department of Education.

Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1994) *Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs.* London: DfEE.

DfEE (1995) *Protecting Children from Abuse: the role of the Education Service*. Circular 10/95. London: DfEE.

DfEE (1997a) *Excellence For All Children*. London: HMSO.

DfEE (1997b) *Teaching: High Status, High Standards.* Circular 10/97. London: DfEE.

DfEE (1998) *Guidance on LEA Behaviour Support Plans*. Circular 1/98. London: DfEE.

DfEE (1999) *Social Inclusion: pupil support*. Circular 10/99. London: DfEE.

Department of Education and Science (DES) (1975) *A Language for Life* (The Bullock Report), London: HMSO.

DES (1978) *Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People* (The Warnock Report), London: HMSO.

DES (1985) *Education for All: Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups* (The Swann Report), London: HMSO.

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2001a) *Inclusive Schooling: children with special educational needs.* London: DfES Publications.

DfES (2001b) *Special Educational Needs Code of Practice* (Ref: DfES/0581/2001). London: DfES Publications.

DfES (2002) *The Children Act Report 2002.* Nottingham: DfES Publications.

DfES (2003) *Every Child Matters.* Nottingham: DfES Publications.

DfES (2004a) *Five Year Strategy for Children and Learners: Putting People at the Heart of Public Services*. London: DfES.

DfES (2004b) *Removing Barriers to Achievement: the Government's strategy for SEN*. London: DfES Publications.

DfES (2004c) *Every Child Matters: Change for Children in Social Care.* Nottingham: DfES Publications.

DfES (2005) *Higher Standards: Better Schools for All.* London: DfES.

DfES (2006a) *Common Assessment Framework for Children and Young People.* http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/deliveringservices/caf Accessed 27 February, 2007.

DfES (2006b) *Ethnicity and Education: The Evidence on Minority Ethnic Pupils aged 5 – 16*. Nottingham: DfES Publications.

DfES (2007a) *Excellence in Cities.* http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/sie/eic/ Accessed 29 January, 2007.

DfES (2007b) *Supporting Students Through Behaviour Improvement Programmes.* http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/research/themes/behaviour/Supportingstudents/ Accessed 28 March 2007.

DfES, and Department of Health (2000) *Guidance on the Education of Children and Young People in Public Care.* London: DfES.

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (2000) *Index of Multiple Deprivation.* London: DETR.

Department of Health (1991) *The Children Act 1989 Guidance and Regulations*. London, HMSO.

Department of Health (Cmd 1986) (1992) *Health of the Nation: a strategy for health in England.* White Paper. London: HMSO.

Department of Health (1998) *Modernising Social Services: promoting independence, improving protection, raising standards*, Cmd 4169. London: Stationery Office.

Department of Health (2002) *Tackling Health Inequalities: summary of the 2002 cross-cutting review.* London: DoH Publications.

Department of Health (2004a) *Chief Nursing Officer's Review of the Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting Contribution to Vulnerable Children and Young People.* London: DoH Publications.

Department of Health (2004b) *Choosing Health: Making Healthy Choices Easier* (Cmd 6374). White Paper. London: HMSO.

Department of Health, Department for Education and Employment (DfEE), and the Home Office (2000) *Framework for the Assessment of Children in Need and their Families.* London: HMSO.

Department of Health, and DfEE (2004) *National Service Framework for Children, Young People and Maternity Services: Executive Summary.* London: DoH Publications.

Department of Health, Home Office, and DfEE (1999/2006) *Working Together to Safeguard Children: a guide to inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children* (2nd edition, 2006). London: HMSO.

Department of Health and Social Security (DHSS) (1974) *Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Care and Supervision Provided in Relation to Maria Colwell.* London: HMSO.

DHSS (1980) *Inequalities in Health. Report of a Research Working Group* (The Black Report), London: HMSO.

DHSS (1984) *Children in Care. Government Response to the Second Report from the Social Services Committee session 1984-4.* Cmnd. 9298. London: HMSO.

Dillabough, J-A. (1999) 'Gender politics and conceptions of the Modern Teacher: women identity and professionalism.' *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 20(3): 373 – 394.

Dockrell, J., Peacey, N. and Lunt, I. (2002) *Literature Review: Meeting the Needs of Children with Special Educational Needs*. London: Audit Commission.

Donaldson, M. (1978) *Children's Minds.* New York: Norton.

Easen, P., Atkins, M. and Dyson, A. (2000) 'Inter-professional collaboration and conceptualisations of practice.' *Children and Society* 14: 355 – 367.

Edgley, A. and Avis, M. (2007) 'The perceptions of statutory service providers of a local Sure Start programme: a shared agenda?' *Health and Social Care in the Community* (OnlineEarly Articles).

*Education (Handicapped Children) Act 1970.* C.52. London: HMSO.

*Education Act 1980.* C. 20. London: HMSO.

*Education Act 1981*. C.; 60. London: HMSO.

*Education Act 1993.* C. 35. London: HMSO.

*Education Act 1996.* C. 56. London: HMSO.

*Education Reform Act 1988.* C.40. London: HMSO.

Edwards, A.D. (1976) *Language, Culture and Class: The Sociology of Language and Education.* London: Heinemann.

Eisenstadt, N. (2002) 'Sure Start: key principles and ethos.' *Child: Care, Health and Development* 28(1): 3 – 4.

Evans, O. and Varma, V. (eds) (1990) *Special Education, Past, Present and Future*. Lewes: Falmer.

Exworthy, M., Blane, D. and Marmot, M. (2003) 'Tackling health inequalities in the United Kingdom: the progress and pitfalls of policy.' *Health Services Research* 38: 1905 – 1922.

Figueroa, P. (2003) 'Diversity and citizenship in England,' in J.A. Banks (ed) *Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives*. New York: Jossey-Bass.

Finch, J. (1984) *Education as Social Policy*. London: Longman.

*Foster Children Act 1980.* C.6. London: HMSO.

Fitzherbert, K. (1980) 'Strategies for prevention,' in M. Craft, J. Raynor and L. Cohen (eds) *Linking Home and School – A New Review* (3rd edn.) Harper and Row: London: Ch. 23.

Freeden, M. (1999) 'The ideology of New Labour.' *The Political Quarterly* 70(1): 42 – 51.

Gallimore, C.C. (1977) 'The role of an Education Welfare Officer in two contrasting schools.' *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling* 5(1): 102 – 5.

Gewirtz, S. (2001) 'Cloning the Blairs: New Labour's programme for the re-socialization of working-class parents.' *Journal of Educational Policy* 16(4): 365 – 78.

Gilmour, I. (1993) *Dancing with Dogma*. London: Pocket Books.

Gillborn, D. (1997) 'Ethnicity and educational performance in the United Kingdom: racism, ethnicity, and variability in achievement.' *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 28(3): 375 – 393.

Gillborn, D. (2005) 'Education policy as an act of white supremacy: whiteness, critical race theory and education reform.' *Journal of Education Policy* 20(4): 485 – 505.

Gilligan, R. (1998) 'The importance of teachers in child welfare.' *Child and Family Social Work* 3: 13 – 25.

Glendinning, C., Powell, M. and Rummery, K. (eds) (2002) *Partnerships, New Labour and the Governance of Welfare*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Hallet, C. and Birchall, E. (1992) *Co-ordination and Child Protection: A Review of the Literature*. Edinburgh: HMSO.

Hargreaves, D.H. (1995) 'School culture, school effectiveness and school improvement.' *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 6: 23 – 46.

Harris, S. (2003) 'Inter-agency practice and professional collaboration: the case of drug education and prevention.' *Journal of Education Policy* 18(3): 303–314.

Hayden, C. (1997) *Children Excluded from Primary School*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Heath, S.Brice (1983) *Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hirsch, F. (1977) *Social Limits to Growth*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Home Office (1998) *Supporting Families: A Consultation Document.* London: HMSO.

Home Office (2006) *Respect Action Plan.* London: Home Office Respect Task Force.

House of Commons (2005) *Equality Bill.* London: HMSO.

Ingleby Report (1960) *Report of the Committee on Children and Young People* Cmd.1191. London: HMSO.

Jaggar, A. (1989) 'Love and knowledge: emotion in feminist epistemology,' in A. Jaggar and S. Bordo (eds) *Gender Body/Knowledge*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

James, A. and James, A.L. (2004) *Constructing Childhood: Theory, Policy and Social Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

James, A., Jenks, C. and Prout, A. (1998) *Theorizing Childhood*. London: Polity Press.

James, A. and Prout, A. (1997) 'A new paradigm for the sociology of childhood? Provenance, promise and problems,' in A. James and A. Prout (eds) *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Jenks, C. (2005) *Childhood*. London: Routledge.

Jones, C. (2001) 'Voices from the front line: state social workers and New Labour.' *British Journal of Social Work* 31: 547 – 562.

Jordan, B. (2001). 'Tough love: social work, social exclusion and the Third Way.' *British Journal of Social Work* 31: 527 – 546.

Jordan, B. and Jordan, C. (2000) *Social Work and the Third Way: Tough Love as Social Policy*. London: Sage.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation (1999) *Monitoring Poverty and Social Exclusion.* London: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Kogan, M. (1987) 'The Plowden Report: twenty years on.' *Oxford Review of Education* 13(1): 13 – 22.

Lamming, H. (2003) *The Victoria Climbié Inquiry: Report of Inquiry by Lord Lamming*. London: HMSO. http://www.victoria-climbie-inquiry.org.uk/finreport/finreport.htm Accessed on 23rd February, 2007.

Leung, C. (2001) 'English as an additional language: distinct language focus or diffused curriculum concerns.' *Language and Education* 15(1): 33 – 55.

Lightfoot, J., Mukherjee, S. and Sloper, P. (2001) 'Supporting pupils with special health needs in mainstream schools: policy and practice.' *Children and Society* 15(1): 57 – 69.

Lister, R. (2006) 'Children (but not women) first: New Labour, child welfare and gender.' *Critical Social Policy* 26: 315.

Lloyd, E. (1999) *Parenting Matters: what works in parenting education*. Ilford: Barnados.

*Local Government Act 1988.* C.9. London: HMSO.

Loeber, R. and LeBlanc, M. (1990) 'Toward a developmental criminology,' in M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds) *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research* 12: 375–473. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Loeber, R. and Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1986) 'Family factors as correlates and predictors of juvenile conduct problems and delinquency,' in M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds) *Crime and justice: An annual review* 7: 29–151. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Macintyre, S. (1977) 'The Black Report and beyond: what are the issues?' *Social Science and Medicine* 44: 723 – 45.

Macmillan, R., McMorris, B.J. and Kruttschnitt, C. (2004) 'Linked lives: stability and change in maternal circumstances and trajectories of antisocial behavior in children.' *Child Development* 75(1): 205 – 220.

Mayall, B. (2002) *Towards a Sociology for Childhood: Thinking from Children's Lives.* Buckingham: OUP.

Mayall, B. and Storey, P. (1998) 'A School Health Service for Children?' *Children and Society* 12(1): 86 – 97.

McLaughlin H. (2004) 'Partnerships: panacea or pretence?' *Journal of Interprofessional Care* 18(2): 103–113.

McNess, E., Broadfoot, P. and Osborn, M. (2003) 'Is the effective compromising the affective?' *British Educational Research Journal* 29(2): 243 – 257.

Miller, J.L. (1983) 'The resistance of women academics: an autobiographical account.' *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership* 3: 101 – 109.

Moran, P., Jacobs, C., Bunn, A. and Bifulco, A. (2006). 'Multi-agency working: implications for an early-intervention social work team.' *Child and Family Social Work* 12(2): 143 – 151.

Murray, P. (2000) 'Disabled children, parents and professionals: partnership on whose terms?' *Disability and Society* 15(4): 683 – 98.

National Curriculum Online (no date) Statutory Inclusion Statement. http://www.nc.uk.net/inclusion.html Accessed 21 April, 2007.

*National Health Service Act 1977.* C.49. London: HMSO.

Normington, J. and Kyriacou, C. (1994) 'Exclusion from high schools and the work of the outside agencies involved.' *Pastoral Care* 12(4): 12 – 15.

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2004) *Special Educational Needs and Disability: Towards Inclusive Schools.* London: Ofsted.

Parton, N. (1999) 'Ideology, politics and policy,' in O. Stevenson (ed) (1999) *Child Welfare in the UK.* Oxford: Blackwell: 3-21.

Patterson, G.R. (1986) 'Performance models for anti-social boys.' *American Psychologist* 41: 432 – 444.

Payne, M. (2000) *Teamwork in Multiprofessional Care*. London: Palgrave.

Poverty Site (2007) *Tackling Truancy and Exclusion in Schools.* http://www.poverty.org.uk/policies/truancy%20and%20exclusion.shtml Accessed 21 April, 2007.

Power, S., Whitty, G., Gewirtz, S., Halpin, D. and Dickson, M. (2003) *Paving a third way: a policy trajectory analysis of Education Action Zones.* End of Award to ESRC. London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Pringle, M.K. (1974) *The Needs of Children.* London: Hutchinson.

*Protection of Children Act 1999* C. 14. London: HMSO.

Prout, A. (2004) *The Future of Childhood*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Pugh, G., De'Ath, E. and Smith, C. (1994) *Confident Children: Policy and Practice in Parent Education and Support.* London: National Children's Bureau.

*Race Relations Act 1976.* C. 74. London: HMSO.

*Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000.* C. 34. London: HMSO.

Race Equality Foundation (2006) *Strengthening faith communities and black and minority ethnic voluntary and community sector's capacity to deliver health and social care services*. London: REF.

Sanders, M.R., Cann, W. and Markie-Dadds, C. (2003) 'The triple P positive parenting programme: a universal population-level approach to the prevention of child abuse.' *Child Abuse Review* 12(3): 155–172.

*Saving Lives: Our Healthier Nation.* (1999) Cmd 4386. London: HMSO.

Saxena, S., Eliahoo, J. and Majeed, A. (2002) 'Socioeconomic and ethnic group differences in self reported health status and use of health services by children and young people in England: cross sectional study'. *British Medical Journal* Vol. 325. http://bmj.bmjjournals.com/cgi/reprint/325/7363/520.pdf Downloaded 25 March 2007.

Sayyid, S. (2003) 'Muslims in Britain: towards a political agenda,' in M. Seddon, D. Hussain and N. Malik (2003) *British Muslims*. Leicester: The Islamic Foundation.

Scott, S. and Sylva, K. (2002) *The 'Spokes' Project: supporting parents on kids' education*. Final report to the Department of Health.

Scott, S., O'Connor, T. and Futh, A. (2006) *What makes parenting programmes work in disadvantaged areas? The PALS trial*. London: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Seebohm Report (1968) *Report of the Committee on Local Authority and Allied Personal Social Services,* Cmnd 3703. London: HMSO.

Simon, B. (1985) *Does Education Matter?* London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Social Exclusion Unit (2003) *A Better Education for Children in Care.* London: SEU.

Stone, J.E. (1996) 'Developmentalism: an obscure but pervasive restriction,' *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 4(8) http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v4n8.html Accessed 11 January 2007

Slee, R. (2001) '"Inclusion in Practice": does practice make perfect?'. *Educational Review* 53(2): 113 – 123.

Smith, C. (1994) *Confident Parents, Confident Children: Policy and Practice in Parent Education and Support*. London: National Children's Bureau.

*Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001.* C. 10. London: HMSO.

Stevenson, O. (1999a) 'Children in need and abused: interprofessional and interagency responses,' in O. Stevenson (ed) (1999) *Child Welfare in the UK*. Oxford: Blackwell: 100 – 120

Stevenson, O. (1999b) 'Social work with children and families,' in O. Stevenson (ed) (1999) *Child Welfare in the UK*. Oxford: Blackwell: 79 – 99.

Sure Start (nd) 'Welcome to Sure Start.' http://www.surestart.gov.uk/ Accessed 12 April 2007.

Teacher Training Agency (1997) *Career Entry Profile for a Newly Qualified (Primary/Secondary) Teacher*. London: TTA.

Thatcher, M. (1987) Interview for *Women's Own* Magazine, 31 October, 1987. http://briandeer.com/social/thatcher-society.htm Accessed 25 March 2007.

Tikly, L. (2004) *Analytical Report on Education: National Focal Point for United Kingdom*. London: Commission for Racial Equality.

*Times Educational Supplement* (1998) 'Ofsted figures support failing schools poverty link.' N. Pyke, *TES*, 31 July 1998.

*Times Educational Supplement* (1999) 'Inspectors link poor results and poverty.' G. Hackett, *TES*, 10 December 1999.

Todd, L. (2003) 'Disability and the restructuring of welfare: the problem of partnerships with parents.' *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 7: 281 – 296.

Tomlinson, S. (2005) 'Race, ethnicity and education under New Labour.' *Oxford Review of Education* 31(1): 153 – 171.

Tough, J. (1977) *The Development of Meaning: A Study of Children's Use of Language.* London: Allen and Unwin.

United Nations (1989) *Convention on the Rights of the Child.* Geneva: UN.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978) *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wanless, D. (2004) *Securing the Health of the Whole Population* (The Wanless Report), London: HMSO.

Watson, D., Townsley, R. and Abbott, D. (2002) 'Exploring multi-agency working in services to disabled children with complex healthcare needs and their families.' *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 11: 367 – 375.

Webb, R. and Vulliamy, G. (1996) *Roles and Responsibilities in the Primary School: changing demands, changing practices*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Webb, R. and Vulliamy, G. (2001). 'The primary teacher's role in child protection.' *British Educational Research Journal* 27(1): 59 – 77.

Wells, C.G. (ed) (1981) *Learning through Interaction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whitney (1993) *The Children Act and Schools*. London: Kogan Page.

Winkley, D. (1987) 'From condescension to complexity: post-Plowden schooling in the inner city.' *Oxford Review of Education* 13(1): 45 – 55.

Younghusband Report (1959) *Report of the Working Party on Social Workers in the Local Authority Health and Welfare Services*. London: HMSO.

# APPENDIX 1

## THE PRIMARY REVIEW PERSPECTIVES, THEMES AND SUB THEMES

The Primary Review's enquiries are framed by three broad perspectives, the third of which, primary education, breaks down into ten themes and 23 sub-themes. Each of the latter then generates a number of questions. The full framework of review perspectives, themes and questions is at www.primaryreview.org.uk

### The Review Perspectives

P1 Children and childhood
P2 Culture, society and the global context
P3 Primary education

### The Review Themes and Sub-themes

**T1 Purposes and values**
- T1a Values, beliefs and principles
- T1b Aims

**T2 Learning and teaching**
- T2a Children's development and learning
- T2b Teaching

**T3 Curriculum and assessment**
- T3a Curriculum
- T3b Assessment

**T4 Quality and standards**
- T4a Standards
- T4b Quality assurance and inspection

**T5 Diversity and inclusion**
- T5a Culture, gender, race, faith
- T5b Special educational needs

**T6 Settings and professionals**
- T6a Buildings and resources
- T6b Teacher supply, training, deployment & development
- T6c Other professionals
- T6d School organisation, management & leadership
- T6e School culture and ethos

**T7 Parenting, caring and educating**
- T7a Parents and carers
- T7b Home and school

**T8 Beyond the school**
- T8a Children's lives beyond the school
- T8b Schools and other agencies

**T9 Structures and phases**
- T9a Within-school structures, stages, classes & groups
- T9b System-level structures, phases & transitions

**T10 Funding and governance**
- T10a Funding
- T10b Governance

# APPENDIX 2

## THE EVIDENTIAL BASIS OF THE PRIMARY REVIEW

The Review has four evidential strands. These seek to balance opinion seeking with empirical data; non-interactive expressions of opinion with face-to-face discussion; official data with independent research; and material from England with that from other parts of the UK and from international sources. This enquiry, unlike some of its predecessors, looks outwards from primary schools to the wider society, and makes full though judicious use of international data and ideas from other countries.

### Submissions

Following the convention in enquiries of this kind, submissions have been invited from all who wish to contribute. By June 2007, nearly 550 submissions had been received and more were arriving daily. The submissions range from brief single-issue expressions of opinion to substantial documents covering several or all of the themes and comprising both detailed evidence and recommendations for the future. A report on the submissions will be published in late 2007.

### Soundings

This strand has two parts. The *Community Soundings* are a series of nine regionally based one to two day events, each comprising a sequence of meetings with representatives from schools and the communities they serve. The Community Soundings took place between January and March 2007, and entailed 87 witness sessions with groups of pupils, parents, governors, teachers, teaching assistants and heads, and with educational and community representatives from the areas in which the soundings took place. In all, there were over 700 witnesses. The *National Soundings* are a programme of more formal meetings with national organisations both inside and outside education. They will take place during autumn 2007 and will explore key issues arising from the full range of data thus far. They will aim to help the team to clarify matters which are particularly problematic or contested and to confirm the direction to be taken by the final report. As a subset of the National Soundings, a group of practitioners - the *Visionary and Innovative Practice (VIP) group* – is giving particular attention to the implications of the emerging evidence for the work of primary schools.

### Surveys

30 surveys of published research relating to the Review's ten themes have been commissioned from 69 academic consultants in universities in Britain and other countries. The surveys relate closely to the ten Review themes and the complete list appears in Appendix 3. Taken together, they will provide the most comprehensive review of research relating to primary education yet undertaken. They will be published in thematic groups from October 2007 onwards.

### Searches

With the co-operation of DfES/DCSF, QCA, Ofsted, TDA and OECD, the Review is re-assessing a range of official data bearing on the primary phase. This will provide the necessary demographic, financial and statistical background to the Review and an important resource for its later consideration of policy options.

### Other meetings

In addition to the formal evidence-gathering procedures, the Review team meets members of various national bodies for the exchange of information and ideas: government and opposition representatives; officials at DfES/DCSF, QCA, Ofsted, TDA, GTC, NCSL and IRU; representatives of the teaching unions; and umbrella groups representing organisations involved in early years, primary education and teacher education. The first of three sessions with the House of Commons Education and Skills Committee took place in March 2007. Following the replacment of DfES by two separate departments, DCSF and DIUS, it is anticipated that there will be further meetings with this committee's successor.

## APPENDIX 3

## THE PRIMARY REVIEW INTERIM REPORTS

The interim reports, which will be released in stages from October 2007, include the 30 research surveys commissioned from external consultants together with reports on the community soundings and the submissions prepared by the Cambridge team. They are listed by Review theme below, although this will not be the order of their publication. Report titles may be subject to minor amendment.

Once published, the interim reports, together with briefings summarising their findings, may be downloaded from the Review website, www.primaryreview.org.uk .

1. *Community Soundings: report on the Primary Review regional witness sessions*
2. *Submissions received by the Primary Review*
3. *Aims and values in primary education*. Research survey 1/1 (John White)
4. *The aims of primary education: England and other countries*. Research survey 1/2 (Maha Shuayb and Sharon O'Donnell)
5. *The changing national context of primary education*. Research survey 1/3 (Stephen Machin and Sandra McNally)
6. *The changing global context of primary education*. Research survey 1/4 (Hugh Lauder, John Lowe and Dr Rita Chawla-Duggan)
7. *Children in primary schools: cognitive development*. Research survey 2/1a (Usha Goswami and Peter Bryant)
8. *Children in primary schools: social development and learning*. Research survey 2/1b (Christine Howe and Neil Mercer)
9. *Teaching in primary schools*. Research survey 2/2 (Robin Alexander and Maurice Galton)
10. *Learning and teaching in primary schools: the curriculum dimension*. Research survey 2/3 (Bob McCormick and Bob Moon)
11. *Learning and teaching in primary schools: evidence from TLRP*. Research survey 2/4 (Mary James and Andrew Pollard)
12. *Curriculum and assessment policy: England and other countries*. Research survey 3/1 (Kathy Hall and Kamil Øzerk)
13. *The impact of national reform: recent government initiatives in English primary education*. Research survey 3/2 (Dominic Wyse, Elaine McCreery and Harry Torrance)
14. *Curriculum alternatives for primary education.* Research survey 3/3 (James Conroy and Ian Menter)
15. *The quality of learning: assessment alternatives for primary education*. Research survey 3/4 (Wynne Harlen)
16. *Standards and quality in English primary schools over time: the national evidence*. Research survey 4/1 (Peter Tymms and Christine Merrell)
17. *Standards in English primary schools: the international evidence*. Research survey 4/2 (Chris Whetton, Graham Ruddock and Liz Twist).
18. *Quality assurance in primary education*. Research survey 4/1 (Peter Cunningham and Philip Raymont)
19. *Children, identity, diversity and inclusion in primary education*. Research survey 5/1 (Mel Ainscow, Alan Dyson and Jean Conteh)
20. *Children of primary school age with special needs: identification and provision*. Research survey 5/2 (Harry Daniels and Jill Porter)

21. *Children and their primary education: pupil voice*. Research survey 5/3 (Carol Robinson and Michael Fielding)

22. *Primary education: the physical environment*. Research survey 6/1 (Karl Wall, Julie Dockrell and Nick Peacey)

23. *Primary education: the professional environment*. Research survey 6/2 (Ian Stronach, Andy Pickard and Elizabeth Jones)

24. *Teachers and other professionals: training, induction and development*. Research survey 6/3 (Olwen McNamara, Rosemary Webb and Mark Brundrett)

25. *Teachers and other professionals: workforce management and reform.* Research survey 6/4 (Hilary Burgess)

26. *Parenting, caring and educating*. Research survey 7/1 (Yolande Muschamp, Felicity Wikeley, Tess Ridge and Maria Balarin)

27. *Children's lives outside school and their educational impact*. Research survey 8/1 (Berry Mayall)

28. *Primary schools and other agencies*. Research survey 8/2 (Ian Barron, Rachel Holmes, Maggie MacLure and Katherine Runswick-Cole)

29. *The structure and phasing of primary education: England and other countries*. Research survey 9/1 (Anna Eames and Caroline Sharp)

30. *Organising learning and teaching in primary schools: structure, grouping and transition*. Research survey 9/2 (Peter Blatchford, Judith Ireson, Susan Hallam, Peter Kutnick and Andrea Creech)

31. *The financing of primary education.* Research survey 10/1 (Philip Noden and Anne West)

32. *The governance, administration and control of primary education*. Research survey 10/2 (Maria Balarin and Hugh Lauder)


The Primary Review is a wide-ranging independent enquiry into the condition and future of primary education in England. It is supported by Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, based at the University of Cambridge and directed by Robin Alexander. The Review was launched in October 2006 and aims to publish its final report in autumn 2008.

**FURTHER INFORMATION**

www.primaryreview.org.uk

General enquiries: enquiries@primaryreview.org.uk

Media enquiries: richard@margrave.co.uk

Published by the Primary Review,
Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge
184 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB2 8PQ, UK

ISBN 978-1-906478-07-0