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**Overarching Abstract**

With data indicating around 126,720 refugees and 45,244 pending asylum cases in the UK, inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children in UK schools is highly important. The Asylum and Immigration Act 1999 has meant refugees and asylum-seekers have been dispersed around the country into the care of local authorities, some with little prior experience supporting their inclusion into communities and schools.

Seeking the perspective of educational professionals, a qualitative synthesis of four research articles was undertaken using a meta-study method. The review of the literature, presented in Chapter one, revealed three key themes related to inclusion: how inclusion is conceptualised, how others are valued, and how the needs of children are conceptualised. The review concludes with a reflective framework built on the premise that conceptualisation of inclusion influences the practice of inclusion.

Arising from the systematic literature review, Chapter three presents the five stage process of an Appreciative Inquiry in which a group of eight professionals from a local authority and two primary schools in the North East of England considered: their previous and current successes in inclusive practice, and their dreams and wishes for the future. Analysed using abbreviated realist grounded theory, findings revealed several factors related to supporting the structural and relational inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children in schools: being human, proactive working together/sharing, professional qualities which empower and enable others, and access and opportunities.

Chapter one and three are linked by a bridging document outlining the philosophical and methodological stance underpinning the thesis. The hoped contribution of the thesis is to add to the understanding of factors and conditions that support the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children in UK schools, and to emphasise the implications for policy.

Chapters one and three are written for considered for publication in The Journal of Refugee Studies.
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Chapter One. Literature Review - What do UK local authorities and schools do that supports the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children in school? Exploring the perspective of educational professionals

1.1 Abstract
Educational professionals in host countries play a pivotal role in supporting refugee and asylum-seeking children who have been forcibly displaced from their homes to settle into their new school environment. In the UK, experiences of inclusion in school can differ markedly depending on local authority and school context, policies, procedures and discourse. This paper aims to contribute an understanding on how the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children in school is conceptualised and enacted in practice by educational professionals. A qualitative research synthesis of four research articles using a meta-study approach is presented. The methods, findings and theoretical underpinnings of each paper were analysed, with consideration of the socio-political context in which they were generated. The analysis culminates in a synthesis which constructs further understanding of factors that shape the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children in schools. Three key themes emerged: how inclusion is conceptualised, how others are valued, and how the needs of children are conceptualised. A framework is presented from the findings which demonstrates how the conceptualisation of inclusion influences the practice of inclusion. It is hoped that by exploring educational professionals’ perspectives, this paper can inform how schools, local authorities and policy makers approach inclusive practice.
1.2 Introduction

1.2.1 Context and focus for this review

Today, conflict across the globe has displaced over 70.8 million people (UNHCR, 2020). The majority of those forcibly displaced tend to flee to neighbouring countries and regions, while some seek asylum further afield (UNHCR, 2018b). The term asylum-seeker is used to describe people with a pending application for asylum. The term refugee refers to people whose application for asylum has been successful and who have been granted refugee protection. The 1951 Geneva Convention defines a refugee as:

a person who owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable, or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it (p.137).

In 2016, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) asserted that the world is facing the biggest refugee and displacement crisis since World War II (Ki-moon, 2016). Among the 70.8 million displaced persons are nearly 30 million refugees and asylum-seekers, over half of whom are under the age of 18 (UNHCR, 2020). Regardless of unclear or temporary immigration status, all children have the right to education (Human Rights Act, 1998; The United Nations, 1989).

The presence of individuals with different immigration and citizenship status in this age of global human mobility raises significant challenges for inclusion in education and society more broadly (Dryden-Peterson, 2018; Pinson & Arnot, 2007). Despite this, forced migration and the marginalised position this group occupies in host societies, has been largely neglected by educational research (Cerna, 2019; Hulusi & Oland, 2010; Pinson & Arnot, 2007).

This qualitative research synthesis seeks to produce a summary of evidence to clarify the approaches UK local authorities (LAs) and schools adopt to support the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children (RAS). It is hoped these insights will contribute to the existing literature and have implications for the way RAS children are supported, and ultimately promote inclusion in education and, more widely, in society.

1.2.2 UK context and legislation

Most recent data indicates that in the UK currently are approximately 126,720 refugees and 45,244 asylum-seekers with pending applications (UNHCR, 2018b). There is no accurate UK
data of the number of RAS children in the education system, rendering them largely invisible (Cerna, 2019; McIntyre & Hall, 2018). There remains a lack of central government policy regarding the education of RAS children beyond good practice guidelines (DfE, 2004; McIntyre & Hall, 2018; Ofsted, 2003; Rutter, 2006). Additionally, the UK continues to receive international criticism for its refusal to take in more of the most vulnerable refugees (unaccompanied minors; Madziva & Thondhlan, 2017).

UK legislation on forced migration can arguably be viewed as a narrative of exclusion through immigration controls and erosion of social, economic and political rights (Burchardt, 2005; Rutter, 2006). The Nationality, Asylum and Immigration Act 2002, for example, denies the right to work for the duration of an asylum claim. Most noticeable in its impact on the education system, however, was the introduction of the Home Office dispersal programme, in The Immigration and Asylum Act 1999. The purpose of the programme was to reduce cluster areas of refugees and asylum-seekers in south east England by dispersing them throughout the country. In reality, the dispersal policy has resulted in uneven geographical distribution of refugees and asylum-seekers in poorer areas of the country (McIntyre & Hall, 2018). Lyons and Duncan (2017) reported that 174 LAs had no asylum-seekers, whereas 10 LAs were responsible for more than a third of all asylum seekers; these 10 LAs were in the most economically deprived areas of the North West and Midlands. The School Admissions Code (DfE, 2014) dictates that LAs and schools must agree a Fair Access Protocol and are responsible for finding school places for all children as quickly as possible. Decisions on how to promote and support RAS children’s education and inclusion, however, is not straightforward in this complex social and political environment.

Behind current UK immigration policies lies what can conceivably be described as an education system built on a performance culture of schooling - high-stakes testing, narrow curriculum, standardised pedagogical approaches and increased accountability (Sahlberg, 2011). This position assumes that meritocratic education is synonymous with fairness (Brighouse, Howe, & Tooley, 2010). Differences in outcomes between groups of children are accepted and justified because ‘processes are fair’ and there is ‘equal opportunity’ (Mazzoli Smith, Todd, & Laing, 2018, p. 2). Meritocratic, or performance driven education cultures, have been criticised for representing residual concerns about minority ethnic groups and social exclusion (Rushek, 2017).

1.2.3 Integration and inclusion
There is no single, generally accepted definition, theory or model of refugee and asylum-seeker integration or inclusion and their manifestations vary in practice (Ager & Strang, 2008; Berry, 1997; Castles, Korac, Vasta, & Vertovec, 2001). This may in part be due to the
concepts’ ambiguity. Though ambiguous, I argue an important distinction between them. Where inclusion is upheld as a ‘means to remove barriers, improve outcomes and remove discrimination’ (Lindsay, 2003, p. 3), integration implies that the onus belongs on individuals to adapt or negotiate their way into existing systems (op. cit). Ainscow (2005) argues that inclusive education is a basic human right and the foundation for a more just society. The aim of inclusive practice, therefore, is to:

Eliminate social exclusion that is a consequence of attitudes and responses to diversity in race, social class, ethnicity, religion, gender and ability (Ainscow, 2005, p. 109).

Emerging from their critical consideration of the special educational needs system, Thomas and Loxley’s (2007) conceptualisation of inclusion echoes this, arguing that inclusion is comprehensive education, equality and collective belonging. Here, responding to and celebrating difference are important components that represent more than integrating individuals into schools and rather promote and value diversity (Nikolou-Walker, 2019; Thomas, 2007).

In a conceptual framework which aimed to define core ‘indicators of refugee integration’, (p. 166), Ager and Strang (2008) identified employment, housing, education and health as ‘means and markers’ of integration (p.170). However, for refugees, and particularly for asylum-seekers, many dimensions, or markers, of integration (and consequently inclusion) are restricted. Receiving a weekly income one quarter of that required to meet the relative poverty line makes reaching markers of integration in society challenging, highlighting the influence political context has on social experiences (Asylum Matters, 2018). Burchardt (2005) described UK policy affecting refugees and asylum-seekers as having ‘the effect of generating social exclusion, rather than preventing or ameliorating it’ (p.226).

1.2.4 Existing research

Research has found that early experience in UK schools has a significant impact on how quickly and successfully RAS children settle in the UK, with good early experiences of schooling facilitating adaptation to their new life (Hastings, 2012; Hek, 2005; Rutter, 2006). Sarr and Mosselson (2010) describe schools as the ‘primary acculturating institution’ (p. 549), a place where RAS children may make their first contact with society. Acculturation refers to changes that take place as a result of contact with different cultures (Berry, 1997) and is ‘a multidimensional process of confluence among heritage-cultural and receiving-cultural practices, values, and identifications’ (Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik, 2010, p. 237).
RAS children’s lives are often characterised by complex pre-migration and trans-migration experiences requiring schools to tailor their strategies to meet their needs (Madziva & Thondhlana, 2017; Rutter, 2006; Taylor & Sidhu, 2012). However, previous dominance in the literature constructing RAS children as traumatised (Ehntholt & Yule, 2006) has arguably been at the expense of concern with their educational experiences and inclusion in schools. This has also, perhaps, impeded analysis of their post-migration experiences such as poverty, racism and uncertain migration status (Rutter, 2006).

In the first major research based text on the education of RAS children in the UK, Rutter (2006) identified three discourses dominant in ‘good practice’ literature:

1. Welcoming environment
2. Meeting psychosocial needs
3. Meeting language needs

Highlighted within the literature is the importance of this group being viewed holistically and belonging to schools with a strong community, an ethos of inclusion, and which celebrate diversity (Rutter, 2006). Subsequent Australian research found additional important factors: targeted policy and system support, leadership (which challenges), and working with other agencies to address social, emotional needs (Taylor & Sidhu, 2012).

There is a need for more, up to date research on how LAs and schools view and support the inclusion of RAS children. This needs to be framed by a socio-political understanding of their position in society (de Wal Pastoor, 2015; Tikly & Barrett, 2011). In order to understand the role Educational Psychologists (EPs) can play in supporting policy makers, LAs, schools, children and families, it is important to first critically consider the existing research base.

1.3 Method
The research question is: What do UK local authorities and schools do that supports the inclusion of RAS children in school? Exploring the perspective of educational professionals.

Educational professionals’ insights are being sought; consequently, this review focuses on qualitative research, concerned with how people see and understand their social worlds (Atkins et al., 2008). The review method adopted is that of a meta-study (Paterson, Thorne, Canam, & Jillings, 2001), a method of synthesis incorporating the methodological, theoretical, and societal contexts of research findings (Garside, 2008). Meta-study looks beyond the studies themselves to the context in which they were produced, looking at differences in theory and social context (Paterson et al., 2001). There are three components of a meta-study: meta-method (analysis of method), meta-theory (analysis of theory) and meta-data analysis (analysis of findings). These then culminate in synthesis (meta-
synthesis) (Paterson et al., 2001). Though a relatively new method, it draws on more well-developed methods of qualitative synthesis in its processes, such as meta-ethnography (Noblit & Hare, 1988), during the meta-data-analysis stage.

In its initial stages, meta-study parallels Petticrew and Roberts (2008) seven stages of a systematic review. The overlapping stages of Petticrew and Roberts (2008) and meta-study proposed by Paterson et al. (2001), including Noblit and Hare’s (1988) meta-ethnography, are used as an organisational heuristic (Table 1).

**Table 1 Stages of systematic literature review adapted from Petticrew and Roberts (2008), Paterson (2001) and Noblit and Hare (1998)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clearly define the research question</td>
<td>Formulation of research question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Determine types of studies needed to address the research question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conduct comprehensive literature search to locate relevant studies</td>
<td>Selection and appraisal of primary research – identify inclusion/exclusion criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use inclusion and exclusion criteria to screen studies to determine which require further consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Describe the included studies to ‘map’ the field and appraise them for quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Meta-method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Meta-theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Meta-synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dissemination of findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.1 Stages 1 and 2 - clearly define the research question and determine types of studies needed to address the research question

School inclusion of RAS children was the initial interest driving this review. Before adopting a more focused interest, I considered the available literature more generally, exploring the various perspectives and approaches present in the field (see 1.2.4 Existing research).

1.3.2 Stages 3 and 4 - conduct comprehensive literature search to locate relevant studies and use inclusion/exclusion criteria to screen studies

A systematic literature search of published and unpublished research was undertaken between July and November 2018. The electronic databases searched were: Scopus, Education Resource Information Centre (ERIC), the British Education Index, Psyc Info and Web of Science. Databases were searched using a combination of search terms (Table 2), developed from those used in existing literature and consideration of the review question.

Table 2 Key search terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Search Term</th>
<th>Synonyms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Educat*¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Wide Policies</td>
<td>Whole School Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>Asylum Seek*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forced Migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Child*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Inclu*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrat*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Various combinations and synonyms were systematically explored, the final search string being: 'child* OR family, AND inclu* OR integrat*, AND refugee OR asylum seek*, AND school OR educat* OR Local Authority OR Local Government, NOT health*'. A hand search

¹ The asterisk operator ensured variations of the trunk word were also included in the search.
of journals was conducted in *Educational Psychology in Practice* and *Educational and Child Psychology*, in addition to reference harvesting and citation searching of emerging relevant papers. The search produced just over 400 results; however, a large number were quickly excluded based on title alone, it being clear they were unrelated to the inclusion of RAS children.

A search of unpublished dissertations and theses was also undertaken to reduce the ‘file drawer’ problem (Rosenthal, 1979), where studies with inconclusive or null findings are less likely to be published. The electronic databases used were the Newcastle University Library Search and the Electronic Theses Online Service (EThOS). Because the search term input box was restricted, various combinations of the above search string were used. This search yielded 130 studies, though all were excluded due to lack of relevance to the review question.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria were steadily refined throughout the searching process. This involved making a series of ‘judgement calls’ (Tarrahi & Eisend, 2016, p. 314) when reading abstracts and full papers before the final set of criteria was adopted (Table 3). With the addition of each of the first seven criteria, the number of potential papers reduced until seven studies remained. To focus the review further, the remaining seven papers were mapped to highlight similarities and differences in their primary focus and perspective, or voice. This led to the addition of the eighth inclusion criterion and warranted the exclusion of three further studies, leaving four studies for review (highlighted by the red circle, Table 4).
Table 3 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Related to inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children in schools</td>
<td>Relevance to the research question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Undergone quality assurance procedure</td>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Written in English</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Empirical design, qualitative methodology, exploratory approach</td>
<td>Appropriateness for meta-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not an evaluation of a specific intervention</td>
<td>Broadened applicability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conducted in UK</td>
<td>Similarity of settings for comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Published in 2000 or later</td>
<td>Relevance of pertinent UK legislation (Immigration and Asylum Act 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Explicitly exploring educational professionals’ experience or perspective relating to the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children</td>
<td>Relevance to the research question (refined)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4 Mapping focus and voice of studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>Child or Young Person</th>
<th>Professionals</th>
<th>Mix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualisation (of inclusion, integration etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madziva &amp; Thondhlan, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pinson &amp; Arnot, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.3.3 Stage 5 - describe the included studies to ‘map’ the field and appraise for quality**

Contextual information about each study’s setting, sample, method, data analysis and theoretical framework were recorded (Table 5).
### Table 5 Mapping of the included studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Research question/focus</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Terms used e.g. inclusion, integration</th>
<th>Data collection (method)</th>
<th>Data analysis (method)</th>
<th>Theoretical framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reakes (2007)</strong></td>
<td>UK LEAs and schools</td>
<td>'Examine the strategies and range of educational provision made by LEAs and schools for asylum-seeker children’ (p.95)</td>
<td>'Key personnel in LEAs and schools (i.e. those who had a responsibility for or a role in the education of asylum-seeking children’ (p.96)</td>
<td>'Meeting educational needs’ (p.92)</td>
<td>'Case studies’</td>
<td>'Data was coded using the MAX QDA software package’ (p.96)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Effective provision' (p.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Integration’ (p.100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whiteman (2005)</strong></td>
<td>UK schools</td>
<td>'Analyse the views of teaching staff regarding their experiences of integrating refugee children into schools in Newcastle-upon-Tyne’ (p.375)</td>
<td>'The head teacher, or any other member of staff with relevant experience’ (p.376)</td>
<td>Integration’ (p.376)</td>
<td>'Questionnaire’ (open and closed questions) (p.376)</td>
<td>'Case studies’ - 'In depth interview’ (p.377)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In depth interview participants:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Learning Support Co-ordinator’ (p.377) and 'Head of a primary school’ (p.378)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hek and Sales (2002)</strong></td>
<td>UK schools</td>
<td>'Examined support structures for refugee and asylum-seeking children at school. The main aims were: 1. To assess the aspirations and sense of belonging of refugee children within their school and wider social networks; 2. To examine the policies and practices within schools which facilitate settlement and encourage positive aspirations for this group' (p.3)</td>
<td>'The data was analysed in two stages utilising a thematic approach. 1. Organised into meaningful but broad categories or themes. 2. Search for patterns within the data and identification of similarities and differences' (p.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pinson and Arnot (2010)</strong></td>
<td>UK LEAs and schools</td>
<td>'To capture the different experiences, practices and expertise in the UK' 'Offer insights into the ways in which the presence and the needs of such pupils (refugee and asylum-seeking) are conceptualised by local authorities and schools' (p.247)</td>
<td>'Three phase analysis of the LEA policy documents and telephone interview data' (p.249) 'The interviews were then discursively analysed using Atlas.ti software' (p.251)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.3 Appraising quality

Critical appraisal has traditionally been located within a quantitative paradigm and usually draws on a specific set of criteria, for example, Gough (2007), Weight of Evidence Tool (WoE). Methodological requirements detailed in such criteria are arguably incongruous with the iterative and reflexive process of qualitative research (Hammersley, 2008; Sandelowski & Barroso, 2002).

A review of several quality criteria assessment tools (Atkins et al., 2008; Gough, 2007; Yardley, 2000) was undertaken. The Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) quality assessment tool, developed by the Journal of American Medical Association (adapted by Guyatt, Sacklett, & Cook, 1993)\(^2\), was selected and applied. To determine the methodological congruence of each study, the CASP tool evaluates appropriateness of research aims, sampling, data-analysis, rigour in data interpretation procedures, ethics and the value of the research in its field (Table 6).

I adapted the CASP framework by adding four questions, or judgments:

- How clear are the methods and procedures detailed (row 6)
- How clear is the process of arriving at conclusions (row 11)
- An overall summary judgement of quality (drawing on WoE, Gough, 2007) (row 13)
- Judgement of the papers’ relevance to my purposes (row 14)

The purpose of quality assessment at this stage was to provide further context for the studies when understanding and interpreting the synthesis findings. The critical appraisal did, however, highlight that many of the studies lacked detail in the application of their method and analysis approach, leading to questioning the research’s rigour and transparency. Additionally, three studies did not outline clearly how their statement of findings were reached. This may reflect broader issues of research rigour and quality in the field. However, reporting of methods and analysis may not always equate to the rigour with which the research was conducted (Atkins et al., 2008). It was concluded that the studies still make a valuable contribution to the synthesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting refugee and asylum-seeking children: An examination of experiences and support structures that facilitate settlement in school</td>
<td>Local conceptualisations of the education of asylum-seeking and refugee students: From hostile to holistic models</td>
<td>The education of asylum-seekers: Some UK case studies</td>
<td>Welcoming the stranger: A qualitative analysis of teachers' views regarding the integration of refugee pupils into schools in Newcastle-upon-Tyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Are the data collection procedures detailed? E.g. interview questions</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can't tell</td>
<td>Can't tell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? | Yes | Can't tell | Can't tell | Somewhat
9. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? | Yes | Yes | Somewhat | Can't tell
10. Is there a clear statement of findings? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Somewhat
11. Is it clear HOW the statement of findings was reached? | No | Yes | No | No
12. How valuable is the research? | Valuable | Valuable | Valuable | Less valuable
13. My overall judgement of ‘quality’ | Medium | High | Medium | Medium-Low
14. How valuable /relevant is the research for my purposes? | Relevant | Relevant | Relevant | Less relevant

1.3.4 Stage 6 Meta-Method

There is a bi-directional relationship between the strands of meta-method, meta-theory, and meta-data-analysis (Paterson et al., 2001). I have chosen to write them in a linear fashion to aid clarity, though the synthesis process has not always lent itself to linearity. I have decided to present details and analysis of the method (meta-method) for each of the studies first, before presenting the meta-theory and meta-data-analysis. It is my view that findings (meta-data-analysis) will be better understood once the methodological and theoretical contexts are known.

The purpose of a meta-method is to determine how research methods have influenced findings and emergent theory in a field (Paterson et al., 2001). Meta-method allows exploration of how disciplinary assumptions may shape the approach to research and the conclusions that can be drawn. Two steps informed the basis of this meta-method: (1) a review of each study’s sampling, data collection and data analysis methods (Table 5), (2) greater consideration of the empirical soundness of the studies, validity and use in the field against the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) (Table 6). The headings below reflect the outputs of the process.
1.3.4.1 The research question, the researcher and the setting
All studies were clear in their research aims and selection of qualitative methodology appeared appropriate, given that they sought to explore experiences or views.

Only one study explicitly referred to researcher role, acknowledging potential influence during data collection (Hek & Sales, 2002). Here, the same researcher carried out all interviews to ensure as much consistency as possible. This was also cited to support the challenging nature of some events the researcher asked about.

In three studies (Hek & Sale, 2002, Arnot & Pinson, 2010, Reakes, 2007), interviews were conducted in school or LA settings. Whiteman (2005) did not report the setting. None of the studies referred to potential bias during formulation of the research question or interview questions.

1.3.4.2 Sampling procedures and data collection techniques
All studies utilised purposive sampling (Robson & McCartan, 2016); LAs, schools and, subsequently, participants, were selected based on their professional experience and contact with RAS children. The amount of experience varied both within and across studies. Participants were described as ‘key personnel’ (Reakes, 2007) or ‘local officials’ (Arnot & Pinson, 2010) with various interpretations. Whiteman (2005) requested ‘the head teacher, or any other member of staff with relevant experience’, interviewing a head teacher and special educational needs co-ordinator. Arnot and Pinson (2010) interview participants included head teachers, teachers, a school governor and a language support teacher. Arnot and Pinson (2010), did, however, have the most far reaching sampling (58 LAs).

Whiteman (2005) and Reakes (2007) provided limited detail regarding their decision and adoption of their method, limiting the possibility of replication.

All studies reported what they termed variably as semi-structured or in-depth interviews. Three studies had additional components: Hek and Sales (2002) included an examination of school and LA policies and procedures. Whiteman (2005) included a questionnaire about school demographics and existing procedures. Arnot and Pinson (2010) had two additional components – telephone surveys with LAs and analysis of a range of relevant policy documents from LAs.

The use of individual retrospective open-ended interview questions has been the common strategy for collecting professionals’ views or experiences on this topic. There was little consistency across the studies in how the semi-structured interviews were reported and therefore, presumably, conducted. Two studies (Whiteman, 2005, Reakes, 2007) provide an explanation and some detail of the process of how the question areas were developed, for
example, questions were derived from a LA working group for RAS children (Whiteman, 2005). Two studies provided examples of the questions asked (Whiteman, 2005 and Pinson & Arnot, 2010).

It is beneficial to know the questions asked in semi-structured interviews in order to critically consider their potential influence on responses. The quality of data obtained from interviews depends on a number of factors, including the questions that are asked, individual participant’s willingness and ability to recall accounts, and the researcher’s ability to create a space conducive to sharing (Paterson et al., 2001).

1.3.4.3 Data analysis
Detail of data-analysis methods used varied across the studies. One study (Whiteman, 2005) did not specify the method of data-analysis but referred to ‘themes’ and ‘categories’ identified, which raises questions regarding the rigour, and transparency, of analysis. Reakes (2007) and Pinson and Arnot (2010) described how interviews were recorded, transcribed and coded using software to facilitate the analysis of qualitative data³. Hek and Sales (2002) cited a thematic approach to their data-analysis, clearly outlining the 2-stage process adopted. Hek and Sales (2002) also reported analyst triangulation involving two or more researchers.

1.3.4.5 Underlying assumptions
From all of the studies’ approaches to their research, it can be assumed that the researchers share an underlying view that schools and LAs are pivotal in the ‘integration’ (Whiteman, 2005; Reakes, 2007; Pinson & Arnot, 2010), ‘settlement’ (Heks & Sale, 2002) and ‘social inclusion’ (Pinson & Arnot, 2010) of RAS children.

It is possible that similarity in method (semi-structured interviews) may account for similarity in conclusions. Although open-ended interview questions allow for diversity of experience to be heard (Robson & McCartan, 2016), responses to questions depend on who, and what, is asked, and are open to interpretation in reporting. Semi-structured interviews in this field may represent what has become expected in our socio-cultural, historical and political context. Individualism inherent in Western social ideology may be in part responsible for the emphasis in the literature on individuals, rather than group, family or community experience (Paterson et al., 2001). The methods researchers chose reflect an ontological position, (i.e. belief about what there is to know), which inform their epistemological position (i.e. how can it be known) and subsequently their methodological options (Grix, 2002). Given that ontological and epistemological assumptions shape research, they have the capacity to

³ MAX QDA and Atlas.ti, respectively
influence knowledge, and inform, in this case, the way we conceptualise the inclusion of RAS children.

1.3.5 Stage 7 Meta-Theory
Theory can be defined as ‘a system of interrelated propositions that should enable phenomena to be described, explained, predicted and controlled’ (Duldt & Griffin, 1986, cited in Garsdie (2008), p.58). The purpose of meta-theory is to analyse the theoretical perspectives driving, or arising from, the studies reviewed (Garside, 2008). Here, the relationship between emerging theory and research and the larger contexts in which theory has been generated are considered, including relating theory to the socio-cultural, historical and political context (Ritzer, 1991).

1.3.5.1 Theory used
Only one study (Pinson & Arnot, 2010) referred explicitly to theoretical frameworks to inform their work (discussed below). This is an overall weakness of the review studies, which may also reflect a wider issue in the field. In research, strong theoretical or conceptual frameworks provide insights into potential new directions for inquiry and help researchers develop existing research in more deliberate ways. Without theoretical or conceptual frameworks, it is difficult to see, or explore, how constructs may relate to one another (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019).

1.3.5.2 Language, socio-cultural, historical and political context
The three studies that do not explicitly use a theoretical framework (Hek & Sales, 2002, Reakes, 2007, Whiteman, 2005) do not provide definitions of the concepts they are using (i.e. inclusion, integration, resettlement). These studies arguably did not have the guidance of an organisational framework for later data interpretation and synthesis (Paterson et al., 2001), leaving their conclusions open to a range of interpretations. In contrast, Arnot and Pinson (2010) detail the difficulties of defining this group of children and their needs, commenting that the use of existing policy language and conceptual frameworks, ‘define the nature and scope of the “problem”, relevant “solutions” and the type of support to offer’ (p.254). Arnot and Pinson (2010) suggest the focus within many of the existing discursive framings in policy (e.g. EAL approach, Special Educational Needs approach, race equality approach) is on the individual child, rather than on value and culture transformation. Though such framings are difficult to capture empirically and often are not mutually exclusive (Rutter, 2006), I suggest it is important to recognise the impact they have on the conceptualisation and subsequent inclusion of this population of children.

As Arnot and Pinson (2010) were conducting their research, the Home Office released Integration Matters: A National Strategy for Refugee Integration (Home Office, 2004).
Indicators of successful integration were predominantly based on academic attainment (e.g. English language attainment) and designed only to apply to those granted refugee status. This underlying attainment discourse perhaps reflects the political priorities of the time and the perception of refugees - the School Inspection Handbook (Ofsted, 2016) made no mention of refugees at all. It is important, therefore, that research and theory be considered in light of the macro-context, including public discourses (Ritzer, 1991). Media reporting about refugees and asylum-seekers can influence how researchers frame social experiences, such as racism and nationalism. Shifts in public discourse have the potential to influence researchers’ willingness to contest what becomes publicly accepted.

Although three studies (Hek & Sales, 2002, Reakes, 2007, Whiteman, 2005) did not explicitly draw on theory, their language use allows inferences of theoretical assumptions and indicates the influence of the socio-political context. Whiteman (2005) sought some quantitative responses to answer her research interest (‘teachers’ views regarding the integration of refugee pupils into schools’, p.375). This implies the assumption that ‘integration’ can be measured, at least in part, quantitatively, a view more in keeping with the Home Office (2004) position. This is at odds with Pinson and Arnot’s (2010) conceptualisation of a ‘holistic perspective’ (p.256), which they describe as a ‘counter-reaction to the mechanistic explanations of human phenomena associated with positivist science and behaviourist psychology’ (p.256).

**1.3.5.3 Generated theory**

Pinson and Arnot (2010) suggest that the three LAs selected for their case studies represent the adoption of a ‘holistic approach’ (p.256) regarding their conceptualisation of the needs (not specifically inclusion) of RAS children. They describe these LAs and their schools as demonstrating a ‘strong humanistic child-centred approach’ (p.249). They draw on the definition provided by Lewis (1998) who described a holistic approach as ‘concerned with the whole phenomenon and not merely with its parts’ (cited in Pinson & Arnot, p.256). Similarly, humanist psychology considers the whole person and assumes that individuals have personal agency and innate motivation towards personal growth (Rogers, 1959). Pinson and Arnot (2010) suggest that there are three common characteristics present in the LAs they identified as applying a holistic approach to RAS children:

- Valuing cultural diversity
- Constructing new indicators of integration
- Adopting a caring/compassionate ethos and a maximal approach to the role prescribed for the school or LA (p.257).
Pinson and Arnot (2010) report that while the holistic approach may be useful as a tool for examining good educational practices, it is unlikely to offer a strong theoretical framework which can engage critically with the impact of forced migration on national educational systems, or the politics which surround it. For the purposes of this review, since Pinson and Arnot’s (2010) approach presents the strongest theory-based research it will be used in the meta-data-analysis as the study against which the findings in the other papers will be considered: the Index Theory (see Garside, 2008, p.183). Where other studies provided ‘conceptual building blocks’ (ibid), these building blocks will be analysed to see if they could be located within the Index Theory, or if they offer something distinct from or at odds with it.

1.3.6 Stage 8 Meta-Data-Analysis
Meta-data-analysis’ purpose is to reveal the similarities and the discrepancies of a phenomenon across studies. The process involves making judgements about other researchers’ findings and looking for relationships between them. Various data-analytic methods can be used in a meta-data-analysis (e.g. thematic analysis, Clarke & Braun, 2013; meta-enthnography, Noblit & Hare, 1988).

I have drawn on Noblit and Hare’s (1988) meta-ethnography; a systematic, qualitative synthesis approach. Meta-ethnography is a widely used approach which aims to reveal similarities, differences and lines of argument across studies which research experiences and understandings of complex social phenomena (France, Wells, Lang, & Williams, 2016). In a meta-ethnography, the reviewer re-interprets the conceptual data, i.e. themes or concepts, created by the authors of primary studies using the synthesis method described below.

1.3.6.1 Translating the Studies into One Another and Synthesising the Translation
The identification of key themes represents the first part of the analysis. This was a complex process because all the papers had slightly different agendas and came from different positions, prioritising different aspects of their data.

Within the interpretive paradigm of research, truths are recognised as constructed and multiple. Consequently, different researchers’ interpretations of data and research are likely to vary. When assessing the interpretation of the data in the studies, it became apparent that my understanding from the data provided was sometimes different from the conclusions drawn by the studies’ authors. This occurred most often in the studies which did not define the phenomena under study or refer to a theoretical framework (Hek & Sales, 2002; Reakes, 2007; Whiteman, 2005). It was decided that only concepts that arose in at least two studies...
were taken forward as themes – whilst necessary for pragmatic reasons, I acknowledge that some views and voices were lost in this process.

The themes identified across the studies which were found to relate to the inclusion (variously termed in the studies as ‘integration’ or ‘resettlement’) of RAS children in schools were:

- Language provision
- LA/school policy/procedure
- Initial assessment
- Multi-agency working/working together
- Peer support
- Resources
- School ethos
- Perception of refugees and asylum-seekers
- Family support

Although not the primary focus of this review, barriers to inclusion identified in more than one study were also recorded.

The synthesis, or ‘reciprocal translation’ (Noblit & Hare, 1988, p. 38), is demonstrated in Tables 7 and 8 and was achieved by recording how each theme was expressed across the individual studies. Supportive first-order constructs – direct quotes from the studies’ participants that are intended to illustrate their own understandings, were used most often to address concern regarding authors’ choice of language/interpretation. Whilst participant quotes have been preserved in an attempt to remain faithful to their meanings (Britten et al., 2002), I acknowledge that the extracts have been selected twice (once by the original authors and then by me) and so cannot still reflect the fullness of participants’ views (Atkins et al., 2008).
### Table 7 Themes related to the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children identified across the studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language provision</th>
<th>Hek and Sales, 2002</th>
<th>Whiteman, 2005</th>
<th>Reakes, 2007</th>
<th>Pinson and Arnot, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hek and Sales, 2002</td>
<td>‘…Students can look at simplified texts and the text in their first language and if they don’t understand in the lesson they can come to the EAL department and go over this’ (p.23)</td>
<td>‘…Learning Support Unit where newly-arrived pupils usually spend their first term, having intensive English tuition…’ (p.377)</td>
<td>LAs identified language support as a necessary provision and both reported the need to increase their base of language support staff (p.98)</td>
<td>Criteria such as educational attainment were referred to as a means of integrating the children rather than as a tool for measuring their integration (p.260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman, 2005</td>
<td>‘Yes, we have special English classes of 4 hours per week’ (p.24)</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘We are a multi-cultural school. We are already highly aware of the need to recognise cultural and religious differences and the situation fitted into our policies and procedures’ (p.97)</td>
<td>‘…focus the support offered to these pupils to improve their English’ (p.243)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reakes, 2007</td>
<td>The school has devised a proforma to be completed when the child starts school, providing information about previous schooling, and details of any special educational needs (p.378)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinson and Arnot, 2010</td>
<td>These LAs systematically collected data about those students, developed policies and diverted LA resources to support such students (p.256)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hek and Sales, 2002</td>
<td>The teachers at this school saw this policy and procedure (on bilingualism) as underpinning the policy on the inclusion and settlement needs of refugees…These policies are backed up by LA policies (p.26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman, 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reakes, 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinson and Arnot, 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial assessment</strong></td>
<td>Hek and Sales, 2002</td>
<td>Whiteman, 2005</td>
<td>Reakes, 2007</td>
<td>Pinson and Arnot, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial assessment of pupils is crucial in helping them settle (p.22)</td>
<td>‘...Learning Support Unit where newly arrived pupils usually spend their first term... and being assessed to ensure the appropriate ‘stream’ when they join mainstream classes’ (p.377)</td>
<td>‘...The most important thing is to get them into schools. It makes a difference to their psychological wellbeing and their adjustment to what’s happened to them’ (p.97)</td>
<td>‘We don’t have ‘pains in the arse’ or ‘little buggers’ opposed to learning, we’ve got barriers to learning and we systematically find out what those barriers are and find ways to overcome them’ (p.257)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All teachers talked of the importance of knowing about students’ experiences and circumstances, and agreed that this affected their emotional life and this was key to settling within the school environment (p.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Multi-agency working/working together</strong></th>
<th>Hek and Sales, 2002</th>
<th>Whiteman, 2005</th>
<th>Reakes, 2007</th>
<th>Pinson and Arnot, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘...We monitor the children through the department and we meet each week. And we work closely with the heads of years’ (p.23)</td>
<td>Voluntary organisations or other services, such as children’s charities, education welfare, school nursing and church or community refugee support groups were additional sources of support (‘for children who suffered traumatic experiences’) (p.383)</td>
<td>All 3 LAs were involved in multi-agency partnerships which included other LA departments – social services and health, non-statutory agencies and other local authorities (p.99)</td>
<td>‘I try to liaise with other agencies to try and sort out other needs as well’ (p.261)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding that asylum-seeking and refugee students have multiple, complex and diverse needs which require different types of support (p.256)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer support</td>
<td>Hek and Sales, 2002</td>
<td>Whiteman, 2005</td>
<td>Reakes, 2007</td>
<td>Pinson and Arnot, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'We try to find out what language they speak and then see if there are other children in the school who speak the same language so we can pair them up' (p.22)</td>
<td>‘...new pupils are paired up with another child who speaks the same language’ (p.379)</td>
<td>In one LA, a film-making project was developed for mixed groups of asylum-seeking pupils and existing pupils in three schools (p.96)</td>
<td>‘I think, especially in their first two years the social element is the big indicator and the most important thing to me is whether they participate in clubs, are getting involved in choirs, in music, and other extracurricular things’ (p.259)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>‘...so all the GCSE and SATS books are ordered in Turkish and Somalian if possible’ (p.23)</td>
<td>Teachers use the (Learning Support) Unit when necessary for advice and support (p.377)</td>
<td>Joint film-making project was used to raise awareness of asylum-seeking issues (p.96)</td>
<td>‘...(These LAs) diverted LA resources to support such students’ (p.256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School ethos</td>
<td>‘...Last year we had a celebration of Eid and Christmas together, so we try to give the sense of all cultures feeling that there is something special about them’ (p.24)</td>
<td>‘An overtly ‘multi-cultural’ approach to promoting understanding of pupils from overseas was initially taken’ (e.g. Refugee Week) (p.378)</td>
<td>‘We are a multi-cultural school. It is a great strength that there’s likely to be someone from the community or national group here’ (p.100)</td>
<td>‘We are a genuine multi-class, multi-cultural comprehensive school. Every child here has equal value, and one way we make that absolutely clear is by opening our doors to refugees and asylum-seekers' (p.100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hek and Sales, 2002</td>
<td>Whiteman, 2005</td>
<td>Reakes, 2007</td>
<td>Pinson and Arnot, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of refugee and asylum-seekers</strong></td>
<td>All the teachers agreed that having a positive attitude towards refugee students is probably one of the most important aspects of helping them to settle (p.24)</td>
<td>The degree to which pupils and parents were prepared to welcome refugee pupils did not seem to be related to the proportion of refugees in the school but the general ethnic mix of the school (p.384)</td>
<td>‘They have brought a greater depth of understanding of the world. They’ve brought different cultures, individual skills and the opportunity for the indigenous population to see that things can be done in a different way’ (p.105)</td>
<td>‘They bring an added dimension to the school population and in terms of our language profile it increases that and makes the school richer’ (p.258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family support</strong></td>
<td>The use of interpreters at parent evenings improved the number of parents and carers of refugee children attending (p.24)</td>
<td>‘School has devised its own welcome packs, aimed at helping new families settle in to the area using pictures of local amenities, school activities, accompanied by ‘key words’ in English’ (p.378)</td>
<td>Through the local church the teacher volunteers to offer English tuition to the families of refugee pupils (p.377)</td>
<td>‘The school has intervened and helped the family write letters, help them canvass MPs and so on. That’s something we would normally do with asylum-seekers’ (p.261)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘…last year I managed to get a family moved from very poor accommodation through being able to liaise with the housing department of their behalf’ (p.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘We do home visits as well so we get to meet the parents in their own space and also to find out what the parents’ needs are…’ (p.257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of background information</td>
<td>Hek and Sales, 2002</td>
<td>Whiteman, 2005</td>
<td>Reakes, 2007</td>
<td>Pinson and Arnot, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘We also need to know of their other experiences. Who are the children without parents or separated from their parents. Behaviour problems come up because of that’ (p.23)</td>
<td>Areas in which information was felt to be lacking: language needs, SEN, medical/health problems, current family situations, immigration status, background information of the country of origin, previous schooling (p.381)</td>
<td>Limited background information, particularly for non-dispersal areas (p.98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precarious UK circumstances</td>
<td>‘The main problem is housing and getting benefits for the families. Also, for many of them, they don’t know if they will stay or go’ (p.25)</td>
<td>Barriers to integration: Precarious UK circumstances (p.385)</td>
<td>The allocation of children to schools was heavily influenced by the availability of housing (p.97)</td>
<td>Temporary status emphasised by immigration politics, but schools are still expected to meet their needs (p.261)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>‘There is still a big stigma attached to being a refugee…’ (p.22)</td>
<td>Reactions of other pupils and parents to arrival ‘depends on profile in media’ (p.383)</td>
<td>‘…because of negative media attention, one (school) had taken the decision to release accurate information on asylum-seekers to ensure a balanced discussion of the issue’ (p.101)</td>
<td>Media and political discourses in Britain have on occasion, constructed asylum-seekers and refugees as potential criminals and welfare scroungers that pose a threat to the social cohesion of British society (p.261)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>‘…commitment of resources, which are always threatened both by budget limitations and an emphasis in education generally on targets… and so on’ (p. 28)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding arrangements were subject to constant change and delays which made planning long-term support difficult (p.104)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 shows the further synthesis of these themes into 3rd order concepts - the creation of new meaning from existing constructions (Noblit & Hare, 1988). This was achieved by drawing on concepts Pinson and Arnot (2010) report to have arisen in their study, which drew on holistic and humanistic theoretical frameworks and acted as an Index Theory to develop the synthesis.

From this I suggest:

- Language provision, LA/school policy/procedure and peer support systems relate to how inclusion is conceptualised
- School ethos and perception of refugees and asylum-seekers relate to how others are valued
- Initial assessment, family support, multi-agency working/working together and resources relate to how children’s needs are conceptualised

The interrelationships that appear to exist between these themes will now be explored in greater depth (Noblit & Hare, 1988).

1.4 Discussion
This discussion provides an understanding of constructions this synthesis claims to be related to the inclusion of RAS children in schools: conceptualisation of inclusion, how others are valued, and conceptualisation of the needs of children (Table 9).

1.4.1 Conceptualisation of inclusion
A single conceptualisation of inclusion (integration or resettlement) was not present across the reviewed studies. All studies referred to RAS children’s place in schools as a right. Terms and phrases such as ‘entitlement’, ‘LA responsibility’ were seen variously across all studies. Reference was made to national and international legislation, including the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989 (Pinson & Arnot, 2010; Hek & Sales, 2002). This was often coupled with an acknowledgment that difficulties experienced by refugees and asylum-seekers can be exacerbated by existing government agendas, including The Immigration and Asylum Act 1999. One study (Pinson & Arnot, 2010) also referred to the Home Office ‘Integration Matters: A National Strategy for Refugee Education’, a document which detailed successful indicators of integration only applying to individuals with refugee status, having the potential to further alienate asylum-seekers from inclusion in society.

Each study demonstrated nuanced differences in their implicit conceptualisations of inclusion, beyond the right to a place in school. This has been inferred by practical considerations raised, and language used in the studies regarding language provision, school/LA policy/procedure, and peer support systems.
Table 9 Synthesis of themes from studies to form constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes from reviewed studies</th>
<th>Interpretation (2\textsuperscript{nd} order concepts) from a single study (Pinson &amp; Arnot, 2010) to explain themes from review</th>
<th>Constructions from the synthesis (3\textsuperscript{rd} order concepts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language provision</td>
<td>New indicators of integration</td>
<td>Conceptualisation of inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/LA policy/procedure</td>
<td>(1) The social aspects of integration; (2) whether the children feel safe and secure in school; (3) whether their needs are being met so they can fulfil their potential</td>
<td>A holistic approach (inclusion) vs. a means of fitting in (integration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer support systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>How others are valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caring ethos and child-centred approach and maximal approach to the role prescribed for school and LA</td>
<td>Individuals have inherent value (humanistic approach) vs. some groups are intrinsically different (‘othering’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School ethos</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptualisation of the needs of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of refugees and asylum-seekers</td>
<td>Constructing a positive image and promoting cultural diversity</td>
<td>Recognising and responding to needs and interactions across environments (whole child-approach) vs. viewing children in isolation (within-child approach)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-agency working/working together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inclusion was discussed implicitly in two principal, but not mutually exclusive, ways: as a holistic approach and as a means of fitting in.

Where studies described refugees and asylum-seekers ‘fitting in’ with the majority culture (Whiteman, 2005, p. 386), this may be more accurately thought of as integration rather than inclusion. Studies which discussed refugees and asylum-seekers as having ‘individual needs’ (Hek & Sales, 2002, p. 28) and having their ‘needs met’ (Pinson & Arnot 2010, p.259) could be considered to fit of Lindsay’s (2003) definition of inclusion, wherein systems remove barriers to improve a range of outcomes. I argue that this represents a holistic conceptualisation of inclusion; not as a concern merely with its parts, but with the whole phenomenon (Lewis, 1998).

Consideration of LA/school position on language provision provides insight into their conceptualisation of inclusion. The emphasis placed on language provision across most of the studies (Reakes, 2007; Hek & Sales, 2002; Whiteman, 2005) implies the view that proficiency in English is both a means and marker of inclusion (Ager & Strang, 2008). Alternatively, Arnot and Pinson (2010) position proficiency in English language as a facilitator, or means, of social connection, not as marker of inclusion. This fits within a holistic conceptualisation of inclusion, recognising the social and emotional aspects of inclusion.

Consideration of LA/school policy language, and educational professionals’ views on policy and procedures, provides some insight into LA and schools’ conceptualisations of inclusion. RAS children are often still defined by existing approaches and policy language used (Rutter, 2006). For example, an English as an Additional Language (EAL) policy framework legitimises data-collection mainly on refugees’ and asylum-seekers’ competence in the English language. The studies which described LAs and schools where policy/procedure was adaptable or bespoke, and recognised the realities of displacement, represent a more holistic conceptualisation of inclusion beyond focusing on learning English (Pinson & Arnot, 2010, Hek & Sales, 2002, Reakes, 2007).

How the schools managed peer-support systems also offers some insight into their implicit conceptualisations of inclusion. Studies where schools emphasised mixed groupings and extra-curricular activities also referred to ‘social aspects of integration’ (Pinson & Arnot, 2010, p.259), such as whether children felt ‘safe and secure in school’ (p.259). Here, peer relations are regarded as important, representing a holistic conceptualisation of inclusion.

1.4.2 How others are valued

All of the studies reviewed captured a human rights perspective of education in some form, viewing education as a basic entitlement of all children. Two studies (Arnot & Pinson, 2010; Hek & Sales, 2002) present LAs and schools with perspectives more in keeping with a social
A social justice view of education adopts a holistic conceptualisation of inclusion and is a position from which others are valued. I suggest that the value placed on RAS children can be inferred from LA and schools' ethos and their existing perception of refugees and asylum-seekers.

Two studies reported schools that referred to themselves as ‘multi-cultural’ (Reakes, 2007, Pinson & Arnot, 2010) – “we are a genuine multi-class, multi-cultural comprehensive school. Every child here has equal value, and one way we make that absolutely clear is by opening our doors to refugees and asylum-seekers” (Pinson & Arnot, 2010, p.258). Here, multi-cultural is conceptualised as more than a fact or statistic (having multiple cultures within a school) but rather as an ethos to be promoted and celebrated. An ethos of valuing different cultures is illustrated by LA/schools taking an active role in promoting different languages and cultures in schools by using maps, art, songs, plays and celebrating religious festivals together (Hek & Sales, 2002, Whiteman, 2005). However, this position was found in some schools (Whiteman, 2005) to be influenced by the existing mix of pupils and current perception of refugees and asylum-seekers. The inferred assumption was that the more ethnically diverse a school, the more tolerant it was of refugee and asylum-seeking pupils. This may reflect the proximity effect; physical closeness increases interpersonal liking (Schneider, Gruman, & Coutts, 2011). There are examples of times when placing refugees in places that are unfamiliar with other cultures or languages has worked well, such as the Kindertransport to Yorkshire (Dale, 2014). Conversely, sometimes a more diverse population can lead to greater discomfort due to a range of complex interacting factors (Forrest & Dunn, 2007).

Constructing a valued image of refugees and asylum-seekers and promoting cultural diversity is conducive to a global humanistic perspective. Global humanism adopts a positive view of human possibilities, asserting that all humans have inherent goodness and value (Gurtov, 1991). Some LA/schools in the reviewed studies adopted a similar view and spoke explicitly about instances where RAS children are part of the school community and ‘feel valued’ (Hek & Sale, p.29). This position reflects the literature suggesting that when people feel appreciated and valued, they are more likely to feel that they belong (Due, Riggs, & Augoustinos, 2016).
1.4.3 Conceptualisation of the needs of children

Implicit conceptualisations of inclusion and the value placed on others influences the practical approach LAs/schools take in supporting RAS children. I argue that the approach to initial assessment, multi-agency working/working together, resources, and family support reflect how the needs of children have been conceptualised.

A whole-child approach has the potential to shift problems and solutions from being perceived as within the individual child to recognising that they occur between people and contexts (Tomm, George, & Wulff, 2014). Taking a whole-child approach is central to a holistic perspective on inclusion. Madziva and Thondhlana’s (2017) model conceptualising the quality of education for refugees in the UK (p.948) frames ‘quality education’ (p.946) as arising from interactions between three overlapping environments: the wider education context, the school, and the home/community. This echoes what I suggest represents a whole-child approach. Madziva and Thondhlana’s model (2017) and a whole-child approach are theoretically underpinned by ecological systems theory and acknowledge the influence interacting systems and environments have on individuals and vice versa (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Darling, 2007). When systems and services are under pressure, difficulties can arise and challenges can emerge (Gollan & Young, 2019).

How and why RAS children are assessed is also, arguably, a reflection of LA/schools’ conceptualisations of their needs. Focus on their previous educational experience and academic abilities may shift attention away from some of their social and emotional needs. In some studies, initial assessment was viewed as necessary to ensure ‘correct streaming’ (Whiteman, 2005), the focus being on testing children’s academic abilities in the new setting, a discourse more in keeping with performance outcome measures and a ‘fitting in’ conceptualisation of inclusion (i.e. integration). Initial assessment was viewed from a holistic perspective in other studies (Hek & Sales, 2002; Arnot and Pinson, 2010). These studies referred to the importance of knowing about children’s experiences and circumstances, acknowledging explicitly the emotional factors which may affect how they settle and their subsequent learning and inclusion in school. This approach has foundations in psychological need theories, recognising the array of emotional needs children have to be met. (For example, Self Determination Theory, Deci & Ryan, 2012; Human Givens, Griffin & Tyrrell, 2013).

Studies conceptualising inclusion holistically were inclined to adopt a whole-child approach which took children’s needs beyond school into account, recognising the impact of family circumstances on their functioning in school, and the importance of engaging in multi-agency working to support the families’ needs (Hek & Sales 2002, Arnot & Pinson, 2010).
LA/schools which adopted whole-child approaches reported the importance of positive, supportive relationships with families. In practical terms, this often manifests as access to interpreters and welcoming families to the school community with welcome packs, for example (Hek & Sales, 2002, Whiteman, 2005).

LA/school resources targeting a range of factors beyond academic outcomes are also characteristic of a whole-child approach. For example, the use of an awareness raising filmmaking project on asylum-seeking issues (Reakes, 2007).

**1.4.4 Meta-Synthesis**

Consideration of the reviewed studies’ methods, application of theory, and findings has allowed a more detailed understanding of the ways in which RAS children’s inclusion has been researched, conceptualised and applied in practice in the UK between 2002 and 2010. Particular patterns emerged: individual semi-structured interviews were the most used qualitative method; definitions of terms researched were largely absent; and theory or frameworks were generally not explicitly referenced or generated (other than Pinson & Arnot, 2010).

I suggest that the findings from my synthesis can inform a framework to drive policy and practice in LAs and schools. To do so, I take inspiration from Parker’s (2013) adaption of Grix’s research model (2002), positing that underlying beliefs and conceptualisations guide not only research, but practice, too (Figure 1). The framework illustrates how conceptualisations of inclusion shape how others are valued, how children’s needs are conceptualised, and how inclusion is manifested in practice.

**1.5 Dissemination (the derived model)**

From this meta-study, three broad, interacting constructions relating to the inclusion of RAS children in schools emerged: how inclusion is conceptualised, how others are valued, and how children’s needs are conceptualised. When inclusion is viewed as more than a means of fitting in, or integrating into existing systems, and regarded rather from a holistic perspective, a whole child-approach, where others are valued, is more likely to follow. The ways in which RAS children’s inclusion is conceptualised by educational systems and professionals, therefore, acts as a lens through which to examine their practices and define their commitments to inclusion (Arnot & Pinson, 2010).

Tensions between the political positioning of RAS children in law and the practices of LA/schools shaped the rationale and background of this review. Refugees and asylum-seekers are at risk of being subject to the complex, cumulative effects of multiple forms of discrimination overlapping and intersecting (e.g. racism, classism). This intersectionality of
social and political identities can have an exponential impact in terms of inequality and exclusion (Carbado, Crenshaw, Mays, & Tomlinson, 2013).
Figure 1 Framework illustrating a holistic conceptualisation of the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children in school

(Adapted from Grix (2002); Parker (2013))
In the absence of a holistic conceptualisation of inclusion, valuing others, and whole-child approaches in policy and practice, refugees and asylum-seekers are at risk of being positioned in line with the prevailing political and public discourse, shaping the reception and support they receive both in schools and in wider society.

Deliberately excluded from the framework which emerged from the synthesis is what doesn’t support the inclusion of RAS children in schools; positions at odds with a holistic conceptualisation of inclusion, including integration. The differences between inclusion and integration, discussed throughout, arguably mirror the dichotomy of drivers of education. Whilst inclusion promotes personal growth and celebrates difference (capabilities perspective of education, Mazzoli Smith et al., 2018; Nussbaum, 2011), integration arguably aligns more closely with the current performative culture of UK education (Young, 2017).

**1.5.1 Limitations**

I hope the framework outlined provides for educational professionals and policy makers a tool with which to reflect and develop conceptualisations of, and practices around, the inclusion of RAS children in schools. This review, however, contributes one potential understanding of the area, and claims no more. Rather, it aims to generate further debate, discussion and research. As noted on page 20, only ideas that were reflected in at least two papers were taken forward. Consequently, single item ideas that could have been important may have been lost from the overall analysis.

The studies reviewed were all published before 2010. Although that in itself says something about drive for research in this area, I acknowledge that the papers may not reflect current views and practice and therefore further research is required. Since 2010, centralised governance has increased in the UK alongside a growing focus on controlling (im)migration and measures of attainment in education (Hall, 2018). This has arguably adversely affected the inclusion of RAS children in schools further (Hall, 2018). More research, therefore, is required which focuses on exploring current processes and underpinnings of inclusive practice in LAs and schools.

**1.5.2 Implications for EP practice**

Given continuing displacement of children around the globe due to conflict, this review’s findings have a number of significant implications. The UNHCR describes education as, ‘the most critical element in bridging the gap between relief assistance and durable solutions’ (cited in Dryden-Peterson, 2011, p. 83). If we are to take a holistic, humanistic perspective on the experiences of RAS children, explicit focus on the role of inclusion in education is crucial. Both in research and in practice, Educational Psychologists have a role in supporting educational professionals and policy makers in taking a critical view of how their
conceptualisations of inclusion are shaping practice, and in raising awareness of the socio-political context within which these are effected. Educational Psychologists can illuminate the psychology underlying inclusion across all the levels they work. This may begin at the individual case level by moving away from standardised normative cognitive assessments as the first course of action, and instead, cultivate a holistic perspective of children by drawing on consultation skills (Wagner, 2000), need theories (e.g. Self Determination Theory, Deci & Ryan, 2012; Human Givens, Griffin & Tyrrell, 2013) and dynamic assessment (Feuerstein, Feuerstein, Falik, & Rand, 2002). This last originates from Feuerstein’s work with children after WWII. Feuerstein’s Learning Assessment Propensity Device, for example, rests on the assumption that children’s abilities are not fixed and that all children have the ability to progress and overcome obstacles with the right mediation (Sher, 2019). These principles can be drawn on when working at the whole school and LA level, too, to create small, but deliberate change (Rees, 2008) towards more inclusive practice.
Chapter Two. Bridging Document

2.1 Introduction
The purpose of this document is to link together my Systematic Literature Review (SLR) (Chapter one) and Empirical Research (Chapter three). I will explore some of the pertinent socio-political reasons for my interest in this research area and outline the links between my Systematic Literature Review and Empirical Research. I will consider the ethical, ontological and epistemological underpinnings of this thesis, highlighting the rationale for my approach. A central concept from my Empirical Research, being human, resonated with me and will form the foundation of this reflection. Broadly, this chapter outlines my conceptual framework – why I did this research, at this time and in this way.

2.2 On being human
The first time I thought properly about what it means to be human was when reading a chapter from Maslow’s (2013), Towards a Psychology of Being. Many of the basic assumptions Maslow outlines resonate with my own beliefs.

We have…an essential biologically based inner nature…‘natural’, intrinsic, given and, in a certain limited sense, unchangeable…This inner nature…, seems not to be intrinsically evil, but rather either neutral or positively ‘good’… Each person’s inner nature is in part unique to himself and in part species-wide (p.1).

Some have argued, however, that the human selfhood promoted in theories such as Maslow’s humanism (i.e. self-actualisation) deter recognition of our social, cultural, and historical context (Martin & McLellan, 2013; Sugarman, 2015).

…as long as we are focused on ourselves, our desires, ends, and pursuits are detached from collective concerns, and the socio-political status quo goes largely unexamined and unquestioned (Sugarman, 2015, p. 113).

In the absence of orientation toward social-cultural contexts and the people within them, the kinds of selves and aspired to human functionings advocated by Western psychology (e.g. self-motivation, self-reliance) can conceivably be viewed as complicit with neo-liberal agendas where a radically free market in which competition is maximised is promoted and social responsibility towards others is diminished (Sugarman, 2015).

The language we use to describe what it means to be human has arguably shaped our experience for centuries. Though beyond the scope of this piece, it is important to note that language is littered with latent philosophical flaws which can define, or obscure,
understanding and progress (Cromwell, 2010). During the research process, I wanted to understand as best I could what being human means.

Research in social psychology identifies two dimensions of humanness – uniqueness and nature (Bastian & Haslam, 2010). Human uniqueness captures attributes which distinguish humans from animals, such as civility and high cognition (Leyens et al., 2001). Human nature describes shared and fundamental features of humanity, such as agency and emotional warmth (Bastian & Haslam, 2010).

Social exclusion is at odds with what many describe as a fundamental human motive and need to belong (Griffin & Tyrrell, 2017; Haslam, Rothschild, & Ernst, 2000; Maslow, 2013). If belonging, or inclusion, is central to our experience of being human, then social exclusion, or exclusion from shared humanity, is a central aspect of being treated as less than human and can disrupt the sense of self as a member of the human community (Bastian & Haslam, 2010). Bandura (1999) and Bastian and Haslam (2010) have suggested that dehumanisation involves moral disengagement; being placed outside the circle of humanity. When human uniqueness attributes are denied, people become explicitly or implicitly likened to animals and are seen as irrational. When human nature attributes are denied, people are explicitly or implicitly likened to objects, or machines, and seen as cold or lacking emotion (Bastian & Haslam, 2010). This is a stance that many governments might subscribe to when they categorise and label people, including refugees and asylum-seekers, within a complex matrix of cultural, legal and social practices (Gatrell, 2017). This labelling can be dehumanising though thought necessary for bureaucratic processes linked to access and entitlement (i.e. structural inclusion), which then legitimises power and control over the Other (Zetter, 2007).

2.3 Why I conducted this research

2.3.1 Political context

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) argued recently that the language of politics has become ‘ruthless’ and described refugees as the ‘catalyst of a dehumanisation trend, whose sole purpose is immediate political gain’ (UNHCR, 2018a p.1).

Branded as a threat to national interests, refugees and asylum-seekers have often had their basic human need for security disregarded or denied, and have been excluded to the margins of society (UNHCR, 2018a).

Today, global conflict has displaced 70.8 million people worldwide (UNHCR, 2020). RAS children are a particularly vulnerable group, one often overlooked in official statistics and policy-relevant research (Cerna, 2019; McIntyre & Hall, 2018). In the absence of reliable
data, the risks facing RAS children remain largely hidden and unaddressed (Cerna, 2019). What is known, however, is that their successful inclusion in school systems is important for their social and emotional wellbeing, and also for their future prospects in work and broader society (Cerna, 2019; Rutter, 2006).

A global commitment to universal access to education began in 1990 with the Education for All Declaration (Dryden-Peterson, 2018). Further, in 2016 the United Nations General Assembly reaffirmed the commitment of member states to provide ‘quality’ education for all refugee children (i.e. contributing to children’s whole development, allowing them to learn and thrive) (United Nations General Assembly, 2016, p. 14). In 2016, the UK government committed to resettle 20,000 refugees by 2020, the majority of whom would be from Syria (Home Office, 2014). Locally, the LA in which I conducted my research is one of the designated dispersal regions in the UK, which has received RAS children and families since the dispersal programme was born following the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999.

2.4 Driving values, underpinning psychology and ethics

The application of psychology as an agent of positive change to support social justice drives my practice and research.

Liberation psychology is one example of a body of literature that has shaped my views. Liberation psychology focusses on locating psychological experiences within a context and suggests mainstream psychology has often done the opposite (Dykstra, 2014). Liberation psychology has aimed to uncover the socio-political and economic determinants of experience and shift away from mainstream Western psychology’s individualistic tendencies. Instead, liberation psychology desires to alter theory and practice into alignment with the needs of the oppressed in the hope of achieving levels of well-being and justice which have been ‘systematically erased’ (Dykstra, 2014, p. 889). Applying liberation psychology to education, Freire (1972) argued that in order to promote critical consciousness about justice, educational practice needs to be changed. He believed that this required transformative action in the form of reflection, and action against oppressive structures.

The transformative paradigm provides a framework for addressing injustice and inequality in society (Mertens, 2007). It recognises realities as socially constructed and shaped by political, cultural, economic, racial and social values. From a transformative position, the Educational Psychologist’s role is to recognise society’s injustices and inequalities and strive to challenge the status quo (Mertens, 2005). This is achieved by explicitly examining assumptions and addressing power issues and social justice throughout practice and research. Similarly, emancipatory practice aims to raise awareness of external sources of
oppression, or privilege, and confront structural sources of marginalisation and exclusion (Sewpaul, Ntini, Mkhize, & Zandamela, 2015).

Though research on inclusion in education has evolved and taken positive steps (e.g. inclusion and physical disability), language, processes and policies have not always matched this (Thomas. & Loxley, 2007). On starting my research I felt this tension, feeling impelled to do something useful, but aware of my likely limits. I queried the authenticity of my research because it did not have the voice of refugees or asylum-seekers in it. To alleviate these ethical concerns, I referred back to the literature on emancipatory psychology; to emancipate means to be freed of historical, political and cultural domination and connect with our self and others (Freire, 1972; Sewpaul et al., 2015). I concluded that although I was not going to be working directly with refugees and asylum-seekers, my research was shaped by humanity and took a critical view of social injustices in existing research and practice, with refugees and asylum-seekers firmly at the core.

2.5 Epistemology and ontology

Ontology refers to what there is to know about the world; questions about the form of reality and what it is to be a human (Willig, 2013). Epistemology refers to how and what we can know: the theory of knowledge (Willig, 2013). Methodology describes the approach to research and is shaped by the epistemological and ontological position of the researcher (Grix, 2002).

Ontology can be conceptualised along a spectrum with objectivism (realism) at one end and constructivism (relativism) at the other (Willig, 2013). An objectivist position claims that social reality exists independently of interactions (Grix, 2010). This aligns with the realist assertion that the world is comprised of structures that have causal relationships with one another (Willig, 2008). In contrast, a constructivist position claims social reality is a product of interactions that lead to continually changing constructions of perceived reality (Grix, 2010). This aligns with the relativist assertion that we are unable to capture and create rules for the multiple interpretations of the social world (Willig, 2013). From this, three main epistemologies emerge: positivism (objectivist ontology), interpretivism (constructivist ontology) and critical realism (sitting in between) (Grix, 2010).

On balance, I believe that an independent reality exists, ontologically reflecting a realist view of the world (Scott, 2005). However, I believe that objects of reality are not easily described or captured, and are shaped by the social world. Epistemologically, this aligns with critical realism. From a critical realist perspective, attempts to measure reality are fallible and open to varying interpretations (Maxwell, 2012). I believe that a purely constructivist approach
lacks the advocacy to support marginalised people (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Rather, complementary to critical realism, I recognise the multi-faceted construction of reality, and in doing so am examining assumptions which highlight how power and privilege are important determinants of which reality is privileged in a practice and research context (Mertens, 2007). Different realities can emerge because different levels of unearned privilege are associated with characteristics of individuals. Practice needs to be continually aware of political contexts and change agendas in order to confront the various forms of oppression (Mertens, 2007).

2.6 Findings from my Systematic Literature Review

My SLR explored educational professionals’ perspectives on factors supporting the inclusion of RAS children in UK schools. The foundation of this was an existing, but not extensive, body of literature indicating the importance of school settings, though the focus was rarely just on inclusion. My hope was to generate, or expand existing, theoretical frameworks and aid continuing development of education and social policy. I hoped that my synthesis could support practitioners in their interpretation of research and incorporate this knowledge into practice. I hoped it may expose underlying structures and assumptions of extant theory as it influences the development of knowledge within the field.

During critical analysis of the quality of the papers under review using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (Guyatt et al., 1993), a clear pattern emerged: the terms integration and inclusion were used interchangeably with limited definitions. Further, little detail about research methods, procedures and analysis was provided, making it hard to understand the claims made. To consider this further, I gathered a small sample of non-UK papers in a similar research area to compare their quality. Across measures of transparency and criticality, international papers were slightly better than the UK papers I had selected for the SLR. This strengthened my developing awareness that research reflects the time and context in which it was conducted, and is shaped by assumptions and accepted views, or definitions, of that time and place.

Overall, my synthesis revealed the importance of adopting a holistic conceptualisation of inclusion, valuing others and taking a whole child approach in enacting inclusive practice.

2.7 Method and methodology
In this section I will discuss why I used a meta-study in my SLR. I will then discuss how this approach led to the development of my rationale for choosing to facilitate an Appreciative Inquiry (AI) for my Empirical Project. Finally, I will outline the decision to utilise grounded theory for my data analysis.
2.7.1 Meta-Study

After analysing the quality of the papers for my SLR, I explored methods of synthesis which could align with my ontological, epistemological and ethical position. After a review of a range of methods, I chose to conduct a meta-study (Paterson et al., 2001). It was clear that my research area was particularly influenced by socio-political factors, therefore I did not want to aggregate findings in a review; I wanted to view them in their social context.

Paterson et al. (2001) argue that combining results of similar studies excludes consideration of the highly significant ways in which theoretical, methodological and societal contexts shape reported findings. Historical, socio-cultural factors and theoretical frameworks influence which issues are chosen for study, which questions are asked, which research designs are used and the interpretation of the findings (Paterson et al., 2001).

Given the time and resource constraints of this project, the meta-study was not conducted entirely as it was designed to. For example, I am not part of a team, nor do I claim to have located all of the research in the field, merely a sample of that available.

Meta-study is an interpretive qualitative research approach seeking to understand how people construct and reconstruct knowledge about a phenomenon (Paterson et al., 2001). Though it stems from a constructivist ontology, it mirrors my views and values sufficiently that I could apply it. The meta-study led me to ask questions such as: why did the researchers in particular years construct the experiences of inclusion of RAS children in the ways they did? What historical, social and cultural factors influenced these constructions? Any prescriptions for practice or theory emerging through my conclusions were constructed by me, at that particular time, with my interpretative skills. Conducting research in this way means I was interpreting primary research and translating what had been written to reveal similarities and differences.

Translation represents the cognitive component of interpretation…the researcher, as translator, interprets the primary findings to present the meaning of the phenomenon under study, including relationships between categories of data (Denzin, 2001, cited in Paterson, 2001, p.9).

Zhao (1991) described meta-study as ‘re-mapping the cognitive status’ (p. 381) of a changing field of study. At its core, the meta-study process involves a shift from ‘what is’ to ‘what might be’ (Paterson et al., 2001, p. 14). This aligns with the underpinnings of Appreciative Inquiry (Cooperrider, Whitney, Stavros, & Stavros, 2008) and shaped my decision to use this method in the Empirical Project (discussed below). Additionally, the philosophical underpinnings of meta-study require ‘an attitude of openness, discovery and reflection to discern and reframe knowledge about a particular phenomenon’ (Paterson et
This resonates with the underpinnings of grounded theory and shaped my decision to use this method to analyse the data in the Empirical Project (discussed below).

2.7.2 Appreciative Inquiry (AI)
The rationale for my empirical project was shaped by findings in the SLR. All SLR papers were published between 2002 and 2010 and used semi-structured interviews. I wanted to update the literature to reflect the current context and utilise a different qualitative method, one inherently more collaborative.

AI explores and builds on appreciative narratives to bring about organisational and social change (Zandee & Cooperrider, 2008). The aim of an AI is to support others to explore their strengths, values and high points, to nurture a sense of positivity and build a new, hopeful future reality (Bright, Powley, Fry, & Barrett, 2013; Zandee & Cooperrider, 2008).

I chose to use AI for several reasons. Firstly, I recognise similarities between the theoretical underpinnings of inclusive practice and AI. For example, Whitney and Trosten-Bloom’s (2010) beliefs about human nature: people individually and collectively have unique gifts, skills, and contributions to bring to life. Secondly, AI can align with my critical realist perspective because it explicitly acknowledges my role as researcher as active and shaping within the process (Zandee & Cooperrider, 2008). By facilitating the AI, even with the lightest touch, there was likely a degree of reciprocal reshaping between me and the participants (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Though AI grew out of social constructionist thought (Cooperrider, Srivastva, Woodman, & Pasmore, 1987), I suggest that the AI process acknowledges a reality (i.e. by asking what’s working well in an organisation or group) whilst accepting that there may be multiple interpretations of it. The research I conducted aimed to discover these interpretations (Larkin, Watts, & Clifton, 2006). I brought the topic for inquiry, and therefore AI was not used in its traditional sense as an organisation change model, but primarily as a tool for generating data.

2.7.3 Grounded Theory
There were various ways I could have analysed the views collected in the AI. Discourse analysis would have focused on the language of participants (Johnstone, 2018), and phenomenological analysis would have sought to discover how participants made sense of their experiences (Smith & Shinebourne, 2012) However, I was more interested in ‘identifying and explicating contextualised social processes’ (Willig, 2013, p. 79).

Grounded theory assumes that social processes have an objective reality (i.e. events take place irrespective of the researcher observing). This suggests a realist ontology. However,
grounded theory also assumes that social realities are negotiated within individuals and that people’s interpretations of events shape their consequences (Willig, 2013). Different approaches to grounded theory have evolved, and now broadly encompass realist and social constructionist positions. Where realist versions aim to discover and build theory from data (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), social constructivist versions focus on the construction of theory through interaction with the data (Charmaz, 2006). My epistemological position acknowledges the difficulty in establishing universal truths, consequently, I accept Charmaz’s (2006) assertion that my interpretation of the data cannot be removed from any theory I generate. However, I still believe there are aspects to be known, and I have striven to understand the social phenomenon that is the inclusion of RAS children in schools from the data I have collected. Therefore, a realist version of grounded theory seemed most appropriate to apply. Additionally, AI describes grounded theory as the best means to understand living cultures and phenomena (Cooperrider et al., 1987).

An abbreviated version of realist grounded theory was used and focused on what the data revealed. Pragmatic considerations of time and resource meant I was unable to return to participants to check and refine the emerging findings; this made the abbreviated version more appropriate (Willig, 2013).

2.8 Reflexivity
I hope that this chapter has illustrated how, from a foundation of being human, my ontological, epistemological and ethical position have shaped, and defined my research. In particular, I hope it has illustrated my epistemological reflexivity – the way I have considered how my worldview has influenced each decision I have made and guided future actions (Birks & Mills, 2015, p. 52).

Throughout the process, I have queried my position as researcher and felt it change stage by stage. Typically, in realist versions of grounded theory, the researcher is positioned as a witness (Willig, 2013). Though it is true that at the analysis stage I was careful not to apply my own assumptions by adhering to the proposed procedures (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), it has been challenging to systematically present a picture of what is going on in one piece of social reality (Willig, 2013). Here, grounded theory has been criticised for a lack of reflexivity (Birks & Mills, 2015; Willig, 2013). I believe issues of reflexivity can be addressed through memo writing, because memos are a written record of reflectivity (Pidgeon & Henwood, 1997). During this process, memos have documented my actions and feelings, and the influence they have had on my thinking and analysis. Memos have captured some of my lived experience, and helped me to analyse my subjective self throughout the process (Birks
& Mills, 2015). For example, by using AI, I acknowledged that I was taking a more social constructivist stance, and that my presence shaped the research. To counter this, I made attempts to be as removed from the process as possible (e.g. by providing prompt sheets and asserting my position as facilitator, not participant).

2.9 Summary
Understanding how professionals can support the inclusion of RAS children in schools has been at the forefront of my mind since beginning this research. The impact of global socio-political affairs on the most vulnerable continually reminds me of the humanitarian significance of this research area. Refugee and asylum-seeking experiences are valuable, and perhaps function as a litmus test for our education system (Dryden-Peterson, 2018; Leo & Barton, 2006). How we react to RAS children tells us something about our humanity, and may encourage reconsideration of how we facilitate our education system and society to embrace all, and ask - how are we human in the face of human crisis?
Chapter Three. Empirical Research - What supports the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children in schools? An Appreciative Inquiry with educational professionals

3.1 Abstract
Human displacement is not a new phenomenon; providing refuge is enshrined in international law. However, in recent years a complex mix of socio-economic factors, political commentary and media reporting has led to a perpetuated image of a ‘refugee crisis’. Refugee and asylum-seeking children are positioned vulnerably at the intersection of how discourses in migration and discourses in education are experienced. This study aimed to explore the perspectives of educational professionals on factors or conditions supporting their practice of including refugee and asylum-seeking children in schools in England. A qualitative research approach was adopted. A five stage Appreciative Inquiry was carried out with a group of eight professionals from a local authority and two primary schools in the North East of England. The Appreciative Inquiry was recorded and transcribed; the data was analysed using abbreviated realist grounded theory. Factors which were found to be important in supporting the participants' inclusive practice now, and in a preferred future, are presented using an abbreviated version of the Realist Explanation. These factors are: being human, proactive working together/sharing, professional qualities, and access and opportunities. It is suggested that these factors positively affect the structural and relational outcomes of inclusion for refugee and asylum-seeking children. Implications for educational professionals and policy makers are offered.
3.2 Introduction
This chapter outlines an Appreciative Inquiry (AI) research project exploring inclusive practice relating to refugee and asylum-seeking (RAS) children in schools. The research is focused on the perspective of professionals working in one local authority and two schools in the North East of England.

3.2.1 Current context
Current figures indicate that global conflict has displaced approximately 70.8 million people worldwide, around half of whom are believed to be under the age of 18 (UNHCR, 2020). In keeping with general European trends, between June 2018 and June 2019 the UK received 21% more applications for asylum than the previous year (UNHCR, 2020). Four out of five refugees, however, continue to stay in their region of displacement, hosted by neighbouring countries (UNHCR, 2020). The most recent figures (UNHCR, 2018b) indicate that there are approximately 126,720 refugees and 45,244 pending asylum cases in the UK.

To be granted refugee status, a person must have their application approved by the receiving country. To be successful, the person seeking asylum must be deemed to:

…(have) a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, (be) outside the country of his nationality, and (be) unable to, or owing to such fear, (be) unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it (UN General Assembly, 1951, p. 137).

Actual numbers of RAS children in the UK education system are unclear, and policy-relevant research from an educational perspective is fragmented and limited (Cerna, 2019; de Wal Pastoor, 2015; Pinson & Arnot, 2007). Despite growing urgency, processes vary and remain unstandardised (Dryden-Peterson, 2011). Arguably, this is in part a consequence of UK government measures which have limited LA powers, centralised the relationship between the government and individual schools, and put many public services out to tender, for example, dispersal accommodation for refugees and asylum-seekers (McIntyre & Hall, 2018). Wood and Flinders (2014) argue this power transfer involves:

…not simply the withdrawal of politicians from the direct control of a vast range of functions as the market takes priority, but also a de-politicisation of the debate so that the dispersal of new arrivals becomes seen primarily as a technical and managerial matter (p.156).

It is perhaps no coincidence that RAS children are often overlooked in national and international surveys, such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) (Crul, Keskiner, Schneider, Lelie, & Ghaeminia, 2016).
In 2019, the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) argued that there exists a global assumption that most refugees are displaced temporarily; they receive life-saving support and then return home to resume their briefly interrupted lives (UNHCR, 2019). The UNHCR suggests that these assumptions shaped earlier, temporary approaches to RAS children’s education. In reality, however, figures show that at the end of 2018, 15.9 million refugees worldwide were living in protracted circumstances, representing 78% of all refugees (UNHCR, 2019).

3.2.2 Inclusion
UK research has explored the educational needs and experiences of RAS children, with varying focuses on inclusion (Madziva & Thondhlana, 2017; Rutter, 2006; Tyrer & Fazel, 2014). Schools have been found to be essential sites through which RAS children experience their first contact with their host society (Sarr & Mosselson, 2010). Dominant discourse in existing good practice literature highlights the importance of: providing a welcoming environment, meeting psychosocial needs, meeting language needs, and collaborating with families, communities and external agencies (Rutter, 2006; Taylor & Sidhu, 2012).

Ainscow (2005) conceptualises inclusion in education as a basic human right and the foundation for a more just society. It has been suggested that inclusive school environments for RAS children have stemmed from a combination of interacting inputs and processes across policy, school and home environments and are deemed to be most effective when a holistic perspective of needs is adopted (Cerna, 2019; Rutter, 2006). In the literature, distinction has been made on processes of inclusion between ‘structural integration’ and ‘relational integration’ (Dryden-Peterson, 2018, p. 10). Dryden-Peterson (2018) argue that RAS children’s inclusion in education is ‘the active and dynamic processes of coming together of refugees and nationals in schools’ (p.10). Peterson-Dryden (2018) uses the concepts of structural integration (i.e. access to services) and relational integration (i.e. socio-cultural process) to enable a focus on the educational goals of inclusion: access, quality, belonging and social cohesion (Korac, 2003).

Drawing on Human Rights Education Theory, inclusion is one practical expression of the ideals of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which includes respect for human dignity and equality (Tibbitts, 2017). Though governments are ultimately responsible for preventing human rights abuses, if viewed through the lens of social change, individuals are accountable for the everyday enactment of human rights (Tibbitts, 2017). In education, efforts to reduce inequalities and the exclusion of minority groups require critical consideration via collective consciousness raising, something which is embodied in the goals
of emancipatory education; to foster discourse that generates change for marginalised groups (Freire, 1972; Melo, 2019).

3.2.3 Rationale
Refugees and asylum-seekers are politically positioned in line with ever-changing socio-political discourses and climates. Therefore, there is a need for research which acknowledges the influence of contextual factors on the practice and experiences of professionals who support this group, with the ultimate aim of promoting the inclusion of RAS children in schools and society.

An unpublished literature review (Owen-Hughes, ND) suggests existing research in this area has predominately been conducted using individual semi-structured interviews. This led me to wonder what the collective perception might be of a community of professionals at this time, across one LA and a selection of schools. In particular, I wondered what their positive experiences had been and what their dreams are for a better future.

3.2.4 Aims of this project
This project aims to explore the perspectives of professionals on factors which currently do, and factors which potential could, support the inclusion of RAS children in schools.

3.3. Method

3.3.1 Data generation
In order to better understand participants’ perspectives and experiences of inclusive practice, I felt it important to select a data generating tool which aligned with inclusive values and drew on practice found to promote it (i.e. collaboration, celebrating difference, taking a holistic perspective, see Rutter (2006), for example). This led me to Appreciative Inquiry.

Appreciative Inquiry (AI) differs from conventional action-research problem-solving because the process is shaped by the history and experiences of the group (Cooperrider et al., 1987; Hall & Hammond, 1998). AI approaches development from a strengths-oriented perspective, identifying what is already present and building upon it (Zandee & Cooperrider, 2008). It is based on the premise that all organisations or groups have a positive core (Zandee & Cooperrider, 2008). AI asserts that focus on positivity has the potential to lead to generative conversations, where a new and hopeful reality is created in discussion through community engagement and enthusiasm (Kadi-Hanifi et al., 2014). Many of the theoretical foundations and underpinning principles of AI mirror inclusive values. For example, AI rests on Whitney and Trosten-Bloom’s (2010) beliefs about human nature; people, individually and collectively, have unique gifts and contributions to bring. This is akin to celebrating difference.
Given the compatibility of AI with the topic under exploration, in addition to the underutilisation of collaborative research methods in the existing literature, AI was chosen to be applied as a framework for the research process. This research project utilised the five-dimension (5-D) cycle of AI which involves: defining, discovering, dreaming, designing and destiny (Hall & Hammond, 1998) (Table 10 for process description).

The focus for the AI was: how do we support the inclusion of RAS children in schools? Proponents of AI suggest development projects are more likely to be successful when the specifics are developed within the group (Cooperrider et al., 2008). Therefore, group members were free to discuss what felt most pertinent to them within the broad topic. As AI involves processes that extend an appreciation for ‘what is’ into a reflexive search for ‘what might be’, the AI resulted in a dual focus on:

1. When are we most inclusive? What's happening when things are working well?
2. What in our current practice do we want to take forward into the future? What else would we like to see/do in a preferred future?

3.3.2 Participants
Eight participants took part in the research, five females and three males. Participants had the following job roles:

- LA Educational Psychologist (x2)
- Primary School Head Teacher
- LA Family Support Worker
- English as an Additional Language Support Worker in a primary school
- LA Admissions Officer
- Refugee and Asylum Lead for the LA
- LA Inclusion Officer (Schools of Sanctuary Project Team)

Whilst I initially wanted to invite interest from more professionals across schools, this was not possible given the research timescale. Instead, professionals from schools were approached based on the schools' positive reputation regarding their work with RAS children, representing a purposive sample (Robson & McCartan, 2016).

3.3.3 Research process
The AI took place over one three-and-a-half hour session in September 2019. The participants remained in a whole group when instructions about the different AI phases were delivered. Participants were then split into smaller groups of either pairs or groups of three-
four for discussions. All participants came back together to report back as a group at the end of each phase. A structured time-frame for each phase of the AI was followed to manage the time available (Table 10).

AI requires the facilitator to help bring themes to the surface and enable the group to organise the discovery process together (Hall & Hammond, 1998). In an attempt to reduce my bias as researcher, I developed prompt sheets for the participants to use as a guide through the AI (Appendix 1). The AI was audio recorded using an electronic recording device. In addition, a scribe noted key feedback points during the process. These notes were posted up around the room for the participants to see throughout the process.

**Table 10 Five-dimension Appreciative Inquiry process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong>&lt;br&gt;(13.00 – 13.30)</td>
<td>A presentation introducing AI was shared with participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1. Define – What’s the focus?</strong>&lt;br&gt;‘What is inclusion?’&lt;br&gt;(13.30 - 14.00)</td>
<td>Participants reflected in pairs and fed back their discussions and definitions of inclusion, specifically in relation to RAS children. They were then asked to finish the sentence, ‘We are at our best when…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2. Discovery – What gives life?</strong>&lt;br&gt;‘When is our practice most inclusive?’&lt;br&gt;(14.00 – 14.30)&lt;br&gt;(Break 14.30 – 14.45)</td>
<td>Participants reflected in pairs and fed back to the group on:&lt;br&gt;- Times when their practice/work has been most inclusive&lt;br&gt;- Times their work has had the greatest impact&lt;br&gt;- Stories of when they felt most engaged and enthused when working in this field&lt;br&gt;- What they valued most about the work they do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3. Dream – What might be?</strong>&lt;br&gt;‘What would it look like if our practice was as inclusive as it could be?’&lt;br&gt;(14.45 - 15.15)</td>
<td>Participants reflected in groups and fed back to the group on:&lt;br&gt;- Their dreams for what their practice would be like if it was as inclusive of RAS children as it could be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 4. Design – What should be?</strong>&lt;br&gt;‘How should our inclusive practice be?’&lt;br&gt;(15.15 – 15.45)</td>
<td>Participants reflected in pairs and fed back to the group on:&lt;br&gt;- What the future could be like, drawing on themes developed&lt;br&gt;- How they would know things were moving in the direction they wanted&lt;br&gt;- Who would be involved&lt;br&gt;- Provocative propositions developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 5. Destiny – What will be?</strong>&lt;br&gt;‘What do we need to do to build this?’&lt;br&gt;(15.45 – 16.15)</td>
<td>Participants reflected in groups and fed back to the group on:&lt;br&gt;- An action plan for the next steps to build upon inclusive practice with RAS children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.4 Ethical approval
Ethical approval for this project was provided by Newcastle University Ethics Committee in January 2019. Following the British Psychological Society requirements, an information sheet and consent form were shared with the participants (Appendix 2). Participants’ names were anonymised and they were informed of their right to withdraw at any time. Participants were informed that the audio recordings would be destroyed following research completion and stored securely in the meantime. I spoke to all participants face to face before the information sheets were sent out, and offered to visit them closer to the start of the project to answer any questions they had. Two participants opted for visits ahead of the project.

Eight of the ten professionals approached were able, and consented, to take part.

3.4 Analysis

3.4.1 Grounded Theory
Following the AI, I transcribed the audio-recording and analysed the transcript - visual artefacts were not analysed. Analysis employed a realist grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Grounded theory is designed to generate theory from close examination of data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). A realist version of grounded theory seeks to explicate social processes through examination of the social realities of structures, mechanisms, and experiences (Willig, 2013); this involves the progressive identification and integration of categories of meaning from data.

A full version of realist grounded theory involves returning to participants to check and refine emerging themes; however pragmatics (time constraints) meant the abbreviated version was more appropriate (Willig, 2013). Table 11 describes the analysis stages. Though presented in a linear order, the stages often integrated and overlapped with one another. This follows Strauss and Corbin’s (1998) approach, whereby coding tools allow structure but can be used in a flexible way; responding to the data rather than dictating the direction and form of analysis.
### Table 11 Stages of analysis as denoted by Strauss and Corbin (1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Micro-analysis</strong></td>
<td>During this stage, I completed line-by-line analysis by questioning, analysing words, phrases and sentences. I made comparisons to establish properties and dimensions of words/sentences, as well as considered similarities and differences between them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Open Coding</strong></td>
<td>I noted emerging concepts and categories. These were made up of multiple categories and sub-categories created through identifying similarities and differences within and across the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Axial Coding</strong></td>
<td>Once categories were established, axial coding was the consideration of the possible relationships and connections between categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Selective Coding</strong></td>
<td>This stage refined the categories and connections into an order, creating new theory. New theory is then validated with the original data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Throughout – Memo Writing</strong></td>
<td>Memo writing was completed throughout the analysis to elaborate thinking processes, assumptions and to increase reflexivity (Birks &amp; Mills, 2015).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 provides an example of the first two stages of the analytical process. Italicised writing is my coding. Once the first two stages of analysis were completed, the open codes were handwritten on to post-it notes to enable movement as part of the process of categorising, sub-categorising and connecting data. This manual organisation of codes constituted the third and fourth analysis stages. Table 13 provides a sample of the entire analytic process from a segment of raw transcript data through to established categories and connections, where each column builds on the previous one. The numbers represent page and line number.
Table 12 An extract of analysis from Stage 1 and Stage 2, as denoted by Strauss and Corbin (1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questioning:</th>
<th>Analysis of a word, phrase or sentence:</th>
<th>Comparisons:</th>
<th>Open Coding (Stage 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Who, what, where, how, when</td>
<td>• Possible meanings</td>
<td>• Comparing incidents and objects to establish similarities and differences</td>
<td>Open coding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Frequency, duration, rate, timing</td>
<td>• Assumed or expressed</td>
<td>• Comparing categories and concepts to establish properties and dimensions</td>
<td>• Emerging categories or relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3.28 …but feeling that what you do is making a difference | Feeling – *emotional component* |
| Feeling rather than knowing/seeing? | Difference – not the same as before |
| What kind of a difference - positive? | Results – *winning/losing, ranked, tangible*? |
| 3.26 We feel we’re successful? So we feel the approach we are trying is successful for the child | We’re successful – *it worked*? We’ve *done the right thing* |
| 3.31…when you’re getting the results. So, you’re making that difference you can see the results. Whether it’s an individual child or a wider level | Trying – trial and error approach? Not assumed to work |
| What’s the frequency, level and type of results? | Wider Level – *families, communities, policies, systems* |
| 4.16 The results in children and families | Children and families – *both are important* |
| What kind of results? How will we know? | Making a difference, getting the results = *seeing results* |
| | Whether it’s an individual child or a wider level – *can be one or the other* – the results in children and families |
| | See ‘results’ (effect/impact) |
| | - At various levels (child, family) |
| | - Professional interpretation/feelings of success – trail element? |
| | - Practical (uniform, speaking English), |
| | - Emotional/qualitative (loving new school) |
### Table 13 A sample of analysis across all four stages, as denoted by Strauss and Corbin (1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Microanalysis</th>
<th>Open Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding</th>
<th>Selective Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.5 But on a wider, kind of more systemic level, it’s about how everyone is working together and how some of those things are happening so it feels like there’s a process and everyone is pushing in the same direction</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wider</strong> – broader Systemic - relating to a whole system as opposed to a particular part Working together – collaboration, implicit sharing Feels like – intuition or perception Pushing – resistance or collective force Learn – gain knowledge or skill Want – desire, motivation Sharing – having or giving a proportion of something Best practice – consensus of effectiveness Ended up – resulted in Releasing – allowing Resources – an asset Action – doing</td>
<td>People work together across different levels. The systemic level is important to ensure shared processes There is a need for momentum There’s an affective component, perhaps this feeds back into future actions One outcome of working together and sharing could be learning</td>
<td>Category about the types of working together and the levels (dimensions) at which it occurs</td>
<td>Clarification of links Working Together – Sharing Sharing can be sub-categorised into: - Processes - Resources - Goals - Knowledge This can occur at the level of the: - Individual - System This can result in: - Learning - Releasing resources - Action?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.29... and really wanting to learn, and kind of saying I don’t know much about this, I want to learn more about it and that led us on to having a bit of a discussion about that idea of ways of sharing best practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.14... it actually ended up releasing resources because people were tied in to actions...</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Findings
I consider there to be two inter-related, yet distinct, parts to the findings: what’s currently working well in participants’ practice supporting the inclusion of RAS children in schools (AI stage 1, 2), and their dreams for the future (AI stage 3, 4, 5). In answering the research question(s) posed, it is necessary to dedicate space to both parts, whilst acknowledging the link between them. Direct quotes are used to provide further understanding of the information which generated the identification of the categories.

3.5.1 What’s working well
Figure 2 is a visual representation of participants’ perspective of what’s working well. This will be built on in a second schematic (Figure 3) later in the findings, representing the addition of participants’ dream future, followed by a final model (Figure 4) in the discussion.

Although the categories have been identified as discrete, there are many aspects which overlap and influence one another. However, to allow more detail to be covered, the categories will be discussed separately.

3.5.1a Being human
Each participant discussed work they had done that could be categorised in this way. Being human seemed to be a significant factor in their work and became a central phenomenon around which all other categories are integrated: Strauss and Corbin’s (1998) notion of a ‘central category’ (p. 146).

8.1 …having that face to face contact, being able to speak to people and explain it in a human way
9.1 ….treat the family in the same way you would treat anyone else

There was a shared understanding across participants that their work was most successful when it considered not only the individual child, but the family too. This resembles a more holistic perspective of human need and recognition that children and families are interconnected. Additionally, there was a relational aspect to this consideration; emphasis was placed on factors such as “having the time to listen”. Participants also referred to the “story” of a family or individual, acknowledging personal narrative and identity, something which participants considered to be an important component in their best practice.
3.5.1b Professional qualities
Something explicitly present within this AI stage was the importance of the participants’ personal qualities in embodying a ‘human’ approach to their professional work. Professional qualities, including honesty, reflectivity and being respectful, were all discussed, particularly in relation to building trust. These qualities were identified as necessary when working with families, acting as a foundation on which to build. One participant articulated the bi-directional nature of these relationships, suggesting mutual relationships, or perhaps shared interests, are an important component.

3.5.1c Working together/sharing
Participants’ discussions about the way they work together, or share, could be sub-categorised into: resources, goals, processes and learning. Participants discussed the value in sharing at the individual and the systemic level. Some participants referred to success in their practice when there was shared momentum; this was argued to have several benefits including increasing productivity and increasing “potential”.

8.14 ...actually having the time to listen and be present and talk to a family, not just in terms of a particular child but to find out the story about the family

8.18... the dad not just feeling that he’s the dad of that child but that he has his own story

7.17 ...the whole of her team are genuinely feeling... they’re doing the right thing for the right reason

8.14 ...listen and be present... but to actually spend time with the family and make them feel that the relationship is there is really important, for all of us isn’t it?

11.5 ...when we get together and talk about things (referring to two-three different disciplines) it always just feels so much more productive... It feels like you have so much more potential there, than when you just kind of soldier on, on your own
There was also reference to a desire, or openness, to learn from others. This is interconnected with other categories identified in this part of the AI and perhaps represents an extension of some of the human qualities participants identified as important in their work.

6.29... and really wanting to learn, and kind of saying I don’t know much about this, I want to learn more about it and that led us on to having a bit of a discussion about that idea of ways of sharing best practice

Working together and sharing was linked to primary outcomes, or gains, such as “releasing resources” in addition to secondary outcomes or gains which were more affective in nature, such as pride as a collective, possibly acting as a feedback cycle increasing professional self-efficacy.

11.14 And using an early help plan, X was able to bring people together in a way that we were talking about earlier and formalise what objectives might be and it actually ended up releasing resources because people were tied into actions... and it feels more like we’re the council’s response to this

3.5.1d Seeing results/impact
When asked what their inclusive practice looks like when it is at its best, participants invariably spoke about "results". As with the other categories identified, this was discussed in relation to individuals and families, and in this case, the "wider level", too.

3.31 ...when you’re getting the results. So, you’re making that difference, you can see the results. Whether it’s an individual child or a wider level

Seeing or getting results was discovered to be an important factor for participants when they reflected on their past successes. The type of results discussed can be sub-categorised into: practical outcomes, akin to structural integration (e.g. receiving a school place) and qualitative outcomes, akin to relational integration (e.g. the child’s enjoyment of school). Additionally, participants spoke about their own perception of success without reference to any specific outcomes or markers related to the people they were supporting. This perhaps reflects an important personal affective component achieved through professional self-evaluation and which develops professional self-efficacy.
3.26 We feel we’re successful? So we feel the approach we are trying is successful for the child

3.28 ...but feeling that what you do is making a difference

**3.5.2 Dreams for the Future**

Figure 3 presents participants’ dream future, built on from what’s working well. Similar to the above, the categories have been identified as discrete, though there are many aspects which overlap and influence one another. Categories which appeared across the entire AI process reflect factors which have been identified as important in past and present successes, but also are of enough value for participants to carry into a preferred future. The relationships between categories are explored in greater depth in the discussion.
3.5.2a Being human
A human element was core to participants’ current practice and something they chose to take into the future, too. Participants raised an issue of tensions between processes and people, emphasising the importance of individuality and continuing to focus on balancing the needs of children and families, neither being seen in isolation. Additionally, there was recognition of the fundamental importance that RAS children be seen first and foremost as children, rather than as refugees or asylum-seekers.

3.5.2b Positive re-framing
The being human category was taken further by the notion of positive re-framing. Positive re-framing was seen as important to counter labels and stereotypes. Within positive re-framing, there was a particular emphasis placed on the adoption of strength-oriented perspectives. In a preferred future, participants spoke of refugees and asylum-seekers being regarded as individuals who made positive contributions to schools and society, and more than just labels. Elements of trepidation remained in the choice of the language participants used, such as “trying”, reflecting an awareness of the challenges that remained even in a preferred future. Similarly, there was acknowledgement of the contextual conditions which continue to restrict refugees and asylum-seekers ability, or opportunity, to make contributions. Participants’ thoughts on how this could be addressed in a preferred future are discussed further under the category ‘Access and opportunities’.

Participants discussed the means through which positive re-framing could be achieved in practice. Frequent references were made to the “narratives" around refugees and asylum-seekers and how these could shape others' perceptions of them. Participants seemed to accept that this may require action, or challenge, in the face of existing narratives.
Professional qualities – enabling and empowering

Professional qualities and skills identified as important in the first stages of the AI, including honesty and listening, were taken forward into the final stages. When thinking about the future, however, there was a clearer focus on the value, and purpose, of professional qualities – to build relationships. The relationships discussed shared some common features, including the importance of having time for them to develop. There continued to be implicit reference to the realities outside professionals’ control; in these instances, professional qualities are used to mitigate negative effects.

Amongst participants there was some consensus that their role was to “enable” and “empower” the people they work with. This develops the point raised in the first stages of the AI about the importance of relationship mutuality. In a preferred future, enabling and empowering others allows a shift in relationships towards mutuality and equality.

...instead of asylum-seekers being dependent on you always, we need to enable and empower them so that in due course of time, when they get status, they can stand on their own feet, rather than finding crutches of the professionals
3.5.2d Proactive working together/sharing
There was continued emphasis by participants on the importance of working together and sharing. In keeping with the first stages of the AI, sharing could be sub-categorised into: resources, goals, processes and learning. The properties of working together/sharing varied, from informal to strategic, and were discussed in relation to all levels of input with a particular emphasis on proactive, development work.

11.22 ...spend more time doing development work in schools, rather than individual case work because you know that the schools are doing all kinds of good things and that allows you to share that in a much more productive way than going in, dealing with a case, and then moving on to another one

A new feature during this stage of the AI was sharing and working together using a case-study model. The case-study approach could be considered an extension of being human, too, as it emphasises human story and voice. Available time arose again as a critical component in the preferred future.

14.3 So we talked about using case studies to share across LAs and schools, sharing stories of families and involving them in the process. So starting with stories of when they came to the UK... and using that (case-study) to help develop overall processes and good practice for across the LA and across schools

3.5.2e Impact
In the earlier AI stages, professionals’ interpretations of success came through as important. During this phase, a more critical dimension was added; participants questioned how they would know if something had been successful or not – asking, what does “successful” look like? Participants collectively chose to take child and family perceptions of success forward into their preferred future.

12.33 ...how we would know something had worked well, that it has been successful, would be if it was the children themselves that were actually articulating how successful it was and it wasn’t coming from us. I think that was a key thing. I think that’s probably the truest example you can see of something being successful, rather than us interpreting it on their behalf
As in the first stages of the AI, impact can still be sub-categorised in to practical outcomes, akin to structural integration (e.g. school placement) and qualitative outcomes, akin to relational integration (e.g. parents' satisfaction with school and new community). However, in participants' preferred future, there is more depth to the qualitative aspects of assessing, or quantifying, impact (e.g. considering factors such as “coping”) and a wish for a “complete feedback loop”. It was argued that this could be achieved following a case-study model. A key component was, again, allowing time.

Some participants spoke of child-centred approaches as central to the future success of inclusive practice. They went on to argue that child-centred approaches should include the needs of families and communities, too, across the “school life-span” of a child.

3.5.2f Access and opportunities

A more in-depth discussion on impact and outcomes during this stage of the AI led participants to consider the means by which impact can be achieved.

Based on participants' discussions, this category can be sub-categorised into access to, and opportunities across, education, recreation and economy. Underpinning each of these, but most pertinently in education, appeared to be questions related again to time; timely access to school was considered important. This seemed to indicate, in part, recognition of the value of the school environment in helping children settle and make new friends (relational...
integration), but it also possibly implicitly reflects recognition that children have a legal right to education (structural integration).

3.5.2g ‘Other’ – specific project
Several participants were familiar with, and spoke about, a current project in the area – Schools of Sanctuary. Schools of Sanctuary is an authority-wide initiative which aims to acknowledge and promote the good practice of schools which foster a culture of welcome and inclusion for all (Schools of Sanctuary, 2019). Though in its infancy in the area, the Schools of Sanctuary project offers a way to educate children and teachers about the human right to sanctuary and inclusion by working together and engaging with refugee and asylum-seeking families.

Discussion about the project may indicate a need some participants had to identify a practical first step. Additionally, the School of Sanctuary project embodies some of the aforementioned elements which make up participants preferred future, for example, being proactive and working together, underpinned by a core focus on the human element.

3.5.2h Tensions - What works well and the dream future
Despite AI being inherently strength-oriented, many of the participants referred to barriers or tensions throughout the process. As this AI was used as a research method, the data it generated cannot be ignored. In keeping with the solution-oriented principle of ‘one foot in the pain’ (Rees, 2008), I will explore the tensions which arose.
Taken broadly, participants expressed some dissatisfaction with the system in which they work, both when considering what works well and dreams for the future. Specific factors identified include reduction of resource and societal attitudes towards RAS children and families.

During the stages of the AI which focused on what works well, a tension between process and people featured, and appeared amplified by siloed working. Participants highlighted their preferred approach of understanding people above being bound by administrative processes. The use of the term “gate-keeping” implied dissatisfaction with the aspects of participants’ roles linked to controlling, or limiting access, to resources.

Participants had difficulty engaging in more expansive thinking about their work and role in a preferred future (Boyd & Bright, 2007). Even when allowed to envisage a dream future, participants struggled to imagine one where tensions or barriers no longer existed. It seemed participants felt they had to be realistic given the context in which they worked in, even in the dream phase. There was also an acceptance of the limitation of their influence, given wider factors, such as policy.

An additional tension identified during dreams for the future stages was difficulty finding a common first step, perhaps reflecting the challenges of increasingly siloed working.
17.4 – I think we found it difficult to kind of get on to a kind of common thread with this... while we’re all signed up to the principles of how we might work collectively in an ideal world, the steps that we might take individually might all be very different, so it’s hard to say then, that’s the person I can work with, or to come to a common first step as a group who then won’t be taking that step together

Figure 3 Professionals' perspectives on a dream future, built on from what currently supports their inclusive practice
3.6 Discussion
Beginning this research process, I developed an understanding of the existing research and models of refugee inclusion in schools (Cerna, 2019; Dryden-Peterson, 2018; Rutter, 2006; Taylor & Sidhu, 2012). Recognising the social, emotional and learning needs of individuals is a consistent feature, as is consideration of interacting factors across home, school and the wider environment. This empirical project, however, focused on professionals’ perspectives of the factors supporting their inclusive practice. The findings of this research can be presented using a simplified version of the ‘realist explanation’ (Pawson & Tilley, 1997; Robson & McCartan, 2016).

The realist explanation illustrates associations, or correlations, between factors (mechanisms) and outcomes (Figure 4). The model suggests that context conditions (C) (social, cultural, historical) can create, maintain, or alleviate difficulties.

Figure 4 The realist explanation (Pawson and Tilley, 1997; Robson, 2016)

Themes identified across the AI can be conceived as mechanisms (M) which currently do, or in the future could, aid professionals’ practice in supporting the inclusion of RAS children in school. I suggest that the ‘results/impact’ discussed throughout the AI represent the outcome (O). Drawing on existing literature, I propose that the outcome can be expressed as structural and relational inclusion. Dryden and Peterson’s (2018) use of the term integration is replaced here with inclusion as a more accurate definition of the AI focus. Finally, I suggest a third, subsidiary outcome: professionals’ self-efficacy (Figure 5).

Consistent themes across the AI highlight existing mechanisms aiding participants’ successful practice. Additional themes from the final stages of the AI highlight gaps in practice and the systems within which the participants operate, ones they would like to
improve. The AI captures contextual conditions that have intersected at the time and place of
the research project. All the mechanisms identified are complex and interrelated across
structural and relational inclusion.

Being human was identified as a core category because of its centrality to the topic (Strauss
& Corbin, 1998). This model does not, however, claim that any mechanism is more important
than another; rather, that they are all shaping of inclusive outcomes. This model offers a way
of evaluating and guiding future practice.
Figure 5 How professionals can support the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children in school: a realist explanation

Context (C)
Micro and macro conditions: policy, resources (including time), siloed working, societal attitudes

M1 Being Human
Positive Re-Framing

M2 Proactive Sharing/Working Together

M3 Professional Qualities, Empowering and Enabling

M4 Access and Opportunities

O1 Structural Inclusion

O2 Relational Inclusion

O3 Professional Self-Efficacy

--- refers to discovery of a third outcome
3.6.1 Outcomes of inclusion

3.6.1a O1: Structural inclusion
Structural inclusion, sometimes termed ‘functional integration’ (Dryden-Peterson, 2018), refers to accessibility of services and institutions, such as education. Policy and practice that structurally include RAS children in education systems (e.g. school admission procedures, exam accreditation) have often been found to over-shadow consideration of relational factors supporting their inclusion (Cerna, 2019).

3.6.1b O2: Relational inclusion
Relational inclusion is concerned with individuals’ sense of belonging, or connectedness, as well as group-level social cohesion (Ager & Strang, 2008; Korac, 2003). Often neglected in policy, relational aspects of inclusion were stressed as just as important in the participants’ work as structural inclusion mechanisms.

3.6.1c O3: Professional self-efficacy
Participants’ interpretation of outcomes was particularly noticeable in the first phase of the AI and remained present in the final stages. This mirrors research on the role of self-efficacy in professionals’ work (Fraser, Flemington, Doan, Le Doan, & Ha, 2018) and represents the third, subsidiarity outcome. Self-efficacy is defined as ‘the influence of personal beliefs on one’s ability to perform work confidently’ (Fraser et al., 2018, p. 81). Mastery of one’s own experiences has frequently been found to be the most powerful source of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Klassen, 2011).

3.6.1d Child/family perception
In the final AI stages, participants spoke about children’s and families’ perspectives of successful inclusion. Practice that approaches inclusion from refugees’ and asylum-seekers’ perspectives recognises the value of marginalised accounts in contesting dominant discourse (Sewpaul et al., 2015) and has the potential to aid both structural and relational inclusion over time.

3.6.2 Mechanisms for inclusion

3.6.2a Being human (M1)
This AI has highlighted the saliency of the human element in professional work in this field. Key elements of being human, such as recognising rights, acknowledging holistic need and individual difference, and having face to face contact were consistently recognised as central to participants’ successful practice.

The definition (Oxford Dictionary, 2010) of a human is, ‘a person, a member of the human race; a man, woman, or child’. Humanity, is defined as ‘the quality of being humane, spec.
kindness, benevolence’. I suggest that being human in this AI embraces the definition of humanity and acts as a mechanism towards relational inclusion.

The importance of valuing individuals’ and families’ stories and narratives emerged throughout the AI process. Research suggests that listening to others’ stories can help facilitate shared understanding, and shared humanity (Hobbs et al., 2012; Hulusi & Oland, 2010). Current public collective consciousness can conceivably be seen as operating in a world of the Other; a position at odds with being human and promoting both structural and relational inclusion. Listening to people’s stories and positively re-framing existing negative narratives can act as a mechanism to increase positive perceptions and relations.

3.6.2b Proactive sharing/working together (M2)
Current government guidance directs agencies to work together with the espoused aim of developing public services organised to meet the needs of individuals and mitigate social exclusion (DfE, 2018; Warmington et al., 2004). This AI’s participants could be argued to represent multi-agency working - more than one agency working with an individual but not necessarily jointly (Lloyd, Stead, & Kendrick, 2001). For example, Educational Psychologist and Inclusion Officer.

This form of work emerging in complex, multi-professional settings (i.e. across LAs and schools) can be described as co-configuration (Warmington et al., 2004): professionals working with individuals or families but not sharing a common professional background or physical location, who may meet fleetingly in a variety of configurations. This distributed form of work represents a shift away from team working to what Warmington et al. (2004) call ‘knotworking’: rapidly changing, partially improvised collaborations of performance between otherwise loosely connected professionals (p. 6). This way of working can create tensions between strategic and operational practice and has implications for both structural and relational inclusion. During the AI, participants tended to depict their loose, shifting co-configurations as barriers to their practice. Participants found it challenging to identify a first common, or joined up, step, for example. To mitigate this, some participants focused on an existing project (Schools of Sanctuary) to act as a vehicle for their collaboration.

Tensions in existing, and even future, practice highlighted in this AI reflect the literature which suggest that multi-agency working to mitigate social exclusion is, in many ways, under developed in the context within which professionals work (McIntyre & Hall, 2018; Warmington et al., 2004). This AI’s findings suggest that when professionals aren’t able to work together in proactive, systemic ways, there are implications for structural integration (e.g. waiting for school placements), which consequently affect opportunities for relational
inclusion (e.g. building connections at school). When professionals feel that they are working effectively, they experience mastery and have a boost to their professional self-efficacy.

3.6.2c Professional qualities (M3)
Professional qualities, particularly enactments of enabling and empowering others, were found to be a mechanism aiding relational inclusion, particularly by building trust with the families of RAS children. This position aligns with the literature highlighting the importance of considering the impact power dynamics can have on equity and fairness (Dykstra, 2014). Participants recognised the bi-directional influence between themselves, children, families and communities (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Darling, 2007), in line with Ager and Strang's (2008) conceptualisation of inclusion as a two-way process. The value participants placed on listening to children, families and communities, and “genuinely feeling”, seemed to stem from a professional, or arguably a human, imperative.

3.6.2d Access and opportunities (M4)
Participants discussed a preferred future in which refugee and asylum-seeking families would have greater access and opportunities across education, recreation and economy. Such opportunities relate directly to structural inclusion, beyond schools (e.g. employment) and act as the foundation for relational inclusion (e.g. social networks in work and recreation). This ideal, however, contrasts current UK policy and law; the Nationality, Asylum and Immigration Act 2002 denies the right to work for the duration of an asylum claim.

3.6.3 Context
The importance of professionals being allowed sufficient time was a consistent factor in the final stages of the AI. Additional time was regarded as crucial in order to build relationships and listen to people’s narratives. Additional time was regarded as necessary to support mechanisms which shape good practice across relational and structural inclusive outcomes. In an increasingly time-pressed working landscape in education and across public services (McIntyre & Hall, 2018; Vinckx, Bosuyt, & de Casterlé, 2018), this represented a significant tension in the AI. Other contextual tensions were also raised, including societal attitudes and policy.

3.7 Limitations and challenges
This research has drawn on the experiences and perspectives of a small number of professionals within one LA and two primary schools. The generalisation and applicability of the findings cannot be assumed, however, given its compatibility with existing theories, there is likely to be some validity to the findings (Smith & Shinebourne, 2012). The findings of this research have been shaped by my facilitation of the AI process and possibly by the presence of another person, the scribe. Though reciprocal reshaping between myself and
the participants is an accepted component of Al (Cooperrider et al., 2008), my influence as researcher could be considered further by interrogation of the audio recording to explore where I influenced discourse or where participants referred to the scribe’s written records.

Participants found some aspects of the ‘design’ and ‘destiny’ phases of Al challenging. Part of their difficulty during this phase may have been the novelty of working in an appreciative way (Boyd & Bright, 2007). Participants highlighted difficulty creating a common goal given how disparate, or siloed, their work is, echoing research discussed above (Warmington et al., 2004). Cooperrider et al. (2008) suggests Al is likely to bring about a greater organisational shift when all members of the organisation are involved, rather than just a small group. The reduction of resource dedicated to supporting RAS children made this challenging, and the small numbers did not go unnoticed by those present.

3.8 Future study
Involving RAS children and families in the process would provide an opportunity to follow up, in particular, on one of the areas identified in participants’ preferred future – understanding refugees’ and asylum-seekers’ perspectives of success. Involving RAS children and families in more research would provide further depth to an understanding of the factors, or mechanisms, which support their inclusion in schools and society.

The UNHCR (2019) continues to seek research-based evidence, specifically longitudinal analyses of refugee education responses. Research across a longer time period has the potential to inform practice that could benefit all children, families and professionals in host schools and communities, as well as ensure RAS children become more visible.

3.9 Conclusions and implications: EP practice and beyond
In the context of on-going conflict and displacement across the globe, the findings of this empirical project have several significant implications.

The findings contribute to the growing body of research about RAS children’s experience in the English education system, highlighting both the structural and relational elements of inclusive practice. Moreover, in this research project, inclusive practice was found to be shaped by a fundamental relational tenet: being human. Mechanisms supporting structural inclusion are necessary, but alone are not enough. Promoting and supporting professionals’ ability to work with RAS children is a humanitarian issue and should therefore be a priority for governments and policy makers.

This Al has highlighted mechanisms, or ways of working, which can aid professionals’ practice in supporting the structural and relational inclusion of RAS children in schools. If the mechanisms from this Al are considered, a better model of working to support the inclusion of RAS children in schools, and beyond, could be conceived.
In the vast majority of LAs, Educational Psychologists are the only applied psychologists. EPs are, therefore, literally well-placed as they work within the LAs responsible for educating (and housing) RAS children. EPs have the knowledge and skill-set to support the development of inclusive practice in a variety of ways. For example, providing schools, LAs and policy makers with awareness raising training and by supporting problem-solving with reference to evidence-bases on multi-agency working (Warmington et al., 2004). Drawing on the psychology underpinning mechanisms of inclusion, EPs can utilise consultation (Wagner, 2000), narrative tools (White, 2007), need theories (Deci & Ryan, 2012) and person-centred planning techniques (Forest & O'Brien, 1993) to promote and enable inclusive practice across all of the levels at which they work. This aligns with the espoused aims of the UNHCR Refugee Education 2030 strategy:

…to foster the conditions, collaborations and approaches that lead to all refugee and asylum-seeking children…. (having) access to inclusive and equitable quality education that enables them to learn, thrive and… contribute to peaceful coexistence and civil society (p.6).

…and also reflects participants’ hopes for a dream future:

“We work to create an environment in which (refugees and asylum-seekers) can thrive and flourish in all walks of life” (15.24).
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Appendices

Appendix 1 – Example prompt sheet from Appreciative Inquiry

Stage 1. Discovery Interviews – What gives life?

A high point: I would like you to think back on your time since working with refugee and asylum-seeking children. There will have likely been ups and downs. For the moment I would like you to think about a high point – a time when you really felt you were contributing to the success or effectiveness of the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children in school.

Describe this experience, tell me about that time. What was the situation? Who else was involved? What parts of what you did made the most difference? What was special about it? What does inclusion look like when it’s happening and working well?

Values: What are the things that you value about yourself, your work and the organisation/team/group you work with? Give an example of that from your work this year

Values: What are the core factors, values, or strengths that give life to your organisation/team/group without which it would cease to exist in its present format? What would you want to preserve moving forward?

Your work: When you are feeling good about your work, what do you value about it?

Three wishes: If you had three wishes for the work you do regarding the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children in schools, what would they be? Please write your 3 wishes on A3 paper provided
Appendix 2 – Research information sheet and consent form

Research Information Sheet

Introduction
My name is Helen Owen-Hughes, I am a trainee Educational Psychologist with Newcastle University working in Newcastle Educational Psychology Service. As part of my training, I am required to conduct a research project. The topic I hope to explore is how local authority (LA) and schools support the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children.

Please read the following information, and consider whether you would feel able to take part in the project.

Project aims and rationale
In this project I want to work with a group of staff from X LA and schools to explore and discuss inclusive practices regarding refugee and asylum-seeking children and young people and identify aspects of current and previous experience which exemplify successful inclusive practice. The aim of the project is to inform future development of inclusive approaches for refugee and asylum-seeking children and young people in schools.

What the research involves
I am hoping this research project can be a joint endeavour where you, other members of the LA, schools, and I, work together. The information below provides details regarding the project, including what the commitment may look like for you, the process of the research and what will happen to the information gathered.

The project will involve participants partaking in a collaborative inquiry, called an Appreciative Inquiry. The Appreciative Inquiry offers the opportunity for reflective discussion between staff members involved in supporting refugee and asylum-seeking children and young people. The discussions will provide an opportunity to begin to develop shared understandings of inclusive practice and how practice may be developed based on ‘the best that there has been’ and ‘the best that there could be.’

The inquiry process will take place on Monday 9th September, 12.45-4.30pm at Y.

The process and theoretical underpinnings of Appreciative Inquiry will be outlined at the beginning of the session. Participants will then be guided through the 5 stages of the process. There is no requirement for participants to have had prior experience of collaborative inquiries, though an interest in developing inclusive practice for refugee and asylum-seeking children and young people would be beneficial.

At a later date (date to be negotiated with participants), I will provide feedback to staff about the findings of the research project.

Possible Outcomes
It is hoped that the process of an Appreciative Inquiry into the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children and young people may aid you and other staff taking part to generate shared understandings and insights into your practice, whilst also informing the future development and sustainability of inclusive practice.
Information gathered

As this research project is being undertaken as part of my doctoral training a research report will be required. During the Appreciative Inquiry, conversations will therefore be recorded and transcribed to allow for data analysis. The transcriptions will be stored in line with Data Protection legislation and will be kept only until the research project is completed. Participants in the research will remain anonymous in the transcripts, in the project write up and in any feedback given the LA and participants.

Personal information (i.e. from consent forms or information from the discussions) will be kept securely and either locked away or password protected. Transcripts and recordings will be shared only with my supervisors, and those employed to transcribe the data, who will give reassurance about GDPR compliance. The recordings will be destroyed immediately after transcription.

Additionally, in the future, the information gathered may be shared or used in other research articles or presentations to inform inclusive practice for refugee and asylum-seeking children and young people more generally and this will also be anonymised.

Taking part

Participation in the research is entirely voluntary and you can withdraw at any time without reason if you change your mind. If you decide to withdraw contact me (contact details below). It should be noted that once the Appreciative Inquiry has been carried out I will be unable to remove contributions to discussions from the research.

If you have any queries or questions regarding the project, please do not hesitate to contact me. My email address is Z. Alternatively, you can also direct questions to my research supervisor at Newcastle University, Dr Richard Parker (Educational Psychologist & Course Director for Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology). He can be contacted via email at Z.

If you are interested in being involved with this research project please complete the attached consent form and return it to me.

Many thanks,

Helen Owen-Hughes
Trainee Educational Psychologist
Declaration of Informed Consent for Participation in University Research Project

An Appreciative Inquiry exploring practice regarding the inclusion of refugee and asylum-seeking children

Please circle YES or NO as applicable

I have read and understood the information sheet provided

YES / NO

I have had an opportunity to ask questions and seek clarification on aspects I didn’t understand

YES / NO

I understand my participation in this research is voluntary and I am free to withdraw from the project at any point and do not need to give a reason for this

YES / NO

I agree for the group discussions to be audio recorded and transcribed

YES / NO

I am aware that all data collected will be kept confidential and then destroyed once analysis is complete

YES / NO

I understand that my name will not be disclosed in any reports, articles or presentations

YES / NO

I am happy to take part in this research and give my informed consent

YES / NO

Name: …………………………………………………

Signature: ……………………………………………..

Date: …………………………………………………

Appendix 3 – Example of quality assessment process

Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) Checklist: 10 questions to help you make sense of Qualitative research
### Questionnaire on Research Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Can’t tell</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?</strong></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘The purpose of the research was to examine the strategies and range of educational provision made by LEAs and schools for asylum-seeker children and identify the implications arising from the requirements of such provision.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consider</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Many educationalists argue that the notion that educating asylum seekers is problematic stems from inherent weaknesses in the education system itself rather than the individual needs of this group of pupils (Rutter and Jones 1998)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘The findings would hopefully contribute to the understanding and dissemination of good practice in meeting their needs’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?</strong></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘...To examine the strategies and range of educational provision made by LEAs and schools...’ i.e. illuminate the actions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consider</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If the research seeks to interpret or illuminate the actions and/or subjective experiences of research participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Is qualitative research the right methodology for addressing the research goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?</strong></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 case study LEAs based on having significant number of asylum seeking students, or, high level of experience of providing for this group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consider</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If the researcher has justified the research design (e.g. have they discussed how they decided which method to use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?</strong></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Prior to choosing the sample for the study, contact was made with officers at the front line of educational provision for asylum seekers within Welsh LEAs in order to ascertain gaps in current information and the type of research that would be useful to them and their practice’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consider</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If the researcher has explained how the participants were selected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• If they explained why the participants they selected were the most appropriate to provide access to the type of knowledge sought by the study
• If there are any discussions around recruitment (e.g. why some people chose not to take part)

'A sample of seven schools across the five LEAs were visited. These included one secondary school and one Special school in each of the two authorities with asylum seekers in their Special school pupil populations'.

Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?

Consider
• If the setting for the data collection was justified
• If it is clear how data were collected (e.g. focus group, semi-structured interview etc.)
• If the researcher has justified the methods chosen
• If the researcher has made the methods explicit (e.g. for interview method, is there an indication of how interviews are conducted, or did they use a topic guide)
• If methods were modified during the study. If so, has the researcher explained how and why
• If the form of data is clear (e.g. tape recordings, video material, notes etc.)
• If the researcher has discussed saturation of data

'Semi-structured interviews were undertaken with key personnel in LEAs and schools (i.e. those who had responsibility for or a role in the education of asylum-seeker children). All the interviews were recorded and transcribed and the data coded using the MAX QDA software package that facilitates the analysis of qualitative data'.

Interview questions were not provided.

Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?

Consider
• If the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during (a) formulation of the research questions (b) data collection, including sample recruitment and choice of location
• How the researcher responded to events during the study and whether they considered the implications of any changes in the research design

Not mentioned.

Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?

Not mentioned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consider</th>
<th></th>
<th>‘All the interviews were recorded and transcribed and the data coded using the MAX QDA software package that facilitates the analysis of qualitative data’. – No examples provided.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• If there are sufficient details of how the research was explained to participants for the reader to assess whether ethical standards were maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some original data samples provided to support detailed findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the researcher has discussed issues raised by the study (e.g. issues around informed consent or confidentiality or how they have handled the effects of the study on the participants during and after the study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If approval has been sought from the ethics committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If there is an in-depth description of the analysis process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If thematic analysis is used. If so, is it clear how the categories/themes were derived from the data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whether the researcher explains how the data presented were selected from the original sample to demonstrate the analysis process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If sufficient data are presented to support the findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent contradictory data are taken into account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whether the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during analysis and selection of data for presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a clear statement of findings?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Findings are relevant to the research question and divided in to headings (presumably representing themes identified, but unclear).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the findings are explicit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If there is adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researcher’s arguments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the researcher has discussed the credibility of their findings (e.g. triangulation, respondent validation, more than one analyst)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If the findings are discussed in relation to the original research question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it clear HOW the statement of findings were reached?</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How valuable is the research?</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge or understanding (e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or policy, or relevant research based literature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If they identify new areas where research is necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the researchers have discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations or considered other ways the research may be used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Although the research was not a comprehensive study of the area, since it was limited to five case studies, it scoped and documented policy and practice in Wales and drew comparisons with the other two LEAs in Scotland and England. As a result, the findings may be of interest to other national contexts that have received asylum seekers.’

‘This research identified a range of implications and outcomes for LEAs and schools directly resulting from the recent increase in numbers of asylum seeker children. These included ... a variety of challenges and shortcomings in the present provision. Several of those challenges have been highlighted by previous research’.

‘The implications for action by central government, LEAs and schools are therefore considerable if the needs of asylum-seeker children are to be met more fully in the future. The implications include:....’

‘Further research is required if schools are to develop a consistently supportive and effective learning environment for asylum seekers.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How valuable is the research for MY purposes? (‘closeness’ score)</th>
<th>/</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not included in overall judgement of quality score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My overall judgement of quality: Medium