An analysis of the common characteristics of intervention strategies used in secondary education

Michael Power, University of Chester, UK.

Email: 1108135@chester.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper considers the question 'what are the common characteristics of intervention strategies used in secondary education?' This is an important question because understanding the characteristics of intervention strategies allows for a clearer understanding of the resource cost and unintended implications of the use of intervention strategies in secondary schools (Outhwaite, *et al*., 2020). Although this paper doesn't explore the resource cost or implications of these strategies, it provides a framework through which practitioners can begin to analyse the intervention strategies used in their own settings.

The study aims to identify the common characteristics of intervention strategies within a sample taken from one comprehensive secondary school in the Northwest of England. This practitioner enquiry was conducted using thematic analysis to identify the characteristics of a sample of intervention strategies, alongside the study of commonality within the sample by looking at which characteristics are more prevalent when compared to the average number within the same sample. The research is situated within 'post-positivism' which straddles both the positivist and interpretivist paradigms (Grix, 2004) and makes use of both interpretivist and positivist methods through thematic analysis of characteristics and the statistical analysis of commonality.

The two most common characteristics within the sample were found to be reaction to a trigger or stimulus such as underperformance in a test, which was present in all 23 intervention strategies. Having a measurable outcome, such as improving reading age, was present in 22 of the 23 intervention strategies in the sample, making it the second most common characteristic from this sample. The least common characteristic was for intervention strategies to focus on the child's motivations, for

example intervention strategies that make use of things students are interested in, such as football. This was present in only 5 of the 23 intervention strategies.

Keywords

Secondary Education, Children, Intervention, Characteristics, Strategies

Link to article

https://educationstudies.org.uk/?p=16043

Introduction

This paper aims to identify the common characteristics which are present in several intervention strategies carried out within a secondary school. The research is important because, in this author's experience, modern education contains within it a 'culture of intervention', where underperformance is tackled through additional interventions undertaken by the school. This creates a highly reactive system of education in which a child falls behind and is then subjected to intervention to make the expected amount of progress. The majority of intervention strategies are reactive to secure outcomes (Madigan *et al.*, 2016).

Common characteristics are identified by conducting a thematic analysis of interventions that occur within a host school alongside literature focusing on intervention strategies. This provides a lens through which to study what each intervention has in common. For example, Sharples *et al*. (2011) concluded that one-to-one tutoring by qualified teachers was the best intervention and provided the greatest results. Although this finding is interesting, the aim of this study is to understand which common characteristics a one-to-one tutoring session possesses when compared to other interventions. In this instance, the characteristic identified is that the child receives individual tuition.

The researcher is positioned as a practitioner researcher, holding the role of head of year within a secondary comprehensive school in the Northwest of England. This role brings with it an experience of the intervention strategies employed within a school in both academic and pastoral domains. Being employed in the same context that the research was conducted meant that ethical approval and permissions were gained from the University ethics committee as well as the employing school. Although this poses a potential conflict of interest, the scope of the study is to ascertain what the

common characteristics of interventions are and not how effective the interventions were, or any judgement being made on the adequacy of the host school's interventions.

The study aims to answer the question 'what are the common characteristics of intervention strategies used in secondary education?' By using a sample of intervention strategies employed by one secondary school the researcher will conduct a thematic analysis of which characteristics are present in the sample before using a statistical average to ascertain which characteristics are common to the sample. The study is interpretivist in nature; despite the thematic analysis being guided by literature the analysis occurs at the level of the subjective experience of the practitioner researcher (Carsonet *et al*., 2001).

This paper will first review literature on academic and pastoral interventions within education in the UK and further afield before outlining the method employed in analysing the sample of interventions strategies and conducting a thematic analysis to highlight the common characteristics. The purpose of this paper is to understand what the common characteristics are and not to problematise intervention strategies that schools may use. In this way it provides a lens through which interventions can be viewed and will allow for further research to be completed on the impacts these characteristics have on outcomes and school resources.

Review of literature

Failing to understand the common characteristics that interventions hold would appear short-sighted. Understanding the characteristics of intervention strategies allows for a clearer understanding of the resource cost and unintended implications of the use of intervention strategies in schools (Outhwaite *et al*., 2020). Although this paper doesn't specifically explore the resource cost or implications of these strategies, it provides a framework through which practitioners can begin to analyse the intervention strategies used in their own settings.

Because the purpose of the paper is to provide a lens through which practitioners can view their intervention strategies, it is important that the study includes not only academic or educational interventions but all the intervention strands that schools would work with in their daily business (Sokol *et al*., 2021; Jennings, 2017). For the

purposes of this review, academic and pastoral interventions will be taken separately to allow for a broad understanding of intervention practices in schools.

The act of intervening, by its very nature, requires a trigger for an intervention (Sokol *et al*., 2021) that could be a particular event in one's life, poor performance in an academic assessment, or a pattern of poor behaviour in lessons.

Intervention sessions often take place outside of a child's regular lessons: for example, 'intensive reading interventions during a 90-min block that replaced a child's elective classes' (Torgesen, *et al*., 2009, p. 36). Wilfred Carr (1989) argued that teaching is the most important factor within a school for determining child outcomes. Sharples *et al*. (2011) suggest that teachers who can teach smaller groups have a greater impact, and those teaching one-on-ones have the most success.

The focus for interventions is on securing the academic progress. This is often based on the idea that children should be making linear progress towards a target. Many schools make use of a 'flightpath' (Hannafin, 2017) to ascertain where a child should be at any given point in their educational journey. One key argument against such a model is that progress against any given targets is rarely linear. 'Learning is often conceived as a staircase which pupils steadily ascend' (Didau, 2015, p. 149), an idea widely adopted as a result of the work of Jean Piaget. However, Robert Siegler developed another theory which likened learning to 'overlapping waves' (Siegler, 1998, p. 86).

Others point to socioeconomic factors playing a greater role in determining academic success with teaching and learning playing a lesser role (Lucey and Walkerdine, 2000; Povey, 2017; Rowland, 2015; Ward and Worsham, 1998). For this reason it is important to study the whole range of interventions a school offers and not only those which focus on academi outcomes.

Asmus *et al*. (2017, p. 120), when writing about interventions aimed at tackling bullying, suggest that 'social-related goal attainment' with an aim that is shared by a group can lead to effective intervention. The implication is that intervention should take place as part of a group. Another characteristic is that expected outcomes are to be made explicit to those taking part (Bradshaw *et al.*, 2015, p. 481). This correlates with Asmus *et al*. (2017) where aims were shared in a group to achieve success.

The mental health services offered by the NHS provide intense support to children with mental health issues, something which has become increasingly common in schools. However, in 2010 Russel Hobby, when giving evidence to the education committee of the house of commons, made the comment every teacher needs to know: 'It is not just a specialist role' (House of Commons Education Committee 2011, p. 42), speaking on the role teachers had to play in understanding special educational needs and mental health. When read in context this comes in direct response to a question regarding the provision of CAMHS (Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services) being 'patchy' and in some areas not fit for purpose. This highlights the pressures for schools to continue to offer more interventions that are not strictly academic, despite their not being wholly qualified.

Many suggest that, for an intervention to be successful, specialist staff need to be used, for example, a literacy specialist or a teacher who specialises in ADHD strategies (Frankel, 2016; Fabiano, 2014). This implies that it is important for those delivering interventions to understand the process of intervention at a level above that of the everyday classroom teacher. In some circumstances, such as a literacy intervention, it would be understandable to use an English specialist to lead the intervention. With an ADHD intervention, a member of staff with a specialism supporting those with additional learning needs would be an appropriate choice.

Numerous studies suggest that intervention strategies need to attend to a child's motivation, engagement, and self-efficacy (Alvermann, 2002; Biancarosa and Snow, 2004; Kamil, 2008; National Council of Teacher of English, 2006). The prevalence of intervention strategies in the modern secondary school is in part to be attributed to the fact that schools must be seen to be tackling issues to satisfy an Ofsted inspection team. This is in stark contrast to the current financial landscape of education where '…budget cuts and preparation for new curriculum standards have left many high-school teachers faced with the challenge of doing more work with fewer resources' (Swain-Bradway *et al.*, 2015, p. 252).

There are critics of interventions taking place in schools. Goodman (2006) notes that assessments used to measure progress can sometimes be flawed and lead to decisions regarding interventions being made which may not be necessary, or could lead to a student not being included in an intervention where they may otherwise have

benefitted. A point further is supported by Reynolds and Shaywitz (2009) and Bailey (2015) who demonstrated that there is often a lack of student-based data to guide effective choice of approaches to intervention, and that intervention strategies are sometimes implemented without fully understanding their effectiveness or the possible side effects.

Methods and methodology

This research sits within the interpretive paradigm. With interpretivism, reality is indirectly constructed based on individual interpretations and is therefore subjective. Observers make their own meaning of events and, because of this, a unique interpretation of an event. One potential issue with the research is that the observations cannot be generalised beyond that one observed event or study. Any knowledge acquired is socially constructed rather than objectively determined (Carson *et al.*, 2001), with a focus on capturing meanings (Black, 2006), and making sense of what is perceived as reality. Interpretivism rejects the idea of 'metanarratives' (Lyotard, 1979) or generalisations, meaning findings are context specific, thus inviting other practitioners to undertake similar studies of their own intervention strategies in order to understand their characteristics.

Although suited to highlighting the individual characteristics, interpretivism does not allow for the more objective analysis of commonality. Therefore, it was necessary to employ a positivist approach to understand what characteristics were more common within the sample. This researcher would argue that this study is situated within 'post-positivism' which 'straddles both the positivist and interpretivist paradigms' (Grix, 2004, p. 86). The ontological positioning of post-positivism assumes that reality exists independent of the observer, but can only be understood through the lens of the observer's own beliefs and experiences. Therefore, the adoption of a mixed (interpretivist and positivist) methodology within the paper is appropriate in reaching an understanding of the characteristics common to intervention strategies.

The sample of intervention strategies was generated by the host school. They provided a list of different interventions a child may have access to during their time at school; they also provided an explanation of what each intervention strategy was and how students are allocated to the intervention programme. Rather than the names of individual students, a list was provided of the interventions available. This ensured that

individual students were not identifiable and that the sample size would be sufficient to ensure enough data points to study.

Thematic analysis is a qualitative research method used to identify, organise and report themes found within a data set (Braun and Clarke, 2006) The aim of this thematic analysis is to produce trustworthy and insightful findings which demonstrate what characteristics are present within the intervention sample.

While thematic analysis is a useful tool through which to conduct this initial analysis, the flexibility it provides can lead to inconsistency and a lack of coherence when developing themes (Holloway and Todres, 2003). The approach to thematic analysis follows the stages set out by Nowell *et al.* (2017). Phase one involves familiarisation with the data set. In this instance, it meant understanding what each intervention strategy was, and what characteristics may be present. It was followed by generating the initial codes, searching the data for themes, reviewing the findings and finally naming the themes within the data set.

Once themes or characteristics have been identified for the interventions within the sample, it is necessary for the research question to ascertain commonality of the characteristic. A statistical measure was necessary in order to assess commonality across the sample of interventions. The mean as a measure of 'central tendency' was used as a starting point for the statistical analysis.

The mean provides a measure of 'central tendency' within a sample (Watier, 2011), allowing for the identification of characteristics that statistically are more 'common' within the sample of characteristics than average. The etymology of mean contains a 'shared by all' connotation (Onions 1966) which is in line with the idea of attributing commonality to characteristics within the sample.

Ethics

No identifying information of students at the participant school is needed as the intervention strategies are the subject of the investigation and not the students engaged in the interventions. The participant school provided a list of interventions that was available to a cohort of its students. The participant school (a secondary academy in the Northwest of England) remains anonymous. The participant school maintained the right to withdraw from the study and consented to the data being used

for the study of common characteristics in intervention strategies. The participant school and its staff were fully aware that the purpose of the research is to shine a light on the common characteristics but not to make judgements on how effective intervention strategies used in this context are. Ethical approval for the research was granted by the University ethics committee and appropriate permissions were sought from both the university and host school before any research was conducted.

Findings

The sample consisted of 23 intervention strategies which were analysed and shown to have ten characteristics:

- Additional staff time
- An additional cost to the school
- Focus on child's motivations
- Measurable outcome
- Outside agency involvement
- Outside of regular lessons
- Provides a quick fix
- Reactive to a trigger or stimulus
- Specialist staff
- Time-bound

Characteristic	Number of instances
Additional staff time	15
An additional cost to the school	8
Focus on child's motivations	5
Measurable outcome	22
Outside agency involved	8
Outside of regular lessons	16
Provides a quick fix	10
Reactive to a trigger or stimulus	23
Specialist staff	15
Time-bound	21

The mean average of times a characteristic was observed within the sample was found to be 14.3. Those with a number of instances above 14.3 could then be considered to be common characteristics within the sample of interventions.

The most common characteristic within the sample was being reactive to a trigger or stimulus, followed by having a measurable outcome and then being time bound. Making use of specialist staff and the use of staff time were also found to be common.

Four of the characteristics were not found to be common within the sample. Focusing on a child's motivations, bearing an additional cost, involving outside agencies and providing a quick fix all were present in less than 14.3 interventions, meaning they were not common within the sample.

The most common characteristic within the sample was being reactive to a trigger or stimulus, followed by having a measurable outcome and then being time bound. Making use of specialist staff and the use of staff time were also found to be common, but by a lesser amount.

The findings highlighted some disagreement with the literature on similar research. For example, strategies needing to attend to a child's motivation, engagement, and self-efficacy (Alvermann, 2002; Biancarosa and Snow, 2004; Kamil, 2008; National Council of Teachers of English, 2006) was only present in five instances across the sample, meaning that this was an uncommon characteristic.

All 23 of the sampled interventions occurred on a reactive basis as a result of some form of trigger (Torgesen *et al*., 2009); this was, therefore, the most common characteristic within this sample of intervention strategies.

It is indicative of a culture of interventions that, upon closer inspection, explicit outcomes that can be measured are also seen as a common characteristic of the sample, with 22 instances. Outcomes form the backbone of modern education; teachers need to know what they are aiming for in a lesson and how they will know an outcome has been achieved (Killen, 200); this would be supported by the finding that measurable outcomes are a common characteristic of intervention strategies.

Interventions taking place outside of a child's regular lessons was a common characteristic with 16 instances. However, this result could represent a limitation of the

sample data. A sample that included more teacher-led interventions would lead to this characteristic being less prevalent. This is indicative of a common practice within the education sector of having a tiered or stepped approach to intervention, where those further up the tiered system require removal from a child's normal lessons (Smith, *et al*., 2016; National High School Centre, 2010; Bouck Cosby, 2017).

One less common characteristic was the use of specialist staff to deliver interventions. The role of therapeutic interventions like art therapy and behaviour modification is large and growing increasingly important as time progresses. Moreover, they require the input of a qualified professional (French and Klein, 2012).

The research highlighted ten characteristics of intervention strategies being implemented within this context. The common characteristics within these ten were to be reactive to a trigger, having a measurable outcome, being time-bound, occurring away from normal lessons and requiring additional staff time, often in the form of those who have been specially trained to deliver specific interventions. Only four of the characteristics were found to be uncommon within the sample.

Characteristic	**Number of instances**
Reactive to a trigger or stimulus	23
Measurable outcome	22
Time-bound	21
Outside of regular lessons	16
Additional staff time	15
Specialist staff	15
Provides a quick fix	10
An additional cost to the school	8
Outside agency involved	8
Focus on child's motivations	5

Discussion

All of the interventions in the sample are in response to a trigger event or set of circumstances that require the school to intervene or change what is happening. This

pattern is not uncommon and can be seen in the wider literature on the topic. Winburn *et al.* (2017) discuss the role of play therapy as an intervention; again, their work shows clearly that there needs to be a trigger to which they respond. In this instance, there was a variety of triggers, such as not meeting developmental milestones or behaviour practitioners that would be deemed to be abnormal. The reason for a trigger being a common characteristic is simple: to intervene there must be something to require intervention.

Likewise, schools need to show that they are taking positive steps to counter any number of triggers through interventions to satisfy government policy and inspection criteria. Ofsted, in their inspection handbook, make it clear that they need to see schools act to counter poor behaviour and attendance as well as ensuring that children are making adequate progress (Ofsted, 2016). Schools are, therefore, unlikely to spend time on an intervention that does not have clear outcomes that can be measured.

This would normally be through a multi-tiered system of support, or response to intervention policy (Smith, *et al*., 2016; National High School Center, 2010; Bouck and Cosby, 2017). This is particularly true of interventions that require the use of outside agencies or more serious pastoral interventions (Steiker*et al*., 2011; Ward, *et al*., 2006). The example given by Steiker *et al*. is of a child requiring a pastoral intervention regarding sexual relations. It would be inappropriate to deal with something so sensitive at a classroom level and which rightly led to a child speaking with pastoral staff and outside agencies away from their peers.

When considering this tiered approach to intervention, there is opposition. It is the view of some that a tiered approach will deny access to interventions to some children (Reynolds and Shaywitz, 2009; Goodman, 2006; Bailey, 2015). The problem with this model of intervention is focussed on what would happen when a child who requires a very specialised method of intervention (for example, being taught one-to-one by a specialist teacher) would be denied this because the overall aim of the tiered approach is to have children in the mainstream classroom.

Another characteristic that appears for all of the school-led interventions is the use of staff time. This is closely linked to schools' resources because ultimately any additional

time spent on an intervention carries the cost of staffing. All of the interventions in the sample required staff time.

Initially, staff time was not accounted for where interventions engaged agencies external to the school. It is a well-founded truth that intervention uses a vast amount of staff time (Henry, *et al*., 2012; Sulek, *et el.*, 2017; Asher, 2012). Despite not being involved in the delivery of external interventions, staff within an organisation will have worked to engage those services in the first instance. When coding interventions for 'use of staff time', it was clear that by using this approach, all the interventions in the sample required staff time, meaning that alongside being reactive to a trigger or stimulus, those including additional staff time are the most common characteristics of intervention strategies.

The majority of interventions aimed to provide a quick fix for any given situation. This is particularly true of school-led interventions rather than those which involve an external agency. When a trigger arises which causes a school to look at an intervention strategy, they are immediately trying to solve a problem. Many who write about intervention strategies will say that there is no quick fix to the problems being faced by children (Buck, 2017; Povey, 2017; Kovacs, 1998). It is not a resolution to the problem that is often first sought. When a child is misbehaving in a classroom it is unlikely that the teacher would want to resolve the deep-rooted issues causing the behaviour. Instead, what the teacher seeks is for the negative behaviour disrupting their lesson to stop. An intervention which requires the child to leave the lesson for a specified amount of time can provide this 'quick fix'. It is for this reason that many of the interventions in the sample were identified as providing a quick fix.

From the sample, it can be seen that many of the interventions in place for children are pastoral and aim to help the child deal with specific issues within their family lives. Tomaz Lasic (2009) stressed the importance of putting basic needs such as safety and security first and then focussing on educational needs. Unless a child's basic needs are met, they will be unable to fully access the learning on offer and therefore be less able to perform as well as their peers.

References

Alvermann, D. (2002) Effective Literacy Instruction for Adolescence. *Journal of Literacy Research*, **34**, pp. 189-208.

Asher, R. (2012) *Human Resources: Staffing (Vol. 16)*. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-of-School Time.

Asmus, J.M., Carter, E.W., Moss, C.K., Biggs, E.E. and Bolt, D.M. (2017) *Efficacy and Social Validity of Peer Network Interventions for High School Students with Severe Disabilities (Vol. 122).* Washington: AAIDD.

Bailey, N. E. (2015) *'Response to Intervention': An excuse to deny services to students with learning disabilities? retrieved from living in dialogue.* Online. Available at http://www.livingindialogue.com/response-intervention-excuse-deny-services-students-learning-disabilities/ (Accessed 12 August 2021).

Biancarosa, G. and Snow, C. (2004) Reading Next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy. Washington: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Bouck, E.C. and Cosby, M.D. (2017) Tier 2 Response to Intervention in Secondary Mathematics Education. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, **61**(3), pp. 239-247.

Bradshaw, C.P., Pas, E.T., Debnam, K.J. and Lindstrom Johnson, S. (2015) *A Focus on Implementation of Positive Behavioural Interventions and Supports (PBIS) in High Schools: Associations with Bullying and Other Indicators of School Disorder (Vol. 44).* Bethesda, Maryland: National Association of School Psychologists.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology,* **3**, pp. 77–101.

Buck, A. (2017) *Leadership Matters: How leaders at all levels can create great schools*. Melton: John Catt Educational Ltd.

Carr, W. (1989) *Quality Teaching: Arguments for a reflective profession*. London and New York: Routledge.

Carson, D., Gilmore, A., Perry, C. and Gronhaug, K. (2001) *Qualitative Marketing Research.* London, United Kingdom: Sage.

Didau, D. (2015) *What If Everything You Knew About Education Was Wrong?* Camarthen: Crown House Publishing.

for future directions. *School Psychology Review*, Vol. 43(2), pp. 203-209. Fabiano, G.A. (2014) Interventions for High School Students with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder: Considerations

Frankel, K.K. (2016) The Intersection of Reading and Identity in High School Literacy Intervention Classes. (Vol. 51). *Research in the Teaching of English*, **51**(1) pp. 37-59.

French, L. and Klein, R. (2012) Therapeutic Practice in Schools. London: Routledge.

Goodman, K. (2006) *Examining DIBELS: What it is and What it does*. Vermont: Vermont Society for the Study of Education.

Grix, J. (2004) *The Foundations of Research*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hannafin, S. (2017) A Measure of Progress. *Teach Secondary*, pp. 29-30.

Henry, J.J., Tryjankowski, A., Tybor, D., Brandjes, E., Asztalos, J., Smith, K. and Miscarella, M. (2012) Blending Resources for a Collaborative Service Project in a Professional Development School Focused on Student Learning. *School-University Partnerships*, **5**(2), pp. 89-94.

Holloway, I. and Todres, L. (2003) The Status of Method: Flexibility, consistency and coherence. *Qualitative Research*, **3**, pp. 345–357.

House of Commons Education Committee (2011) *Behaviour and Discipline in Schools*. London: House of Commons.

Jennings, Z. (2017) Interventions in Schools' Curricula to Achieve Quality in Learning: Experiences from the Commonwealth Caribbean. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education,* **47**(6), pp. 818-834.

Kamil, M.L. (2008) *Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective classroom and intervention practices: A practice guide*. Washington DC: National Center for

Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Killen, R. (200) *Teaching Strategies for Outcomes-based Education*. Cape Town: Juta & Co.

Kovacs, K. (1998) Combating Failure at School. In L. Stoll and K. Myers (Eds) *No Quick Fixes*. London: The Falmer Press.

Lasic, T. (2009) *Maslow Before Bloom. Retrieved from human* – Edublogs. Online. Available at https://human.edublogs.org/2009/08/11/maslow-before-bloom/ (Accessed 12 August 2021).

Lucey, H. and Walkerdine, V. (2000) Boys' Underachievement: Social class and changing masculinities. In T. Cox (Ed.) *Combating Educational Disadvantage: Meeting the needs of vulnerable children*. London: Falmer Press.

Lyotard, J.F. (1979) *The Postmodern Condition: A report on knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Madigan, K., Cross, R.W., Smolkowski, K. and Strycker, L.A. (2016) *Association between Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and Academic Achievement: A 9-year evaluation*. Abingdon: Routledge.

National Council of Teachers of English (2006) *NCTE Principles of Adolescent Literacy Reform: A policy research brief.* Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

National High School Center (2010) *Tiered Interventions in High Schools: Using preliminary lessons learned to guide ongoing discussion.* Washington DC: American Institutes for Research.

Nowell, L.S., Norris, J.M. and White, D.E. (2017) Thematic Analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* Vol. 16(1).

Ofsted (2016) *School Inspection Handbook*. Manchester: Ofsted.

Onions, C. (1966) The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology. Oxford: Clarendon.

Outhwaite, L. A., Gulliford, A. and Pitchford, N.J. (2020) A New Methodological Approach for Evaluating the Impact of Educational Intervention Implementation on Learning Outcomes. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education,* **43**(3), pp. 225-242.

Povey, D. (2017) *Educating Drew: The real story of Harrop Fold School*. Melton: John Catt Educational.

Reynolds, C.R. and Shaywitz, E.E. (2009) *Response to Intervention: Ready or not? Or, from wait-to-fail to watch-them-fail (Vol. 24).* Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Rowland, M. (2015) *An Updated Practical Guide to the Pupil Premium*. Melton: John Catt Educational.

Sharples, J., Slavin, R., Chambers, B. and Sharp, C. (2011) *Effective Classroom Strategies for Closing the Gap in Educational Achievement for Children and Young People Living in Poverty, Including White Working-Class Boys.* London: Centre for Excellence and Outcomes in Children and Young People's Services.

Siegler, R. (1998) *Emerging Minds: The process of change in children's thinking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, K.G., Dombek, J.L., Foorman, B.R., Hook, K. S., Lee, L., Cote, A.-M. and Stafford, T. (2016) *Self-Study Guide for Implementing High School Academic Interventions*. Gainesville, Florida: Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast.

Steiker, L.H., Powell, T., Goldbach, J.T. and Hopson, L.M. (2011) Dissonance-Based Interventions for Substance Using Alternative High School Youth. *Practice: Social Work in Action*, **23**(4), pp. 235-252.

Sokol, R.L, Heinze, J. Doan, J., Nomoand, M. Grodzinski, A. Pomerantz, N., Scott, B.A., Gaswirth, M. and Zimmerman, M. (2021) Crisis Interventions in Schools: A systematic review. *Journal of School Violence,* **20**(2), pp. 241-260.

Sulek, S., Trembarth, D., Paynter, J., Keen, D. and Simpson, K. (2017) Inconsistent Staffing and its Impact on Service Delivery in ASD Early-Intervention. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, **63**, pp. 18-27.

Swain-Bradway, J., Pinkney, C. and Flannery, K.B. (2015) Implementing Schoolwide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports in High Schools. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, **47**(5), pp. 245-255.

Torgesen, J., Lang, L., Vogel, W., Chanter, C., Lefsky, E. and Petscher, Y. (2009) Exploring the Relative Effectiveness of Reading Interventions for High School Students. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, **2**(2),149-175.

Ward, D., Saunders, R., Felton, G., Williams, E., Epping, J. and Pate, R. (2006) Implementation of a School Environment Intervention to Increase Physical Activity in High School Girls. *Health Education Research*, **21**(6), pp. 896-910.

Ward, M.A. and Worsham, D. (1998) *Student Guidance and Development*. Larchmont, New York: Eye on Education.

Watier, N.N., Lamontagne, C. and Chartier, S. (2011) What Does the Mean Mean? *Journal of Statistics Education,* **19**(2), pp. 1-20.

Appendix A

Pastoral	**Academic**	**SEND**	**In class / teacher-led interventions**
Lunchtime clubs	Additional core subject support in place of other lessons	Nurture Group	Targeted Questioning
Time out passes	In-Class Support from teaching assistant	Advocate	Additional Homework
Bespoke Timetable		Forest School	
Behaviour Contract		Anger Management	
Farm Time		Child & Adolescent Mental Health Services	
Behaviour support service		Educational Phycologist	
Report Cards		Occupational Health	
Team Around the Family (TAF) Meeting		Speech and Language Therapy	
Drug & Alcohol Service			
Parent meetings			
School Counsellor			

Appendix B

		Lunch clubs	Time out passes	Bespoke timetable	Behaviour Contract	Time on School Farm	Behaviour Support	Report Cards	Multi Agency Meeting	Drug & Alcohol Service	Parent Meetings	School Counsellor	Additional Core lessons	In-Class Support	Nurture Group	Advocate	Forest School	Anger Management	CAMHs	Educational Psychologist	Occupational Health	Speech/Language	Targeted Questioning	Additional Homework	TOTAL YES
Original Common Characteristics	Outside of regular lessons	y	n	y	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	16
	Specialist staff	n	n	n	n	y	y	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	15
	Measurable outcome	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	22
	Focus on child's motivations	n	n	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	5
	Reactive to a trigger or stimulus	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	23
	Provides a quick fix	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	n	y	n	n	n	y	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	10
	Time-bound	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	21
	An additional cost to the school	y	n	n	n	y	y	n	n	n	n	y	n	n	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	8
	Outside Agency involved	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	y	n	y	n	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	8
	Additional staff time	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	n	n	y	y	15

Mean = 14.3