

Punishing ‘Unruly’ British Minoritised Children and Young People

The Aim(s)

This paper provides original analysis of Falguni Sheth’s framework on unruliness and the logics of exclusion to understanding intersecting mechanisms that exclude and punish minoritised children and young people in the UK. It highlights how their education and human rights are intrinsically tied to how liberal states apply race as a technological tool to other and discipline liminal groups.

Rationale

Existing research and theoretical insights exploring exclusion of minoritised children and young people limit their analysis to educational impacts, and disregard an intersectional lens to understand how disciplining and punishment operationalises and singles them out. This paper argues that the exclusionary experiences of minoritised children and young people are overlooked because they often fall outside of educational sites, however, there is also a reluctance from some educational psychologists and educators to understand what meaningful inclusion means.

Findings

Sheth’s framework on unruliness is proposed as a template for professionals and academics working with minoritised children and young people. This framework highlights how policies that might appear ‘impartial’ often single out certain groups of children and young people for exclusion from participating in educational and wider settings.

Limitations

This paper provides an original theoretical contribution to understanding exclusion from a safeguarding and rights-based perspective. Further empirical studies applying Sheth’s framework need to be conducted to understand its significance in addressing exclusions that minoritised children and young people experience.

Conclusions

This paper concludes by envisioning a way forward away from exclusionary mechanisms and the implications for educational psychologists and educators.

Introduction

On 7th April 2022, an unnamed non-verbal Black British 17-year-old with learning difficulties disappeared from a hospital in Kent (Abdul, 2022). He was subsequently arrested at London Euston station by British Transport Police for fare evasion, questioned without a guardian present, and then erroneously identified as ‘Nigerian’ before being transferred to an immigration detention centre which held him in custody for two days before determining that this young person’s ‘removal from the UK was “imminent” as he had failed to give “satisfactory or reliable answers” to immigration officers’ (Abdul, 2022). Fortunately, his parents recovered him before he could be deported, nonetheless, this incident raises several disturbing questions about children and young people from racialised backgrounds. Firstly, at what point did this young person become a threat? Why did British Transport Police not consider him a vulnerable young person requiring help? How did they determine that he was not British and refer him to immigration enforcement? Even as a non-citizen, was he not entitled to a duty of care? Arguably, his detainment in an immigration detention centre was not accidental, but rather because of a coordinated multiagency plan designed to identify and manage a threat. By implication this is unlikely to be an isolated incident, with many British children and young people from racialised communities being subjected to systematic exclusionary mechanisms which enjoy the protection of legal frameworks. This paper utilises Sheth’s (2009) Unruly Framework to highlight how liberal states like the UK employ race as a technological tool, a ‘bordering practice’ (Valluvan, 2020, p.250) through

which targeted populations are categorised as undesirable. I reveal how certain values, behaviours and cultures are criminalised to subtly label certain children and young people as ‘unruly’ citizens, reinforcing the link between racism and nationalism. I also illustrate how the construction of unruliness can result in exclusion from safeguarding discourse, and how exclusion can take various less obvious forms. The aim of this paper is therefore to highlight the impact of the intersectional nature of exclusionary mechanisms that are embedded in the everyday practices of educational psychologists and educators, as well as offer critical insight into how societal power structures and racial biases shape perceptions of unruly behaviour in educational settings.

Since the late 1990s, there has been a call for educational psychologists to critically review their practices, particularly in relation to minority communities, and to develop frameworks that are more inclusive and reflective of diverse cultural experiences. Despite this progress has been slow, with many voices within Educational Psychology (EP) still calling for greater and more rapid integration of anti-racist principles into both research and practice (Williams et al., 2015; Kumar and DeCuir-Gunby, 2023). This includes more robust engagement with issues such as the over-representation of racially minoritised students in disciplinary actions, and their under-representation in accessing educational resources. Recent efforts have focused on incorporating cultural competences into professional standards for educational psychologists, recognising that addressing racial inequalities requires a multifaceted approach that considers socio-economic factors, cultural contexts, and systemic biases (Abdi, 2015). However, EP literature also highlights ongoing gaps

particularly the absence of a ‘race-influenced theoretical framework’ which informs the everyday practices of educational psychologists, as well as a lack of recognition of how their own practices sit within cross-institutional powers (i.e. law enforcement, immigration, medical settings, etc.), wider systems, and the liberal state that categorise certain minorities as problematic (Schulze et al., 2017).

The theoretical focus between liberal states and racialisation, however, has been explored by race scholars (Valluvan, 2020; Mills, 2020; Gilroy, 2019; and Yuval-Davis, 1997), highlighting that the ‘identification of a ‘Significant Other(s)’ is how the nation itself can be asserted in a substantive manner’ (Valluvan, 2020, p.246). This paper highlights how the liberal¹ state surveils racialised children and young people, judging whether they have the potential to become ‘good citizens’ from very early on through ruly/unruly categorisations (Valluvan, 2020). The HM Inspectorate of Prisons (Children in Custody, 2018-2019) reported that over fifty percent of all British offenders in the secure estate for children and young people are from Black and minority ethnic backgrounds, four times the percentage they represent at a national level. This alludes to broader structural exclusion and extends into school settings, with Black Caribbean boys ranking second behind only Traveller children as the most excluded group. Compared to the national average, Black Caribbean boys are

¹¹ Here I use Sheth’s conceptualisation of liberal state, who distinguishes this from the more common term used in scholarship, ‘nation state’. Sheth states’ liberalism theoretically or as a self-identification of a society, is predicated on the accommodation of ethnic, racial, political, or sorts of diversity or pluralism...In liberal societies, it is assumed that governmental authority is respected and obeyed because it represents the political will of all members of that society...This view of liberalism involves a corresponding view of law, morality, and moral consequences. In this framework, legal punishments befall mostly ‘bad people’, that is those who have violated laws that are generally just or have just cause’. (Sheth, 2009, p.13/14/15)

doubly likely to suffer a fixed-period exclusion and four times as likely to endure permanent school exclusion (Demie, 2021). This policing of minoritised children and young people, including school exclusions and their placement into the secure estate, is part of the structural racism that excludes minoritised children and young people daily. Moreover, exceptions aimed at minoritised populations have been constructed in the very laws designed to protect an individual citizen's rights, under the pretext of the liberal state needing to penalise 'unruly behaviour' (de Noronha, 2019; Sheth, 2009).

Sheth's (2009) concept of unruliness is useful in critically analysing the complex nature and extent of exclusion that British minoritised children and young people experience at the intersections of disability, religion, ethnicity, race, gender, and immigration status. I argue that this exclusion is not only situated within educational policymaking but is embedded squarely within the national policy discourse of 'racialised communities' (Rizvi, 2023). Therefore, viewing exclusion solely through an educational lens ignores the wide-ranging and deep-seated nature of exclusionary mechanisms that target minoritised communities. Sheth (2009) argues that to understand the exclusion of racialised groups, race must be viewed as a technological tool not a social construct. Sheth (2009) positions 'race as a tool for political management and social organisation' (p.4), which disciplines those communities who threaten the pluralistic façade of the liberal state. Sheth (2009) emphasises how the liberal state uses racialisation as a strategic tool to legitimise its power. She focuses on communities who have suffered oppression by the US state like Japanese

Americans during World War II and Muslim Americans post-9/11, reflecting on how legal frameworks have been used to enable racial othering.

Various scholars have posited different theoretical perspectives to highlight punishment and exclusion discourses within educational settings. Slee (2019) suggests exclusion is intrinsically linked to citizenship and belongingness. He argues that educational practices such as banding, integrating and special education all reflect the hierarchy of belonging and inclusion, and how for some it is a privilege rather than an entitlement. Slee (2019) focuses on the exclusion of disabled children and young people, underlining the impermanence of inclusion owing to changeable protocols and gatekeepers, and how processes like diagnosing and segmenting divide school populations into different degrees of belongingness. Similarly, Daniels et al. (2019) link exclusionary processes to the 'political economy of schooling' (p.26), particularly how both formal and informal exclusions are driven by the pressure of school league tables, high stakes testing, and increasingly outsourcing the management of excluded children and young people. Daniels et al. (2019) suggest that pupils who challenge disciplinary mechanisms are considered 'collateral casualties' (p.26). The rationale for excluding such pupils is case specific, deflecting attention from ineffectual inclusion policies that neglect wider social inequalities, putting those pupils at further risk of exclusion. Done and Knowler (2021) examine illegal school exclusions and off-rolling, utilising a Foucauldian lens to explore how some schools game the education system by manipulating school performance data. Utilising surveys with headteachers across England, Done and Knowler (2021) unpack the 'professional secret'

(p.1052) of some school leaders who use various loopholes to flexibilise the formal definition of 'off-rolling', exacerbating the problem of exclusion.

Scholarship exploring exclusion within the wider context of racial injustice is particularly pertinent to this paper's focus. Connelly et al. (2020) reveal that schools have collaborated with police to surveil Black British communities since the 1950s. They report that police 'exacerbate the risk of minor disciplinary procedures escalating into criminal justice issues', and that they 'discriminate against students of colour, and particularly Black students' (Connelly et al., 2020, p.1). Perera (2020) considers former military and police officers in schools and the increased securitisation of multiracial working-class neighbourhoods. In some cases, Perera (2020) notes that teachers 'act as intelligencers (often under the guise of safeguarding)' (p.35) in partnership with police, punishing Black and Muslim youth because they exhibit distinct cultures considered threatening to British values. Similarly in the US, Christle et al. (2005), Meiners and Winn (2010), and Annamma (2017) have observed how minoritised children and young people are drawn into the school-to-prison pipeline and the prison industrial complex, through zero tolerance policies and militarising educational spaces that incarcerate and 'disappear' them from their communities. To understand to what degree the US has become a 'permanent prison economy' (Meiners and Winn, 2010, p.271), abolitionist scholars like Davis (2005) argue for critical engagement with white supremacy and its present-day technological manifestations to expose how public sector institutions systematically collaborate to exclude racialised others.

Parsons' (2005) research around how retributive punishment forms the foundation of British social welfare policymaking, also helps to understand exclusion discourse. Parsons suggests the 'tough on crime' approach by successive UK governments has conditioned society to depersonalise punishment when it is meted out against 'disruptive' children and young people. Parsons (2005) also states:

[There is] (a) the widespread willingness to pay the cost of punishment when things go wrong, and the more limited inclination to fund prevention, support and restoration; (b) the denigration, demonising and 'othering' of individuals and groups excluded, or deemed to self-exclude, with labels denoting threat, worthlessness and undeservingness; and (c) a corresponding legitimacy in the allocation of blame to the weak and deprived individuals, families, groups and communities (p.189).

For Parsons (2005), educational exclusion and punishment policies mirror the state's punitive policies, which stem from neoliberal and authoritarian ideologies combining to impose a punitive rather than restorative approach. Parsons (2005) suggests that national punitive policies reinforce the state's sovereignty and neoliberal values of justice, because they emphasise individual responsibility over structural changes. By positioning 'wrongful' acts as resulting from individual actions, the state demonises and pathologises the individual, family and/or background, stripping their citizenship rights. Implementing punitive/retributive over restorative approaches also divides 'good' citizens from 'bad', further legitimising the state as democratic and just which rewards law-abiding citizens and

punishes those who threaten order. Whilst Parsons (2005) does not contain a racial analysis, his work nonetheless decodes the racial nature of blame and who society considers 'punishable'. His research resonates with Sheth's (2009) work on exclusion, offering a framework to understand how liberal states utilise race as a technological tool to exclude groups that threaten its social order. To achieve this, various public sector bodies work together to sustain a coherent narrative of the liberal state, however, using race to connect these institutions with the groups/populations being targeted for exclusion. Sheth (2009) outlines three processes that illustrate how race is used to tame minoritised populations. She does not suggest any hierarchical or sequential order to these processes, rather as dimensions that reveal the complex intermeshed nature of how exclusionary mechanisms work in reality.

The next section discusses how Sheth's framework unveils the exclusionary mechanisms imposed on racialised children and young people.

Creation of an Unruly Racialised Other

Sheth's first dimension highlights how legal mechanisms are used to establish racial difference as fact, strategically categorising certain characteristics as 'unpredictable, undependable or threatening to a political order' (Sheth, 2009, p.22). She defines the term 'unruly' as,

...the element that is intuited as threatening to a political order, to a collectively disciplined society. As this term suggests, this element threatens to disrupt because it signifies some immediate fact of difference that must be harnessed and located or categorized or classified in such a way so as to not challenge the ongoing political order. (Sheth, 2009, p.26)

Applying Foucauldian notions of regulatory technology that enable certain intended outcomes, Sheth positions race as a technological instrument that can categorise certain minoritised groups as threats. This implies the state's collective awareness of its history of conflict with an individual group, whether through slavery, colonisation or military intervention. Sheth argues that racialising a group cannot occur by happenstance, rather it is a state-sanctioned policy which uses legal frameworks to position minoritised groups as 'threats' with an official seal. The state then deliberately formalises a group's transition from merely 'different' to 'racialised', formalising what embodies a good and bad citizen by codifying the standards for lawful (acceptable) and unlawful (unacceptable) behaviour (Sheth, 2009). Like Parsons (2005), Sheth posits that the state projects a façade of pluralism, human rights, and social justice, behind which lie policies embedded in necropolitics which employ race to divide society to sustain its power.

Unruly symbols are not only overt like skin colour or dress (e.g. hijab), but can also be intangible such as speaking a foreign language (e.g. uttering *Allahu Akbar* which means 'God is the Greatest'), or a collective memory of a terrorist act executed by members of a

racialised population. The unruly symbol itself is not the threat rather it is the racialised group that, out of political choice, is othered, purportedly threatening the state's liberal values. For instance, a nun may wear a wimple, almost indistinguishable from a hijab, yet is not considered a threat.

Sheth's framework initially seems too radical to examine exclusion and punishment, however, the experiences of racialised children and young people at various intersections are too frequently disregarded from educational inclusion/exclusion discourse. Racialised communities often have their first experiences of injustice in childhood in an educational milieu; institutions identify them as threats because they are perceived as different, and who consequently warrant exclusion or other punishment. The exclusion of racialised children and young people is frequently intentional, reflecting the state's broader relationship with racialised communities, particularly apropos law and order (Runnymede Report, 2010).

Singled out

How are the unruly singled out when the liberal state supposedly offers protection to all citizens? Joseph-Salisbury and Connelly (2018) suggest that 'new racism' thrives under the 'illusion of neutrality' (p.7) of education institutional structures and policies. They argue that institutions ostensibly claim a fair, colour-evasive approach towards everyone, promoting an ethos which establishes the standards expected of the student body regarding their

general behaviour and appearance. These standards and policies themselves are unproblematic, indeed are designed to appeal to prospective ‘good citizens’, students and parents alike. However, Sheth (2009) argues that these same policies are used to incriminate groups who are deemed threats to society. To illustrate the illusion of impartiality and justice, Joseph-Salisbury and Connelly (2018) highlight the case of Chikayzea Flanders, a 12-year-old Black boy in London who was excluded by his school in 2018 for having dreadlocks in line with his Rastafarian beliefs. After a public furore the school headteacher responded,

We are a strict academic boys’ school and have a strict uniform and appearance policy. I would stress that everyone is welcome to the school. We are not a racist school in any way, shape or form. But we have a distinct culture and when boys come to the school we expect them to respect that culture. (p.7)

Such statements allow institutions to argue that their policies merely outline good and bad behaviour which ‘every’ pupil is subject to, rather than being racially discriminatory. However, education institutional standards are based on white mainstream culture which is endorsed as ‘good’, necessarily relegating any difference as ‘bad’ (Blaisdell, 2015). Thus, schools can argue that their uniform policies requiring all children to maintain a ‘neat haircut’ and prohibiting ‘non-traditional’ hairstyles are not overtly targeting Black children, despite banning Black hairstyles (Joseph-Salisbury and Connelly, 2018). Similarly, policies

compelling all girls to wear knee-length skirts are not targeting Muslim girls although religious obligation requires that they wear long skirts or trousers.

Institutional decision-making about what constitutes inappropriate behaviour is arbitrary and contingent on who commits it. A group that is not considered unruly may commit an act and be considered non-threatening, whereas an unruly body committing the same act would be judged as a threat. For instance, in 2009 some pupils at Sutton Grammar School for Boys arranged bricks on the school rooftop to spell out a vulgar word, intending to view it later on Google Earth. The headmaster sidestepped any disciplinary action, stating, 'it was nice, a light-hearted bit of fun' (Education News, 2009). Such arbitrarily lenient decisions following misbehaviour are centred around institutional racism and privilege, where some groups are afforded a childhood whilst others are judged unruly. These policies are portrayed as practical efforts to ensuring everyone feels safe in school, however, this ignores how educational institutions facilitate inclusion/exclusion processes which maintain social control of unruly populations.

Taming through Policy

When racialised children and young people experience school sanctions, they comprehend the qualified nature of their inclusion (Slee, 2019). Unfortunately, this is frequently neglected within educational discourse, consigned instead to other disciplines which are not set up to offer answers. The state also constantly re-negotiates the citizenship and

belongingness of racialised children and young people, as illustrated by the case of the unnamed 17-year-old discussed in the introduction; the unruly symbols of ‘Black male’, ‘adolescent’ and ‘non-verbal’ all made him easily identifiable as unruly. Therefore, policymaking is not a panacea for equal rights and protections because, despite the appearance of impartiality, policies are drafted by human hands and in practice embedded in racial prejudice (Carlile, 2012).

The state employs inclusion/exclusion criteria within policymaking to tame targeted populations, whilst permitting the mainstream population to bask in a perception of tolerant pluralism. Once enough people believe that the state (or institution) will interdict behaviour that ‘threatens’ society, they will be more likely to accept rules that target the ‘unruly’. In Chikayzea Flanders’ case, amidst criticism from various advocacy groups some parents defended the school in the media, citing: ‘Your strict attention to these standards were well publicised to us as prospective parents and I am grateful that they remain consistent as it enables my son to work within these known boundaries—and he is thriving’ (Joseph-Salisbury and Connelly, 2018, p.8). When ‘good citizens’ defend the liberal state, it becomes easier for legal frameworks to persecute unruly subjects. Sheth terms this the ‘Violence of Law’ (2009, p.42), explaining how the ‘state protects those segments of its population whose interests are thought to conserve its own existence and abandon those populations that are considered a threat to the existing order’ (Sheth, 2009, p.42). For instance, the Blair Government amended the British Nationality Act 1981 and introduced the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2005, enabling the state to revoke citizenship from individuals

deemed a security threat. The Immigration Act 2014 under the Cameron Government removed long-standing protections against statelessness.

The next section explores the case of Osime Brown, how multifaceted policies constructed him solely as a threat, and how Osime's case has been omitted from orthodox British educational safeguarding discourse. Like Joseph-Salisbury and Connelly (2018), I have focused on a singular example because Osime's case captures how unruly subjects are created at various intersections, and how different institutions collaborate to exclude racialised young people.

Osime Brown

The case of Osime Brown, a 22-year-old Black man with autism and severe mental health and medical needs, reveals the insidiousness of Britain's educational, carceral and immigration systems routinely classifying Black men with disabilities as unruly threats, and illustrates how the state has successfully excluded debates around racialised young people from educational discourses.

Osime left Jamaica and moved to Britain with his mother at the age of four. He experienced multiple failures by the British state due to inadequate and discriminatory educational and social services provisions. For instance, he was relocated 28 times between separate social care settings within just one 12-month period. In 2016, whilst he was in local authority care,

Osime was present when a friend robbed another young person's mobile phone. According to his mother, of the other eight young people at the scene, only Osime was handed a custodial sentence (Purdy-Moore, 2021). Osime was subsequently tried as an adult under the Law of Joint Enterprise and received a five-year prison sentence. This law permitted the state to convict a person if they were merely present or were aware that the crime would occur. Rather than providing Osime his educational, health and social care needs, the state had imprisoned him for crime he may have witnessed but most likely had not comprehended. Despite his UK citizenship, Osime became subject to deportation under the Borders Act 2007 on account of his Jamaican roots and his sentence exceeding 12 months (Purdy-Moore, 2021).

Osime's case illustrates how the state's immigration policies present the threat of deportation if racialised others are incarcerated (Cowan, 2021). Focusing policy on children and young people in this way sustains the state's authority, and risks racialised young people being deported to a country they may not remember. The unruly symbols associated with Osime, namely 'Black male', 'mental health needs', 'autistic', 'disabled', and 'immigrant family' excluded him from one educational setting because of the supposed threat he posed to their ethos, making him susceptible to ableist carceral and immigration policies geared to excluding at-risk individuals. Examining Osime's case through Sheth's framework, we observe how the state utilised multifaceted institutional policies to transform him from a vulnerable young person with disability into a threat demanding deportation. Notably, no government agency acknowledged how subjecting him to

inhumane conditions in prison was depriving a vulnerable disabled young person of rights guaranteed under the Equality Act 2010. Ultimately, a campaign by Osime's mother, politicians and grassroots organisations compelled the Home Office to revoke its deportation order, but this raises another pertinent question: would Osime have been deported if his mother had not advocated forcefully on his behalf? Families like Osime's continuously risk being classified as unruly, consequently subjected to exclusion from educational settings, PRUs, social care and healthcare, or even deportation.

Osime's case where hostile immigration policies are targeted at individuals of Caribbean heritage is not without parallel, having historically been labelled un-British 'who have no right to be in the country' (Gentleman and Taylor, 2021). I have discussed the plights of Tashaun Aird (and Shamima Begum) elsewhere to illustrate further examples of unruliness (Rizvi, 2023). de Noronha (2019) notes that illegalisation via immigration policies depends on sustained surveillance by criminal justice agencies, and 'shapes and produces racial meanings and racist practices in the present' (p.2). By using the 'anti-social behaviour' label (de Noronha, 2019, p.12), the Black Caribbean community faces punishment through the criminal justice and immigration systems. Categorising 'Black Caribbean' as an unruly symbol which threatens its existence the state uses the prison industrial complex to discipline them, where Black people continue being overrepresented (Wallace and Joseph-Salisbury, 2021). The British state continues to deport Black Caribbean people for committing minor crimes despite being British citizens who have lived most of their lives in this country.

The state deliberately uses educational, carceral and immigration policies to amplify cultural differences between mainstream and unruly populaces, reinforcing an ‘us-versus-them’ paradigm and effectively creating a prison-to-deportation pipeline. Osime’s family understood how he was perceived by the state and more widely, and tried to soften Osime’s public image to garner sympathy as the best way of seeking justice. The state’s exclusionary policies further jeopardise the lives of already vulnerable racialised children and young people; for instance, arising from trauma from his incarceration, Osime has developed a heart condition.

Where do we begin?

This paper has discussed how the state, specifically through educational settings, employs race as a technological tool to preserve the status quo and their vested interests. This is achieved by forming unruly symbols and implementing policies designed to classify the target group as unruly. Reflecting on how school disciplinary procedures operate alongside the state’s immigration, counterterrorism and carceral policies, excluding racialised children and young people through their multiple positionalities, superficial reform of public institutions is evidently not enough to produce consequential inclusion. Unfortunately, there are no easy solutions. Notably, the omission of Osime Brown and others from educational discourse is all too commonplace. Framing racialised children and young people as unruly, defiant or threatening, is based on the historic state-sanctioned

pathologisation of racialised groups and the gatekeeping of educational discourse. So, is meaningful inclusion a realistic goal? Sheth's concept of unruliness offers an invaluable lens for educational psychologists to understand and address the complex dynamics of exclusion and disciplinary practices within schools, particularly for racialised children and young people who are often disproportionately disciplined or excluded, not necessarily because of their behaviour alone but due to underlying racial biases that frame them as disruptive or problematic.

Educational psychologists, and educators in general, can use Sheth's analysis to critically question the implicit biases and structural inequalities that lead to certain behaviours being perceived as more problematic when exhibited by racialised children and young people, compared to their White peers. By recognising these dynamics, educational psychologists can advocate for more equitable and socially-just practices that do not unfairly target certain groups. Additionally, Sheth's framework suggests the need for educational psychologists to challenge the broader socio-political narratives promoted by liberal states that reinforce these biases. State and institutional actions cannot be detached from the everyday practices of educational psychologists and educators. Notwithstanding any objections that professionals hold against Prevent and other discriminatory policies (Joseph-Salisbury and Connelly, 2019), we are nonetheless complicit in applying them within institutions. This calculated vagueness absolves the state and institutions of direct blame whilst implicating everyone else, affecting how radical that change can be within the liberal state.

On the long march towards social justice, a first move could be to expand the definition of who and what are included within education's inclusion/exclusion discourse. Claims that this could alter the inclusion agenda's aims/priorities, or risks politicising the discourse, only reinforces privilege and false consciousness. A new approach incorporating a rights-based perspective can promote empathy for racialised children and young people and their experiences, highlighting the policies and processes which have excluded them from inclusive education discourse. Erevelles (2000) suggests that educational psychologists and educators should reflect on how oppressive structures are inter-related, exposing the multifaceted modes of exclusion that children and young people face at various intersections. She calls for,

...critical pedagogy that provides the intellectual tools that can render visible the material structures and ideological discourses that have different effects on Black, white, lesbian, working-class, disabled, and third world students, and yet at the same time have to be transformed so that all students can achieve social, economic, and political liberation. --- (Erevelles, 2000, p.47)

To achieve progress, educational psychologists and educators must collectively challenge policies and practices which target minoritised populations using unruly symbols. Unless we safeguard racialised children and young people who are targeted in this way, we will

continue to validate an inclusive agenda that has historically failed (and still fails) those minoritised communities who need it most.

Funder Information

Work on this paper is not supported/associated with any funding organisation.

Disclosure Statement

The author reports there are no competing interests to declare. The author reports that this paper is their original work and is not under consideration elsewhere. This paper builds on author's previous analysis on exclusion that was part of Palgrave International Perspectives on Exclusionary Pressures in Education.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank its reviewers for their feedback in developing this paper.

References

Abdi, M. A. (2015). Performing Blackness: Disrupting 'race' in the classroom. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 32(2), 57-66.

Abdul, G. (2022, April 28). Non-verbal black teenager who has never left UK detained at immigration centre. *The Guardian*.

Annamma, S.A. (2017). *The pedagogy of pathologization: Dis/abled girls of color in the school-prison nexus*. New York: Routledge.

Barnes, L. (2022, Jan 19). Ben John: Extremist ordered to read books is jailed. *BBCNews*.

Bei, Z., Knowler, H. & Butt, J. (2021). How do we progress racial justice in education?. *IPPR Progressive Review*, 28,76-84.

Blaisdell, B. (2016). Schools as racial spaces: understanding and resisting structural racism, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 29(2), 248-272,

Children in Custody (2018-19). An analysis of 12-18 year-olds' perceptions of their experiences in secure training centres and young offender institutions. *HM Inspectorate of Prisons*.

Christle, C.A., Jolivette, K. & Nelson, C.M. (2005). Breaking the school to prison pipeline: Identifying school risk and protective factors for youth delinquency. *Exceptionality*, 13(2), 69-88

Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities (2021, Mar). *The Report*.

Connelly, L., Legane, R., & Joseph-Salisbury, R. (2020). "Decriminalise the Classroom: A Community Response to Police in Greater Manchester's Schools." *No Police in Schools*.

Cowan, L. (2021). *Border Nation: A story of migration*. London: Pluto Press

Daniels, H., Thompson, I. & Tawell, A. (2019). Practices of exclusion in cultures of inclusive schooling in the United Kingdom. *Publicaciones* 49(3), 23-36.

Davis, A.Y. (2005). *Abolition Democracy: Beyond Empire, Prisons, and Torture*. New York: Seven Stories Press

De Noronha, L. (2019). Deportation, racism and multi-status Britain: Immigration control and the production of race in the present. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 42(14), 2413-2430.

Demie, F. (2021). The experience of Black Caribbean pupils in school exclusion in England, *Educational Review*, 73(1), 55-70.

Done, E.J. & Knowler, H. (2021). 'Off-rolling' and Foucault's art of visibility/invisibility: An exploratory study of senior leaders' views of 'strategic' school exclusion in southwest England. *British Educational Research Journal*, 47(4), 1039-1055.

Education News. (2009, June 22). Naughty Sutton Grammar School pupils leave a parting gift on roof. *Sutton and Croydon Guardian*.

Erevelles, N. (2000). Educating unruly bodies: Critical pedagogy, disability studies, and the politics of schooling. *Educational theory*, 50(1), 25-47.

Fatsis, L. (2019). Grime: Criminal subculture or public counterculture? A critical investigation into the criminalization of Black musical subcultures in the UK. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 15(3), 447-461.

Gentleman, A. and Taylor, D. (2021, Aug 5). Outcry over plan to deport Jamaican nationals who came to UK as children. *The Guardian*.

Gilroy, P. (2019, Jan 1). 'Still no black in the union jack'. *Tribune*.

Goodfellow, M. (2022, 14 April). Xenophobic exclusion has become a British tradition *Aljazeera*.

Joseph-Salisbury, R. & Connelly, L. (2018). 'If your hair is relaxed, white people are relaxed. If your hair is nappy, they're not happy': Black hair as a site of 'post-racial' social control in English schools. *Social Sciences*, 7(11), 219.

Keyes, C (2004). *Rap Music and Street Consciousness*. Illinois: University of Illinois Press

Kumar, R. & DeCuir-Gunby, J. (2023). What is the role of race in educational psychology? A review of research in Educational Psychologist, *Educational Psychologist*, 58(1), 1-17.

Meiners, E.R. & Winn, M.T. (2010). Resisting the school to prison pipeline: The practice to build abolition democracies. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 13(3), 271-276.

Mills, C.W. (2020). The racial state. In *Routledge International Handbook of Contemporary Racisms* edited by John Solomos (pp. 99-109). Oxon: Routledge.

Parsons, C. (2005). "School Exclusion: The Will to Punish." *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(2), 187-211.

Perera, J. (2020). "How Black Working-Class Youth are Criminalized and Excluded in the English School System: A London Case Study." Institute of Race Relations.

Purdy-Moore, S. (2021, Jun 10). Campaign groups are uniting to stop the deportation of Osime Brown. *The Canary*.

Rizvi, S. (2023). 'Unruly' Ethnic Minorities: Exclusion Through Policy Constructions. In *International Perspectives on Exclusionary Pressures in Education: How Inclusion becomes Exclusion* (pp. 259-277). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Runnymede. (2010). *Did they Get it Right? A Re-examination of School Exclusions and Race Equality*.

Schulze, J., Winter, L. A., Woods, K., & Tyldesley, K. (2017). Investigating the significance of social justice in educational psychology practice—A systematic literature review. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 34(3), 57-73.

Sheth, F.A. (2009). *Toward a political philosophy of race*. Albany: Suny Press.

Slee, R. (2019) Belonging in an age of exclusion, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(9), 909-922.

Valluvan, S. (2020). Nationalism and racism: The racial politics of non-belonging, bordering and disposable humanities. In *Routledge International Handbook of Contemporary Racisms* edited by John Solomos (pp. 243-257). Oxon: Routledge.

Wallace, D. & Joseph-Salisbury, R. (2021). How, still, is the Black Caribbean child made educationally subnormal in the English school system?. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 1-27.

Williams, A., Weerasinghe, D., & Hobbs, C. (2015). Guest editorial: 'race', culture and ethnicity in educational psychology. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 32(2), 5-9.

Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). *Gender and Nation*. London: Sage.