School Distress in UK School Children: Characteristics and Consequences

Sophie Connolly[1], **Katherine Patterson**[1,2], **Eliza Hockey**[1,2], **and Sinéad L. Mullally**[2,✉]

[1]School of Psychology, Dame Margaret Barbour Building, Wallace Street, Newcastle University, NE2 4DR, United Kingdom
[2]Translational and Clinical Research Institute, Henry Wellcome Building, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Framlington Place, Newcastle University, NE2 4HH, United Kingdom

Abstract

As education becomes increasingly centralised, it is important to understand why some children and young people (CYP) in the UK have become too distressed to attend school, or manage to attend school but at a considerable cost to their mental health and wellbeing. Using a case-control, concurrent embedded mixed-method research design, 1121 parents of CYP completed a bespoke online questionnaire. This included 947 parents of CYP who are currently (n=738) or have previously (n=209) struggled to attend school, 149 parents of age-matched control CYP, and parents of 25 CYP who have never attended school. Within this work we use the term School Distress (SD) to describe the experiences of CYP who face difficulty attending school. This is because school attendance was associated with emotional distress for the majority of CYP in our sample who either currently or previously struggled to attend school (94.3%), with often harrowing accounts of distress provided by parents. Findings revealed that age of onset of SD was early (mean age 7.9 years), with a mean duration of 4 years. SD was associated with poor school attendance, poor academic attainment, significant anxiety symptomatology, and extreme demand avoidant behaviour. Neurodivergent CYP (92.1%) and, in particular, autistic CYP (83.4%) were significantly over-represented amongst CYP with SD. Co-occurring multi-modal sensory processing difficulties, ADHD, and anxiety were common. Mental health difficulties in the absence of a neurodivergent profile were relatively rare (6.17%). Hence, whilst not a story of exclusivity relating solely to autism, SD is a story of complexity. Moreover, despite clear evidence that SD creates a context that engenders negative educational and mental health outcomes, parental reports revealed a dearth of support for these CYP, and most parents of CYP currently experiencing SD (85.6%) were not confident, or no longer believed, school to be the suitable and proper place for their child to be educated. Similarly, whilst 97% of the CYP described here once attended a mainstream school setting, only 24.3% of CYP with historical SD were currently educated in a mainstream classroom, with the majority now home-educated.

School Attendance Problems | School Distress | School Refusal | Neurodiversity | Autism | Sensory Processing | Demand Avoidance | ADHD | Anxiety | Mental Health

Correspondence: ***sinead.mullally@newcastle.ac.uk***

Introduction

> **A withered boy who was so afraid, hiding from society in the shade, His solitary cries no-one did hear, his confused mind full of fear. His tortured soul locked inside, with his faded dreams that had died.**
>
> ***Damian Milton, Autistic scholar (1)***

A recent Attendance Audit published in March 2022 by the Children's Commissioner ("Where are England's Children?") (2) concluded that there are currently tens of thousands of children in England who are persistently or severely absent from education, or missing from education altogether. Specifically, based on data collected from a number of local authorities, they estimated that there were 1.7 million pupils persistently absent (missing over 10% of school sessions) and 124,000 pupils severely absent (missing over 50% of school sessions) from school in the autumn 2021 term, with most local authorities reporting persistent absence in 10-29% of pupils, and five local authorities reporting persistent absence in 30-50% of pupils.

Within their survey titled "The Big Ask" (2), the Children's Commissioner heard from nearly 5,000 children who said they were home educated and nearly 2,000 children who were not in school at all. Whilst some families chose to home educate for philosophical reasons, the findings of this survey revealed that the childrens' absence from school was commonly underpinned by factors such as bullying, struggling with anxiety and other mental health needs, and having special educational needs which weren't being identified or supported. In other words, *"these children were out of school, not because of choice, but because they hadn't received the support they need"*. Thus, this report highlighted the urgency of gaining a more nuanced understanding of this problem, and, in particular, of understanding who is most at risk of experiencing school attendance problems (SAPs) so that these children can be identified earlier and appropriately supported.

In the days prior to the release of the aforementioned report, we conducted a bespoke online questionnaire to characterise and better understand the situation for children and young people (CYP) in the UK who struggle to attend school, and that of their families. In a series of papers we will describe the characteristics of the CYP in our sample, describe how their SAPs present, explore the potential reasons underpinning these difficulties, seek to provide clarity with respect to how the CYP in our sample have been supported to access education and how successful this has been, and recount the experiences of parents who are struggling to support their children whilst navigating an often complex and adversarial system. This initial paper will focus on characterising the educational, neurodevelopmental, anxiety, and demand avoidant profiles of CYP cur-

DRAFT

rently experiencing (or who have previously experienced) SAPs, the impact of SAPs on educational and mental health outcomes, and describe parental views with respect to current and future educational provision.

School Distress:

Failure by the scientific community to agree a typology for describing SAPs (3) has stymied understanding and support, and led to a phenomena that is poorly described in the literature (4). Terms such as "school refusal", "school reluctance", and "school avoidance" have been used interchangeably throughout the literature to describe "school-phobic youth", with "school refusal" frequently used as an umbrella term to refer to anxiety-based school refusal and truancy (3). Such terms, and in particular "school refusal", are not however accepted as appropriate by those with lived experience of the phenomena, nor do they convey any information with respect to the emotional distress experienced by these CYP. We propose that SAPs underpinned by emotional distress are best described as "School Distress" (SD), given that for these CYP, emotional distress associated with school attendance is the core and driving feature of their SAPs. Research suggests that the onset of anxiety-based SAPs may be sudden or gradual, the expression of the distress may be verbal or physical, and school attendance may be full, partial, or non-existent (5, 6). Hence, just as SAPs are not necessarily triggered by SD, SD does not necessarily always result in school non-attendance. Indeed, parental reports suggest that extreme SD can occur in the absence of a decline in attendance rates. This questions the appropriateness of definitions of "school refusal" which mandate school absences, such as Blagg and Yule's (7) definition of School Refusal as “extreme difficulty in attending school with refusal and absence from school for at least three days” (p. 119), and similar definitions which have included at least 10%-50% absence in the prior month e.g. (8, 9). Instead, the concept of School Distress encompasses CYP who experience SD yet still manage to attend school, in addition to those who are unable to attend school. It also seeks to convey information to those individuals surrounding the CYP with respect to the child's experience and presentation, which we hope will intrinsically foster greater understanding and earlier recognition, ultimately leading to more empathetic and appropriate support.

Impact of School Distress:

The impact of what is often termed "school refusal" (SR) is multifaceted and enduring, influencing CYP's personal, social, academic, and vocational development (10). To explore this, Flakierska et al. (11, 12) conducted 12-20 and 20-29-year follow-up studies of 35 individuals who experienced SAPs in childhood, comparing them to a control group made up of the general population. Findings revealed that individuals with experience of SR received significantly more outpatient psychiatric care in adulthood. Additionally, this group were likelier to live with their parents in adulthood and had fewer children of their own. Hence, the authors suggested that individuals with a history of SR may have fewer social relationships in adulthood, potentially due to reduced social skills.

Several additional consequences of SR have been described throughout the literature. Potential short-term consequences include family conflict, reduced social interaction, and alienation from peers (13, 14). Longer-term impacts include academic underachievement, employment difficulties, maturational delays (cognitively, psychologically, and socially), and fewer opportunities to attend higher education (15–18).

Such consequences highlight the importance of gaining a better understanding of SD so as to allow for improved understanding of how best to prevent SAPs driven by SD, how to rapidly recognise emerging SD, and how best to support those CYP who experience SD. The latter is urgent given that the UK charity *Not Fine in School* (NFiS) currently support over 20,000 families of CYP who experience SAPs; cases which are predominately best described as SD. Moreover, ensuring appropriate and timely support is essential for these CYP in order to ensure that their difficulties accessing education in a school setting do not prevent them from accessing education more broadly, and ultimately, that these CYP do not have their life opportunities and/or their mental health compromised by barriers to school attendance.

Prevalence and Presentation of School Distress

Although SD likely accounts for a significant proportion of school absences, official figures are not available in the UK. This is because, whilst school absences are recorded, school absences specifically due to mental health difficulties are not coded differently to general absences. This prevents a full estimation of the scale of the problem. However, even if available, these figures would exclude the CYP with SD who manage to attend school but who experience significant distress whilst there, such as those CYP reported by their families to experience extreme emotional distress before or after attending school. Some authors working with this concept of school "refusal" estimate that SAPs due to emotional distress affect around 1% of school-aged children (19), although several other studies suggest higher estimates e.g. (16, 20). Such differences are likely due to the different conceptualisations used (21), and a lack of agreement on definitions and conceptualisations.

School "refusal" is considered equally common amongst boys and girls, and no socioeconomic differences have been noted between children who do and do not experience these difficulties (16). It has often been considered to be a symptom associated with a clinical diagnosis, such as social anxiety disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, specific phobia, major depression, oppositional defiant disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder, and adjustment disorder, among others (16). Possible presentations of SD include children missing school completely, pleading to miss school, displaying physical refusal in the morning to avoid school, or expressing somatic complaints (5, 13). Moreover, some children may successfully set off to school in the morning but become more and more anxious as they get closer to their school, preventing them from proceeding further (16). A more complete description of how SD presents in our cohort of CYP will be reported separately.

Current Understanding of Causes and Risk Factors:

Several studies have investigated the reasons underlying SAPs, including Havik et al. (22), who explored the perspectives of 17 parents of children experiencing SR using semi-structured interviewing. Findings demonstrated several school-related factors which contribute to SR, including noisy and disorganised classrooms, fear of teacher behaviour, bullying, social exclusion, unpredictability, and fear of failure. Further exploring the factors underlying SR, Baker and Bishop (23) and Kljakovic et al. (24) interviewed several secondary school-aged children with

extended SAPs about the causes of their difficulties. Key factors highlighted included anxiety, boredom, isolation, bullying, fear of teachers, and fatigue; several of which align with those identified by Havik et al. (22).

High levels of depression, anxiety, and stress have been widely evidenced in CYP experiencing school-related emotional distress (25–27). Given this, poor mental health (MH) is believed to increase the risk of SAPs amongst CYP. However, it is notable that the same pattern of results would be expected if poor mental health is a consequence of the distress experienced at school, as opposed to a cause of the SAPs in the first instance. Hence, the causal relationship is unclear. Moreover, despite anxiety being highlighted as one potential risk factor for SD, others have argued that most anxious students are able to attend school. Recognising this, Ingul and Nordahl (28) aimed to identify what differentiates anxious non-attenders from anxious school-attenders. Their findings revealed that the former had significantly more behavioural problems and reported having fewer close friends, whilst the latter displayed greater resilience. Additionally, anxiety type appeared to be of importance, with non-attenders having significantly higher social anxiety scores and reporting more symptoms of panic disorder/somatic syndrome, suggesting that they may avoid school as they associate it with the negative, physical symptoms of panic. Although causal conclusions again cannot be made, this study provides insight into the potentially important differences between anxious students who can and cannot attend school.

In addition, higher anxiety and depression scores have been found in the parents of school "refusing" children, compared to controls (29). Hence, poor parental mental health has been suggested to play a causal role in SAPs. Again, however, poor parental mental health may instead occur due to the stress associated with parenting a child who experiences SAPs and/or SD. Despite this, a history of psychiatric disorders in the parents or other relatives of CYP has also been found to be a significant risk factor for school "refusal". This is less likely to be influenced by current circumstances and suggests a picture of complexity with respect to the etiology of SAPs and SD from a genetic and/or environmental perspective (29). Additional factors which have been found to be associated with SAPs include internalising and externalising disorders (30), family and peer conflict, academic difficulties, family separation (10), perception of school as unsafe (31), family dysfunction (32), and loneliness (26), all of which are considered within the literature as potential causal factors. However, it is important to note that correlations are causally agnostic, and extreme care is needed not to over-interpret these findings without an understanding of the wider circumstances.

Autism

Autism has traditionally been characterised in the clinical and psychological literature as a deficit in social communication and interaction, the presence of restricted and repetitive patterns of behaviour, interests, or activities, and (more recently) differences in sensory processing (33). However, contemporary research and autistic scholars argue that a paradigm shift away from a deficit model of autism is needed and a more nuanced understanding is necessary; one that situates autistic communication differences within a wider social context and considers communication breakdowns as a consequence of differing perspectives between autistic and non-autistic individuals (34, 35). One undisputed aspect of the autistic lived experience is differences in sensory processing (36), with sensory processing differences believed to occur in as many as 90% of autistic individuals (37, 38).

In recent years, autism has become increasingly recognised as a risk factor for SAPs and SR. For instance, Ochi et al. (2020) discovered high rates of autism amongst children experiencing SAPs, with 40% of school 'refusing' participants revealed to be autistic. Given that the prevalence of autism is 1-2% (39), such figures highlight an increased risk of SAPs (and likely also of SD) in autistic children. Moreover, Munkhaugen et al. (6) identified teacher-reported SAPs in 42.6% of autistic students, compared to 7.1% of neurotypical (NT) students. Notably, this difference persisted when primary and secondary students were studied separately, indicating that autistic students are at heightened risk of SAPs across their school life. Furthermore, autistic CYP displayed SAPs on a significantly greater number of days than their neurotypical counterparts, indicating greater severity. This aligns with Ochi et al. (40) who reported a significantly lower mean age of onset of SAPs in autistic than non-autistic children. There are now multiple additional studies reporting high rates of autistic pupils amongst school "refusing" CYP (41).

Hence, there may be something specific about the autistic lived-experience of school that increases both risk of experiencing SAPs/SD and the severity of these difficulties, thereby attenuating the age at which these difficulties begin and increasing duration. If particular groups of individuals with a recognised disability are specifically affected by SD, then this is of grave concern; not least when one considers the recent Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman Report (July 2022), the Equality Act (2010), Section 17 of the Children Act (1989), and Article 2 Protocol 1 of the Human Rights Act (1998; *"No person shall be denied a right to an education"*).

Insights into why autistic CYP have a disproportionately negative experience at school, and thus why they may be at increased risk of SAPs/SD, are available from multiple sources. For instance, in a 2017 All Party Parliamentary Group on Autism, over 50% of autistic CYP reported being unhappy at school, and 40% of parents did not feel their child's needs were being met by their school place, with many participants highlighting sensory processing differences and social difficulties as detrimental to CYPs' classroom experiences (42). The latter figure rose to 74% in the 2021 version of this survey (43). In this same report, it is noted that 7 in every 10 autistic CYP feel that school would be better if more teachers understood autism, and parent reports emphasised how autistic children are commonly overwhelmed by the social and sensory demands of the school environment.

Providing further insight into the experiences of autistic CYP in school is a survey of 173 families from Northamptonshire, which attempted to gather the views of every parent or carer of an autistic child living within the county. Findings revealed that a critical issue for 42% of parents of autistic children in mainstream schools is the failure of school staff to understand the challenges faced by autistic children in mainstream schools, particularly autistic children with good academic abilities (44). This study also reported that over 40% of parents were concerned by school staff's tendency to blame the child for behaviours related to their autism, and a reliance on management strategies involving punishment. A more recent survey by Autistic UK (45)

of 249 parents, carers, and autistic children further highlighted difficulties with staff, alongside anxiety, sensory processing differences, depression, self-esteem, bullying, and trauma, as relevant factors underlying SAPs/SD.

The negative experiences of autistic children within the mainstream school environment were also directly explored in a qualitative study titled *"I felt closed in and like I couldn't breathe"* (46). CYP in this study reported that attempts at "inclusion" in mainstream school often result in exclusion, summarised under the theme labelled *"Exclusion in Inclusion"*. Specifically, the autistic CYP described their experiences of being socially, emotionally, and physically isolated from peers, being frequently unsupported and misunderstood by teachers, and experiencing significant feelings of dread due to the unpredictability of school, the social pressures faced, and the high noise levels encountered.

Hence, a number of different themes emerge in the literature in relation to the experience of autistic CYP in school, with anxiety, distress, sensory issues, feelings of exclusion within supposedly "inclusive" mainstream environments, a lack of teacher understanding of autism, peer difficulties, and social difficulties being common. We will explore these in more detail below.

Anxiety

Common across empirical studies, CYP reports, and parent reports, is the observation that anxiety plays an important role in the emergence and persistence of SD for many CYP. This is consistent in studies looking at CYP who experience difficulties attending school generally (e.g., (27), (26), (25)), and in studies looking at the autistic experience of school specifically. For instance, a 2020 study reported that 83.2% of the autistic children sampled indicated having experienced anxiousness in the school setting (47).

Severe anxiety may, however, be especially ubiquitous to the autistic CYP's experience of SD, as severe symptoms of anxiety frequently co-occur in autism (48), with atypical sensory function, difficulties in understanding and labeling emotions (alexithymia), anxiety surrounding uncertain or ambiguous situations (intolerance of uncertainty), and enhanced perception of threat (all typically elevated in autistic individuals, (49)) likely contributing. Notably, a recent qualitative study involving teachers with experience of working with autistic CYP in various school settings (50) reported that anxiety represented a key barrier to learning for autistic pupils in a classroom setting, with one teacher commenting *"their anxiety levels go so up so high they can't think"* (p.4).

Sensory Processing Difficulties

A second key barrier to learning identified by teachers in the latter-mentioned study was sensory issues (50), with one teacher commenting *"(he) flaps a lot, gets out of his seat, makes noises, traces things, and that issue with sensory processing has a direct impact on his education because if I'm standing teaching, he literally cannot concentrate on me"*, p.4).

Sensory processing is the mechanism by which the central nervous system receives and integrates input from the individual sensory systems to generate an appropriate behavioural response (51). Good sensory processing skills enable a person to integrate sensory information automatically and efficiently, whilst poor sensory processing skills stymies this effective integration. Sensory processing difficulties can affect one or multiple sensory systems, with these systems being hyper-reactive, hypo-reactive, or alternate between both states, leading to individuals with sensory processing difficulties being profiled as a 'sensory seeker' or a 'sensory avoider' (51). Many autistic individuals have been found to have persistent sensory processing differences across their lifespan (e.g. (52, 53)), experiencing hyper and/or hypo-reactivity within the affected sensory system(s).

Previous research exploring associations between sensory processing and emotional, behavioural, and educational classroom outcomes in autistic children has found that sensory processing difficulties relate to academic outcomes within a classroom environment. More specifically, tactile hypersensitivity and auditory filtering (i.e. the ability to process verbal instructions in noisy environments) was found to be linked to cognitive inattention and academic under-performance, and movement sensitivity was found to be linked to oppositional behaviour (54).

Moreover, consistent with (50), similar results were reported by the same research group in a separate study using a bespoke online questionnaire to capture parental (n=57) and teacher (n=70) perspectives on how sensory differences affect learning and life at school for autistic CYP. This study found that both parents and teachers reported frequent negative sensory experiences at school, and that these negative sensory experiences impacted learning, which in turn caused distraction and anxiety, and limited the autistic CYP's participation (55).

Hence, in keeping with previous findings [e.g. (50, 54–56)], sensory issues appear to relate to difficulties accessing education in a classroom setting for CYP, potentially increasing risk of SAPs and/or SD. Whilst the previous studies have focused specifically on autistic CYP, it is notable that sensory processing difficulties are not limited to autistic CYP, and can occur across NDs. For instance, sensory processing difficulties are also observed in ADHD (57), where more severe sensory processing problems have been found to be associated with Oppositional Defiant Disorder and anxiety (58). Moreover, a recent study of sensory-processing patterns in 118 preterm and 158 full term 6 year old children found that preterm born children had significantly different sensory processing patterns from their peers born at term (n=158) (59). Understanding the interaction between atypical development, sensory processing difficulties, and SAPs/SD may prove important in better understanding the risk and prevalence amongst individuals with differing needs/disabilities.

Marginalisation in Mainstream Education

The "exclusion through inclusion" and "isolation" themes raised in (46) align with D'Alessio's (60) concept of 'micro exclusion' in mainstream education, whereby students with high-level Special Education Needs (SEN) are frequently segregated and separated from peers (e.g., by being taught away from their peers for all or part of the day). Frequent micro-exclusions were also reported by Webster and colleagues (summarised in (61)), following a series of longitudinal studies, which collected data via both observation of pupils in the classroom and interviews with pupils, parents, and school staff. This data lead the authors to describe the experience of high-needs SEN CYP in mainstream education settings (both primary and secondary) as often equating to *"marginalisation masquerading as mainstream"* (p. 77) [see also (62–67)]. This marginalisation, Webster argues, is driven by the cumulative impact of frequent structural exclusions which cause a divergence in the everyday experiences of high-needs SEN students from those of their peers. These

are described as subtle granular forms of separation, which at the surface level appear innocuous, but which are cumulatively damaging, and can include the installation of a separate workstation for the CYP which physically isolates them, and the provision of a one-to-one teaching assistant (TA), which can cut across, replace, and reduce opportunities for CYP to interact with others in the room, including with their peers and teacher. Indeed, reflecting back this overarching finding, Webster entitled his textbook summarising this body of research evidence *"The Inclusion Illusion"* (61). This raises the possibility that high-needs SEN CYP more generally (and not just autistic CYP) will be over-represented in CYP with SD due to the exclusion and marginalisation that they face when accessing education in the mainstream schools.

However, separate work spaces and time away from the classroom are often recommended for autistic or otherwise ND CYP with sensory processing difficulties to help them to cope with both the noisy and busy environment in the classroom, which has been found to be detrimental to autistic children's learning in school [e.g. (54)], and the physical and emotional distress experienced by autistic CYP in school [e.g. (46)]. Moreover, classroom aids (e.g. TA) have been found to be a protective factor against school "refusal" caused by bullying victimisation in autistic and ADHD CYP, to which autistic and ADHD CYP are particularly vulnerable (68). Hence, there is significant complexity at play, whereby attempts to support one difficulty can have detrimental knock-on affects for CYP's sense of belonging, inclusion, and access to education within that modified environment.

Unfortunately, autistic CYP may be the most at risk of this form of marginalisation due to the complexities of their needs, coupled with the increasing tendency for autistic CYP to be educated in mainstream education settings as a consequence of worldwide educational inclusion policies (69).

Social Difficulties

Whilst studies such as (68) have highlighted links between school "refusal" and bullying victimisation in autistic and ADHD CYP, other studies have suggested that a large proportion of "school-avoidant" autistic students struggle socially and have no friends at school (31). This potentially dovetails in an important way with the previously discussed findings of Ingul and Nordahl (28), who suggested that anxious school non-attenders typically have fewer close friends, higher social anxiety scores, more behavioural problems, and more symptoms of panic disorder/somatic syndrome, than their anxious, but school-attending, contemporaries. Whilst Ingul and Nordahl (28) did not differentiate between autistic and non-autistic CYP within their participant groups, it is plausible (given the more recent research evidence) that autistic CYP were over-represented in their group of anxious school non-attenders, and thus they may have captured aspects unique to the autistic experience, rather than those unique to the anxious-non-school-attending experience. Importantly, they may also have captured issues arising from unsuccessful attempts of "inclusion" in mainstream educational settings.

In addition, Munkhaugen et al. (70) reported that the autistic children with SAPs in their study were significantly less socially motivated, displayed more deficits in initiating tasks or activities and in generating ideas, responses, or problem-solving strategies, and displayed more withdrawn and depressive symptoms, compared to autistic children without SAPs. However, whether these differences play a causal role in the establishment of SAPs, or arise as a consequence of the stress associated with the experience of school itself (with the experience itself causing some autistic children to withdraw from those around them), is unclear. Regardless, it is plausible that for CYP with specific social-interaction difficulties (e.g. autistic CYP), the daily pressure of having to navigate the highly-complex social networks that mainstream school attendance necessarily imposes (with both peers and teaching staff), coupled with structural exclusions within mainstream school environments, either singularly or in tandem, play important roles in triggering and maintaining SAPs and/or SD.

Providing further insight into the experience of autistic CYP in school is a recent paper (71) which explored the first impressions of primary school children of their autistic peers. First impressions are important as they have been shown to become rapidly entrenched and have enduring effects on an individual's attitudes and behaviours (72), with negative first impressions impacting the quantity and quality of future social interactions (73). In this study (71), children aged between 6 and 9 years of age rated autistic children significantly more negatively than neurotypical children on the basis of their looks (assessed using silent videos), their speech, and their speech content (assessed using speech transcripts). This finding indicates that autistic children are likely to be judged more negatively than other pupils even within their formative years, and right from the beginning of their time in education. This likely impacts the formation of friendships and any other social interactions they have within the school environment. This study also found that primary school children were significantly less likely to want to be friends with and to play with autistic CYP compared to neurotypical CYP, on the basis of both the brief audio clips of autistic children (5-6 seconds) and the transcript of these clips in isolation. Similar findings have been reported previously in adolescents and adults (e.g. (73–75)), but this is the first to show that even 6-9 year old primary school children form these rapid, negative first impressions of their autistic peers and would use these impressions to inform their selection of play mates. Hence, autistic children may find themselves isolated by peers right from the offset of their school careers based solely on prejudiced "thin slice judgements" (74).

Lack of Teacher Understanding

Concerns that pupils and families have shared with respect to a lack of teacher understanding of autistic pupils is supported by evidence revealing that student teachers on a four-year Initial Teacher Education course at a UK university, and their tutors, had little or no knowledge or understanding of basic autism teaching strategies (76). Indeed, the research publication that reported this finding included the question *"But how do I teach them?"* in its title. This is not necessarily surprising given the current dearth of theory and research into best-pedagogical practice for pupils with SEND in mainstream settings (77), and the concerning lack of research into understanding how to best support autistic pupils learning in the mainstream classroom (78).

Notably, Ravet et al. (76) also raised the issue of the 'invisibility' of the difficulties that academically-able autistic pupils can face, with their needs tending to be overlooked and teaching staff failing to recognise the challenges they face. Another

study found that teachers of autistic pupils report experiencing a tension when dealing with autistic pupils which can stem from their own anxiety with respect to being able to meet their autistic pupils' needs whilst simultaneously meeting the needs of the other students in their mainstream classroom (79). Such tensions were described by the authors as *"the unique problems that the inclusion of pupils with autism [in mainstream] can present"* (p. 407). Others have reported that, although teachers generally report positive relationships with autistic pupils, behaviour problems and the autistic child's peer status in the mainstream classroom can lessen the quality of the teacher-student relationship (80). Inconsistent with reports of generally positive relationships with teachers (by teachers), Blacher et al. found qualitative differences and considerably poorer student-teacher relationships between teachers and their autistic pupils, relative to both their same-age NT peers and same-aged peers with an intellectual disability (81). In keeping with (80), Blacher et al. found that teacher-reported child externalizing behavior and an autistic child's social skills accounted for significant variance in the total score on the Student Teacher Relationship Scale for autistic pupils. In addition, they found that autistic childrens' level of autistic mannerisms negatively related to their teacher's perception of closeness to them, whereby more autistic mannerisms was associated with less perceived closeness. Hence, autistic children face challenges with their relationships not only with their peers but also with their teachers, and are likely disadvantaged by a lack of teacher understanding of the autistic experience.

Pathological/Extreme Demand Avoidance

Whilst there is growing awareness that, for reasons discussed above, autistic CYP experience SAPs at higher rates than non-autistic CYP, parents of CYP who experience SAPs often highlight one specific aspect of their child's individual profile as being particularly instrumental in the difficulties that they face at school. Specifically, parents commonly highlight their child's difficulties coping with everyday demands, leading to extreme distress and/or extreme behaviours [*"best construed as panic attack"* (82)]. Such demands are omnipresent in the adult-directed mainstream educational setting. This indicates a potential link between SAPs and the disputed subtype of autism, Pathological Demand Avoidance (PDA).

The term PDA was first introduced in the 1980s by Professor Elizabeth Newson (Newson, 1989) to describe what her and her colleagues considered to be a distinct subtype of CYP within the diagnostic category of Pervasive Developmental Disorders (82, 83). It described CYP who demonstrate an obsessive resistance to everyday demands, an extreme need for control, and an apparently poor sense of social identity, pride, or shame (84). Although research is limited, one study using population cohort data from the Faroe Islands indicated that 1 in 5 autistic CYP may show some PDA-type characteristics, and 1 in 25 appear to show a PDA profile very consistent with Newson's original description (85). A key motivation for Newson's differentiation was that the lack of recognition of this *"markedly divergent overall presentation...[that] contributes to inappropriate handling and educational methods, since PDA children respond best to very different approaches compared with those suitable for autistic and Asperger children. In particular, they do not respond to behavioural methods like autistic children, nor to rule-based approaches like Asperger children"* (82). Instead, Newson observed that non-rule-based strategies, such as using novelty to engage the CYP and distractions from demands, tended to be more successful.

Despite Newson's work (which took place in the 1980s when the diagnostic criteria for autism were narrower), PDA does not currently appear as a clinical diagnosis in either the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5 (33)) or the International Classification for Diseases (ICD-11 (86)). However, it is recognised by the National Autistic Society (NAS) in the UK as a variant of autism, and "demand avoidant behaviours" are referenced in the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines (*"Autism spectrum disorder in under 19s: recognition, referral and diagnosis"*). More recently, it has been suggested that PDA may be more appropriately re-termed as 'Extreme Demand Avoidance' (EDA) (85), or should be fundamentally re-conceptualised as 'Rational Demand Avoidance' (RDA), i.e. as an understandable and rational response to the circumstances that one finds oneself in (1, 87).

In the absence of diagnostic clarity, Summerhill and Collett (88) point to anecdotal evidence indicating that when PDA/EDA/RDA children are not identified in a timely manner, their presentation is viewed by others as defiance and deliberately challenging behaviour, leading to school exclusions (78). This, in turn, perpetuates these CYP's learning, social relationships, and mental health difficulties (88). Moreover, recent evidence paints a very concerning picture for autistic CYP with a PDA/EDA/RDA profile. For instance, a 2018 online survey conducted by the PDA society (www.pdasociety.org.uk) found that 686 out of 980 (i.e. 70%) school aged CYP thought to have a PDA profile were either not enrolled in a school or were unable to tolerate their school environment (89). In addition, Truman et al. (90) found that whilst all parents of autistic CYP in their study described their child's experience of school as overwhelmingly negative, parents of autistic CYP with a PDA diagnosis (n=57) or suspected PDA (n=91) provided markedly more negative descriptions of their child's school experience than parents of autistic CYP who do not display PDA/EDA/RDA behaviours (n=63). Hence, autistic children with a PDA/EDA/RDA profile may be especially vulnerable to SD, in addition to the heightened vulnerability of autistic CYP more broadly. This links with the observation that elevated anxiety is a key characteristic of autistic CYP with PDA/EDA/RDA profiles (91), as anxiety (as discussed above) is unanimously agreed to play a central role in SD.

Importantly, PDA is not seen exclusively in autism. It has also been documented in other neurodivergencies such as selective mutism and language disorders, in epilepsy, and (less commonly) in the general population (85). Hence, PDA/EDA/RDA may play a role in SAPs and/or SD outwith of autism. Understanding how demand avoidance relates to SAPs and/or SD, and the parameters discussed above (e.g. anxiety, sensory processing differences...etc.) is critical in helping to establish how best to support neurodivergent CYP to access education. This is particularly important as pressure to comply with demands (e.g. forced school attendance) is well documented to lead to escalation in emotional reactivity and behavior that challenges in PDA/EDA/RDA CYP (92).

Impact of School Attendance on Mental Health

Noteworthy too, from the work of Truman and colleagues, is the finding that school was reported as an overwhelmingly negative experience for <u>all</u> autistic CYP (90), with parents reporting pro-

found consequences of these negative school experiences on their CYP's mental health. Importantly, the parents of these CYP felt that their CYP's elevated anxiety was a *"direct consequence of their children's negative school experience"* (p. 15). This replicates the findings of Brede et al. (93), who interviewed 9 autistic CYP (the majority of whom had a demand avoidant history), their parents, and school staff following exclusion from school. In all instances, both the CYP and their parents reported overwhelmingly negative accounts of the CYP's previous school experiences, with unmet needs and inappropriate approaches by school staff in dealing with the CYP's difficulties considered by the parents and the CYP to be causal in the decline in the CYP's mental health and behaviour. Such themes re-occur in the qualitative findings of Goodall (46) and numerous surveys of autistic CYP and their families, including those conducted by NAS e.g. (42).

Formally quantifying the neurodevelopmental, anxiety, and demand avoidant profiles of CYP who experience SAPs and/or SD is imperative in order to fully understand this population and the extent to which these difficulties are underpinned by neurodivergencies, anxiety, and demand avoidance. We also need to better understand how school attendance itself impacts on these CYP's mental health, given that the default position taken by professionals is often one of enforcing 100% attendance. Whether this is appropriate for these CYP is one which demands urgent attention.

Aims and Hypotheses

Given the gaps and methodological limitations within the current literature base, this study aims to:

1. Identify prevalent characteristics of CYP living in the UK who are currently struggling to/unable to attend school (or who have previously experienced such difficulties).
2. Quantify the proportion of cases of SAPs which are associated with emotional distress.
3. Explore the number and types of education settings attended by CYP with and without experience of SD, with a particular focus on their current access to education.
4. Investigate the impacts of SD on CYPs' attendance rates and academic attainment.
5. Assess the level of support being received by CYP who are currently experiencing SD.
6. Explore the prevalence of a range of ND conditions in CYP with experience of SD (and their families) relative to two control groups: a group of CYP who attend school but do not experience SD, and a group of CYP who have never attended a school setting i.e. Lifelong Electively Home-Educated (EHE) CYP.
7. Use existing standardised parent-report scales to measure anxiety levels and extreme demand avoidance behaviours in CYP with experience of SD, and compare these to age-matched CYP who do not experience difficulties attending school.
8. Quantify how school attendance impacts CYP's mental health.
9. Explore associations between anxiety, extreme demand avoidance, sensory processing difficulties, and four proxy-markers of SD severity (duration of SD, school attendance rates, age of SD onset, and impact of school attendance on MH).
10. Investigate parental opinion regarding whether school is a suitable and proper setting for their CYP to be educated in, and explore whether this opinion varies between parents with and without SD experience, and between parents of autistic and non-autistic CYP.

It is hypothesised that:

- Neurodivergent CYP will be over-represented amongst individuals with experience of SAPs, particularly autistic CYP and CYP with sensory processing difficulties.
- Anxiety will be prevalent in CYP with SAPs, particularly in autistic CYP.
- CYP who experience SAPs will be more likely to have neurodivergent parents/siblings.
- Autistic CYP, and CYP with more extensive sensory processing difficulties, will show more severe SAPs than their neurotypical peers.
- CYP who demonstrate PDA/EDA/RDA behaviours will be more likely to experience SAPs than CYP who demonstrate minimal PDA/EDA/RDA behaviours.

Methods

Participants - Participants were required to live within the UK and to be parents/carers of school-aged CYP. Initially, 1055 participants were recruited via volunteer sampling. Participants consisted of 738 parents of children currently experiencing SD (Current SD), 209 parents of children who have previously experienced SD (Past SD), 83 parents of children who have never experienced SD (No SD), and 25 parents of children who have never attended a school setting for reasons other than SD (i.e. Lifelong EHE). An additional 66 control parents (i.e. parents of CYP who have never experienced SD) were recruited via prolific.org to ensure aged-matched sampling with the CYP in the two SD groups, providing a total of 149 participants in the control group, and an overall sample of 1121 participants. Prolific participants were pre-screened to match the following criteria: sex = female, fluent languages = English, and Year of birth of first child = 2004-2011. To assist with age matching, prolific parents with more than one child were instructed to select their eldest child and to consider this child when completing the questionnaire. This ensured that the Current SD, Past SD, and No SD (control) groups were all matched in terms of chronological age. CYP in the Lifelong EHE group were significantly younger [Current SD = Past SD = No SD) > Elective EHE ($p < .001$)]. Postcodes were requested from participants and were then converted into Indices of Deprivation (IoD; (94)) For privacy purposes, many parents opted not to provide this information. On average, participants completed 77.35% of the survey, with 62.5% of respondents completing 100%. Across all four groups, most participants were mothers (97.03%). Table 1 displays key characteristics of the CYP, including current age, gender, ethnicity, country of residence, and position in family, and Figure 1 shows a map of the CYP experiencing SD in this study, by county.

In so far as possible, we use identity-first language (e.g. autistic CYP), although this is not always possible (e.g. CYP who experience sensory processing differences/difficulties...etc.). Unless



Fig. 1. Map of CYP currently experiencing School Distress, excluding Northern Ireland

otherwise indicated, prevalence rates for each ND were calculated by accepting endorsement of any one of the four options provided to parents [i.e. 1) has a clinical diagnosis, 2) is on the diagnostic pathway, 3) has had a referral refused, or 4) is suspected but has never been referred and/or diagnosed] as indicative of the CYP having the specific ND. We used the term non-autistic to refer to a CYP whose parents did not endorse any of these response options with respect to autism. This does not preclude this CYP from having another neurodivergency. We use the term neurotypical (NT) to refer to CYP whose parent identified them as not being neurodivergent (i.e. CYP whose parents stated that they were not neurodivergent after reading the following definition: *neurodivergence is a term for when someone's brain processes, learns, and/or behaves differently from what is considered 'typical'. Autism is an example of a neurodivergence*).

This study was approved by the Faculty of Medical Sciences Research Ethics Committee, part of Newcastle University's Research Ethics Committee.

Participants were asked to read the information sheet and provide consent before beginning the survey. Participants were informed that they could skip any questions and stop the survey at any time, but that incomplete responses would still be analysed unless requested otherwise via email. Qualtrics' display-logic function ensured respondents were only asked those questions which were relevant to them, based upon their experience of SAPs/SD and their responses throughout the survey. Participants were designated to one of four groups based on their response to the following question: "Has your child ever experienced difficulties attending school?". The response option 'Yes, currently' assigned them to the Current SAPs/SD group, 'Not currently, but they have in the past' to the Past SAPs/SD group, 'No, never' to the No SD control group, and 'Not applicable as child never attended a school setting' to the Lifelong EHE group. Participants could stop and start at any time. Upon completing the questionnaire, participants were presented with a debrief form, which included a comprehensive list of support services. This list was also made available to participants who did not complete the study, and was pinned to the top of the lab's Facebook site so that parents could access the support even if they decided not to participate in the study. The study ran for 14 days (Tuesday 22nd February 2022 - Tuesday 8th March 2022).

Design The study employed a case-control, concurrent embedded, mixed-methods design, within which qualitative data was collected to supplement quantitative data. This design was chosen due to the exploratory nature of this study, and because the limited literature base prevented us from providing fully comprehensive lists of response options to some questions. To collect qualitative data, free text boxes were presented within some questions for parents to provide additional comments, and at the end of the survey to capture any additional information that parents felt was relevant to their, or their child's, experiences. The results reported here are largely quantitative, with some parental comments reported to support understanding. Thematic analyses will be reported elsewhere.

Materials A bespoke online questionnaire was developed for this research. Participants were first asked whether their child currently, or has previously, experienced difficulties attending school.

The survey contained four sections and 76 questions, however only certain questions were presented to each respondent, based upon their answers throughout the survey. Several questions were included for parents of children with no SD experience to provide comparison data. Questions and response options were developed based upon a comprehensive review of the literature, and aimed to collate key information about the respondent and their CYP, their CYP's experience of SAPs and/or SD, and the impact of SAPs/SD on the respondent themselves.

Procedure

Data was collected using Qualtrics. The survey link was advertised on several Facebook pages, including 'Newcastle University Cognitive Development Lab', whose post was shared 228 times. Participants recruited via prolific.org were directed to the Qualtrics link.

This paper will report the data from the questions and clinical scales described below. Data relating to how SAPs and SD presents, the reasons underlying SD, the efficacy of accommodations/supports/treatments, and the impacts of SD on parents will be reported elsewhere.

1) Demographic Information: Participants were asked to provide information with respect to their relationship to the CYP, and their child's country of residence, spoken language, ethnicity, age (in years + months), gender identity (see Table 1 for options provided), number of siblings, and the ages of their siblings. Postcodes were also requested and, where provided, converted into Index of Multiple Deprivation Decile (94), where Decile 1 represents the most deprived 10% of small areas in England and Decile 10 represents the least deprived 10%. The measure excludes families living in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. Prolific participants living in England were asked to calculate their IMD decile themselves (using https://www.fscbiodiversity.uk/imd/) and to provide this information directly.

Demographics	All	Current SD	Past SD	No SD	Lifelong EHE
n (%)	1121	738 (65.8)	209 (18.6)	149 (13.3)	25 (2.2)
Respondent's Relationship to Child (%)					
Mother	1077 (97.0)	707 (96.6)	200 (98.0)	145 (97.3)	25 (100)
Father	18 (1.6)	14 (1.9)	1 (0.5)	3 (2.0)	0
Other	15 (1.4)	11 (1.5)	3 (1.5)	1 (0.7)	0
Mean Age in Years ± SD	11.6 ± 3.3	11.8 ± 3.1	11.8 ± 3.6	11.1 ± 3.5	8.7 ± 3.0
Gender (%)					
Cisgender Boy	577 (52.1)	381 (52.1)	117 (57.6)	68 (45.6)	11 (44.0)
Cisgender Girl	471 (42.5)	300 (41.0)	77 (37.9)	80 (53.7)	14 (56.0)
Transgender Boy	9 (0.8)	9 (1.2)	0	0	0
Transgender Girl	1 (0.1)	0	1 (0.5)	0	0
Non-binary	27 (2.4)	23 (3.1)	4 (2.0)	0	0
Self-describe	11 (1.0)	8 (1.1)	3 (1.5)	0	0
Prefer not to say	12 (1.1)	10 (1.4)	1 (0.5)	1 (0.7)	0
IMD Decile	6.04 (2.9)	6.16 (2.8)	5.51 (3.1)	6.17 (2.9)	5.50 (2.6)
Ethnic Group (%)					
White	693 (93.4)	458 (93.5)	113 (95.8)	106 (90.6)	16 (94.1)
Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups	37 (5.0)	24 (4.9)	4 (3.4)	9 (7.7)	0
Asian/Asian British	6 (0.8)	3 (0.6)	1 (0.8)	1 (0.9)	1 (5.9)
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	3 (0.4)	2 (0.4)	0	1 (0.9)	0
Other Ethnic Group	3 (0.4)	3 (0.6)	0	0	0
Main Language (%)					
English	735 (99.3)	484 (99.2)	117 (100)	117 (99.2)	17 (100)
Other	5 (0.7)	4 (0.8)	0	1 (0.8)	0
Country of Residence (%)					
England	980 (88.3)	644 (88.0)	183 (89.7)	129 (86.6)	24 (96.0)
Scotland	94 (8.5)	68 (9.3)	13 (6.4)	13 (8.7)	0
Wales	22 (2.0)	14 (1.9)	5 (2.5)	2 (1.3)	1 (4.0)
Northern Ireland	14 (1.3)	6 (0.8)	3 (1.5)	5 (3.4)	0
Siblings (%)					
Yes	850 (79.7)	571 (81.1)	145 (75.9)	118 (79.2)	16 (69.6)
No	217 (20.3)	133 (18.9)	46 (24.1)	31 (20.8)	7 (30.4)
Position in Family (%)					
Youngest	329 (33.6)	250 (39.2)	54 (30.5)	20 (14.1)	5 (22.7)
Middle	92 (9.4)	68 (10.7)	17 (9.6)	5 (3.5)	2 (9.1)
Eldest	314 (32.1)	169 (26.5)	57 (32.2)	81 (57.0)	7 (31.8)
Twin	27 (2.8)	18 (2.8)	3 (1.7)	5 (3.5)	1 (4.5)
Only Child	217 (22.2)	133 (20.8)	46 (26.0)	31 (21.8)	7 (31.8)

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the sample (N=1121)

2) School Attendance Difficulties (CYP): Where school attendance difficulties were indicated as current, parents were asked their child's age when these difficulties began and how long these difficulties have been ongoing. They were also asked to estimate how many days their CYP had attended school in the previous four school weeks, excluding school holidays (i.e. over the proceeding 20 school days). Attendance rates for the current academic year (2021/22) and the previous academic year (2020/21; excluding periods of absences relating to Covid-19) were also estimated. Where school attendance difficulties were indicated as past, parents were asked to estimate their CYP's school attendance rate whilst they were experiencing these difficulties, and to briefly describe how long these difficulties persisted and how they were resolved. All parents of CYP with SAPs were asked to describe these difficulties by selecting one of the four following options [Self-corrective school avoidance (i.e. absenteeism that remits spontaneously within 2 weeks); Acute school avoidance (i.e. absenteeism that lasts from 2 weeks to 1 year); Chronic school avoidance (i.e. absenteeism that lasts longer than 1 year); None of the above. It looks more like...(please use the box to describe)]. Parents were also asked whether any of the child's siblings also have a history of SAPs.

3) Educational Information: Parents were asked to indicate the type of educational provision that their child currently (and if relevant, previously) attended. They were also asked to indicate the total number of schools attended by their child, to describe their child's overall current academic progress with respect to their expected progress, and to indicate if their child was currently receiving any SEN support at school. Parents could indicate if their child receives no additional support, receives SEN support (e.g. is on the SEN register), or has an EHCP/Statement/CSP/ALN (or similar) in place or in process. Parents were also asked if their child had ever been excluded (fixed-term or permanent) or off-rolled from a school/educational provision. They were provided with the following definition of off-rolling to assist (*"Off-rolling is the practice of removing a pupil from the school roll without using a permanent exclusion, when the removal is primarily in the best inter-*

ests of the school, rather than the the best interests of the pupil. This includes pressuring a parent to remove their child from the school roll". Where off-rolling was indicated to have occurred, parents were asked to provide information with respect to its duration and nature. With respect to future educational opportunities, parents were asked about where (i.e. what type of provision) they wished to be available for their child in the future, and what type of provision they felt was realistically going to be available/offered to their child in the future.

4) Child Health and Neurodivergencies: In order to better understand the needs of CYP who struggle to attend school, parents then completed a number of questions about their child's physical and mental health, and neurodevelopmental history. Firstly, parents were asked "Does your child have any physical or mental health difficulties" (No, Maybe, Yes; plus a free text box option to specify if the parents wished to), and "Is your child neurodivergent?" (No, Maybe, Yes). Parents were provided with the following definition when answering this question *"neurodivergence is a term for when someone's brain processes, learns and/or behaves differently from what is considered typical. Autism is an example of a neurodivergence"*. If a parent selected yes or maybe to the latter question, they were then provided with a list of possible neurodevelopmental differences (for details see Table 6), and asked to select all that apply to their child. Participants were provided with four response options: 1) has a clinical diagnosis of the condition, 2) is on the diagnostic pathway, 3) has had a referral refused, or 4) is suspected of having the condition but has never been referred and/or diagnosed. Parents who selected the sensory processing option were subsequently provided with a list of the eight sensory systems (i.e. Visual (Sight), Auditory (Hearing), Tactile stimulation (Touch), Olfactory (Smell), Gustation (Taste), Vestibular (Balance), Proprioceptive (Movement), and Interoceptive (Perception of sensations within the body)), and were asked to identify all of the sensory systems in which their child experienced difficulties. Parents who selected the intellectual disability option were asked to select the option which best describes their child's Intellectual Disability (mild-moderate, severe, profound). In order to gain a wider understanding of the CYP's family history with respect to neurodivergency, we asked whether either of the CYP's parents, or their siblings, are neurodivergent.

In an additional set of questions presented later in the questionnaire, parents were asked to identify reasons for their child's SAPs from a given list. Whilst the data from this question will be reported in full elsewhere, parents who identified anxiety as a cause of their child's SAPs were subsequently asked to indicate which of the following best described this anxiety: anxious arousal, generalised anxiety, obsessive-compulsive disorder, selective mutism, performance anxiety, separation anxiety, uncertainty, I'm not sure, or Other. Data from this question will be discussed within this paper.

Finally, all parents, regardless of their child's educational history, were asked to complete the 24-item Anxiety Scale for Children–Autism Spectrum Disorder–Parent Version (ASC-ASD-P) (95). The ASC-ASD-P was selected given the anticipated high rates of autistic CYP in our sample. This was developed for use with autistic CYP and was derived from a well-validated measure of anxiety used with typically developing children (the Revised Children's Anxiety and Depression Scale (96)). This parent-report measure provides a total anxiety score, and individual scores for Separation Anxiety (five items; maximum score 15), Uncertainty (eight items; maximum score 24), Performance Anxiety (five items; maximum score 15), and Anxious Arousal (six items; maximum score 18). Parents respond along a 4-point Likert scale (0=never, 3=always), and total scores are calculated by summing responses, with higher scores indicating greater levels of anxiety. The ASC-ASD-P has a score range of 0-72. A total score of 20-23 suggests "significant anxious symptomatology", and scores of above 24 are considered to be a "more specific indication of significant anxiety" (95). Comparing ASC-ASD-P data with parent-reported clinical anxiety diagnosis status has found that all CYP with a clinical anxiety diagnosis scored 20 or above on the ASC-ASD-P, whilst 71% scored 24 or above (97). The ASC-ASD-P has excellent internal consistency (α=0.94) and good convergent validity.

5) Demand Avoidance: All parents were also asked to complete the 8-item Extreme Demand Avoidance-8 Caregiver Report Questionnaire (EDA-8) (92). The EDA-8 is an adapted, refined, 8-item version of the Extreme Demand Avoidance Questionnaire (EDA-Q) (98). It was refined based upon the results of principal components analysis and item response theory on parent/caregiver-report data from 334 autistic CYP, aged 5–17 years (EDA-Q). This identified eight items that were discriminating indices of EDA traits, and behaved similarly with respect to quantifying EDA irrespective of child age, gender, reported academic level, or reported independence in daily living activities. These 8 items cover the features consistently described in accounts of PDA: obsessive avoidance of demands and requests, outrageous or shocking behavior to avoid, need for control, poor awareness of hierarchy, and lability of mood, and make up the "EDA-8". The EDA-8 has good internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .90) and convergent and divergent validity, and as such, is proposed to be a useful tool to identify autistic children who show an extreme response to demands (92). Parents respond along a 4-point Likert scale (0 = Not at all true, 1 = Somewhat True, 2 = Mostly True, 3 = Very True). Total EDA-8 scores are calculated by summing responses, with higher scores indicating greater EDA. Cut-off scores are not currently available for the EDA-8 (or the EDA-Q).

6) Impact of School Attendance on Wellbeing/Mental Health: All parents were also asked to rate how attending school impacts their child's mental health, using seven response options [Extremely positively (+3), Very positively (+2), Somewhat positively (+1), Neither positively nor negatively (0), Somewhat negatively (-1), Very negatively (-2), Extremely negatively (-3)]. Hence, CYP whose mental health is positively impacted as a consequence of attending school score above 0, and a CYP whose mental health is negatively impacted as a consequence of attending school score below 0. Parents were also asked to rate how often their child leaves the house and does something fun (excluding going to school). Five response options were provided [Everyday, Frequently (a few times a week), Sometimes (once a week), Rarely (please estimate in box below), Never]. Finally, parents of CYP with experience of SD and who also reported a wellbeing-related reason for their CYP's SD, were asked whether being out of school helps to improve their child's wellbeing (Response options: Yes definitely, Yes somewhat, No, Other).

7) Is School "Suitable and Proper?": Based on their experience as a parent, parents were asked whether they believe that school is the suitable and proper place for their child to be educated. The three response options provided were: Yes, Maybe, and No.

Parents of Lifelong EHE CYP were not asked this question as it was considered that their responses (i.e. No) was already evidenced by their decision not to choose a school-based education for their child.

Data Analysis

Data Analysis Quantitative data analyses were run using IBM SPSS Statistics V26. Descriptive statistics were calculated to summarise participants' responses to each question. Further statistical analyses were then conducted to examine relationships between variables. Before performing statistical analyses, normality was assessed by plotting results in histograms and conducting Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests. When results were not normally distributed, non-parametric methods were used (e.g. Kruskal-Wallis tests with bonferroni-corrected pairwise comparisons, Mann-Whitney U tests, etc.). A significance level of α=0.05 was adopted for all analyses.

Chi-squared tests were used to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the expected frequencies and the observed frequencies in one or more categories. For example, chi-square tests with chi-square post-hoc analyses were used to examine associations between being neurodivergent and experiencing SD, between being autistic and experiencing SD, and between having sensory processing difficulties in multiple sensory systems as opposed to no sensory processing difficulties. They were also used to examine differences in the frequency of different neurodivergent diagnoses in autistic and non-autistic individuals between groups, and to identify any associations between academic attainment and SD experience. Odds Ratios (ORs) were calculated as an estimate of effect size. To correct for multiple comparisons in the analysis, a Bonferroni-corrected alpha level was used. Chi-square analyses were only performed on variables with expected cell counts of at least five, and Fisher's exact tests were used for cell counts below 5. Impact of school attendance was explored statistically using non-parametric Wilcoxon signed rank test, comparing each groups median score to '0' (i.e. no impact on mental health).

As CYP in the Lifelong EHE group were significantly younger than CYP in the other three groups [Current SD = Past SD = No SD) > Elective EHE ($p < .001$)], it was necessary to conduct additional analyses using more precisely age-matched comparison groups. Hence, for each CYP in the Lifelong EHE group, two aged-matched participants were identified from each of the three other groups (i.e. two from the Current SD group, two from the Past SD group, and two from the No SD Group). The selected CYP from each group were the two CYP who were closest in age to the corresponding Lifelong EHE CYP. Analyses were then replicated using this reduced sample size, and conclusions specific to the Lifelong EHE group were derived from these results.

Correlational analyses were conducted to examine the relationships between variables using Spearman rho correlations.

Results

1. Demographic Information:

For summary of demographic information, see Table 1.

Gender: 52.1% of the CYP in the sample were identified by their parents as cisgender boys, 42.5% as cisgender girls, 2.4% as non-binary, 0.8% as transgender boys, 0.1% as transgender girls, and the remaining 2.1% were split between the "self-describe" and "prefer not to say" options.

Current Age: The mean age of the CYP in our sample was 11.6 years. As described above, there was an overall between-group difference with respect to current age [$F(3, 1106) = 8.548$, $p < 0.001$]. Post-hoc analyses indicated that this difference was driven by CYP in the Lifelong EHE group who were significantly younger than the three other groups [Current SD versus Past SD: $p = 1.0$; Current SD versus No SD Control: $p = 0.159$; Past SD versus No SD Control: $p = 0.348$; Lifelong EHE versus No SD Control: $p = 0.004$]. No differences remained for the Lifelong EHE age-matched subgroup ([$F(3, 171) = 0.084$, $p = .969$].

Indices of Deprivation: In total, Index of Multiple Deprivation Decile data was available for 348 families (47%) in the Current SD group, 97 families in the Past SD group (53%), 88 families (59%) in the No SD group, and 4 families (16%) in the Lifelong EHE group. Based on this data, there were no significant between-group differences with respect to the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) Decile scores [$F(3, 533) = 1.413$; $p = .238$].

A one sample t-test was performed to compare the mean IMD Decile against the population mean. As the IMD decile is a dimension which places the deprivation scores of individual areas in England into one of ten groups of equal frequency, ranging from 1 (the 10% most deprived areas) to 10 (the 10% least deprived areas), we estimated the population mean to be 5.5. The overall mean IMD Decile was 6.04 (StDev 2.9), which was significantly greater than the population mean; $t(536) = 4.312$, $p < .001$. Broken down into individual groups, the Current SD group mean (6.16, StDev 2.82) and the No SD control group mean (6.17, StDev 2.96) were significantly greater than the population mean [Current SD: $t(347) = 4.368$, $p < .001$, No SD: $t(88) = 2.127$, $p < .001$], whilst the Past SD group mean (5.50, StDev 3.09) and the Lifelong EHE group mean (5.50, StDev 2.65) were not significantly different than the population mean [Past SD: $t(96) = 0.16$, $p = .987$, Lifelong EHE: $t(3) = 0.000$, $p = 1.000$].

Birth Order: We also examined birth order of the CYP. Unfortunately, due to recruitment methods (where a proportion of the No SD control group were explicitly requested to consider their eldest child when completing the questionnaire), it was not possible to directly compare birth order between groups. However, looking within group, only 47.3% of CYP in the Current SD group were first born children (26.5% 'eldest' children and 20.8% an 'only' child; see Table 1 for further details), relative to 49.9% who were younger siblings (39.2% 'youngest' and 10.7% middle children). This pattern is notable when considered within the context of the typical family structure within the UK, where recent Office for National Statistics census data indicated that there were 3.46 million one-child families in the UK, 3.45 million two-children families, and only 1.24 million three or more children families (99), making it considerably more likely for a UK CYP to be a first-born child than any other birth order position. Given this pattern, we asked whether younger children also have older siblings who have experienced SD. This is relevant as it may indicate potential environmental and/or genetic factors, which may act either singly or cumulatively, to increase the risk of SD for younger siblings. As anticipated, having an older sibling who had also experienced SAPs was common. More specifically, 42.9% of younger siblings in the Current SD

Current Setting	*n*	Attendance in previous 20 days	Academic Year 2021/22	Academic Year 2020/21	Number of Schools Attended	Duration of SD (years)
Mainstream School	393	10.18 days (7.2)	61.56% (29.8)	73.82% (24.8)	2.17 (1.0)	3.46 yrs (2.9)
Unit within Mainstream	25	6.35 days (6.7)	47.82% (24.5)	57.5% (26.6)	2.44 (1.0)	3.8 yrs (2.4)
Specialist School	34	10.88 days (6.4)	52.8% (32.7)	44.21% (33.7)	3.26 (1.0)	5.06 (2.9)
PRU or similar	27	8.45 days (8.2)	38.65% (32.8)	50.85% (31.1)	3.26 (1.2)	3.97 (2.2)
In-Limbo/Unspecified	77	0.89 days (3.6)	22.45% (31.59)	46.11% (37.1)	2.29 (1.0)	4.48 (3.3)
EOTAS	35	0.56 days (1.8)	13.47% (23.8)	35.13% (36.2)	2.8 (1.3)	4.81 (2.4)
Other	8	10 days (9.7)	44.17% (39.0)	56.8% (33.0)	2.75 (1.2)	4.11 (1.5)

Table 2. School Attendance: Current SD Group x Current Placement. The 'In-limbo/Unspecified' category combines CYP who had previously been registered at an educational provision but whose parents did not select a current educational provision category for them. From their parents' comments in response to various questions, it was evident that for the majority of these CYP, no option was selected as they were unable to access the provision that they were once registered at, with many of these CYP best described as being in educational limbo. For simplicity, the category did not include CYP whose parents rated their current placement as coerced or elective home education. PRU = Pupil Referral Unit.

group, and 46.5% of younger siblings in the Past SD group, also had an older sibling/s with a history of SAPs. Similar figures were obtained when 'youngest' children are considered in isolation (see Figure S1).

2. School Attendance Difficulties:

***Age of Onset and Duration of SAPs*: The mean age of onset of SD across both groups was 7.89 (StDev 3.37) years. This was younger in the Past SD group (7.19 years of age; StDev 3.21) than in the Current SD group (8.07 years of age; StDev 3.21).**

The mean duration of SD was 3.99 years (StDev 2.95). This was longer for CYP whose difficulties had now resolved (i.e., those in the Past SD group; Mean 4.79 years; StDev 3.12), than in the Current SD group, whose difficulties were still ongoing (Mean 3.79 years; StDev 2.88).

Hence, SD began significantly earlier in the Past SD group ($p < .01$), and lasted significantly longer ($p < .001$), likely because the CYP in the Current SD group were still experiencing SD. There were also significant differences between autistic CYP and non-autistic CYP who experienced SD, with the age of onset of SD for autistic CYP significantly younger than for non-autistic CYP, and SD reported as being significantly more enduring in autistic CYP than in non-autistic CYP (see Figure 2).

Given the timing of this research (22nd February-8th March 2022), with survey completion occurring just under 2 years after the initial Covid-19 school closures which began in the UK on 20th Match 2020, we explored the percentage of SD cases that began after the Covid-19 pandemic (< 2 years prior to the survey), relative to those whose origins preceded the disruption to school attendance caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. In the majority of cases, the onset of SD preceded the Covid-19 related school closures (69.82% of cases in the Current SD group and 85.15% of cases in the Past SD group).

***School Attendance Problems or School Distress*: For 94.32% of CYP in the sample, parents indicated that their child's SAPs were either partially or fully emotionally based.**

The existing categories for school "refusal" within the literature (100) (i.e. self-corrective: *absenteeism that remits spontaneously within 2 weeks*, acute: *absenteenism that lasts from 2 weeks to 1 year*, and chronic: *absenteenism that lasts longer than 1 year*), failed to capture a significant proportion of the experiences of the CYP in this sample (see Table S1; Other).



Fig. 2. Panel A: Age of Onset of SD. Panel B: Duration of SD. Error bars: ±1 SEM

More specifically, whilst self-corrective SAPs accounted for 15.6% of presentations (15.4% and 16.2% in Current and Past SD groups respectively), acute SAPs for 23.0% (25.2% and 14.5% in Current and Past SD groups), and chronic SAPs for 24.4% (26.8% and 15.1% for Current and Past SD groups), this left 37.1% of cases (n=320) falling outside of these categories. Examining the Past SD group alone, the 'none of the above' category was selected by 54.2% of parents. Parents who selected 'none of the above' were asked to describe what their child's SD does look like using a free text box. Example responses included: *"We always got him there - but it was hard on many days"*, *"Occasional days off but having to carry a kicking screaming child into school everyday"*, *"We are able to get her into school most days by carrying her...but if she was bigger...she would be missing school"*, *"Will attend more times than not but frequently late/part of day only and does not go to lessons or if he does will read or do his own writing rather than engaging with curriculum"*, *"sporadic - in response to situations and difficulties at school with particular lessons, teachers or students"*, and *"it's lasted 10 years! Coping on and off depending on which environment she was in"*.

3. Educational Information:

***Type of Education Setting Attended*: Overall, 97% of the CYP in the sample had previously, or were currently, attending a mainstream school setting (Current SD 97%, Past SD 97%, and No SD 99%). Hence, although not exclusive to mainstream education, our sample was dominated by CYP whose school attendance history included a mainstream school provision. Almost all CYP in the No SD control group were currently attending a mainstream school. Of the CYP with a history of SD, 96.3% (non-autistic CYP) and 97.4% (autistic CYP) were currently, or had previously, attended a mainstream school.**

The average number of schools attended by CYP in our sample was 2.24 (StDev 1.085) [Current SD = 2.36 (StDev 1.094), Past SD = 2.22 (StDev 1.164), and No SD = 1.86 (StDev 0.814)], (range: 1-6). There was a significant between group difference with respect to number of schools attended [$F(2, 1007) = 12.986$, $p < .001$], with the No SD control group attending significantly fewer schools than either of the SD groups (Current SD > No SD $p < .001$; Past SD > No SD $p = .009$). There was no difference with respect to number of schools attended for the two SD groups ($p = .360$).

***School Attendance*: On average, CYP currently experiencing SD attended school on 7.7 out of the 20 school days prior to survey completion, with 184 CYP (25.1%) not managing to attend school for a single day over these 20 days. Represented in terms of missed school days, a cumulative total of *6,197 school days had been missed in the previous 4 weeks alone* by the Current SD group.**

When considering attendance rates over the current academic year (survey conducted mid-Spring term in the academic year 2021/22), the average attendance rate in the Current SD group was 49.92%, down from 62.97% for the previous academic year (2020/21) (n=734). Notably, 14.7% of CYP in the Current SD group were unable to attend school for a single day (0% attendance rate), whilst 2.7% attended every day (100% attendance rate). 87% of CYP in the Current SD group had an attendance rate of 90% or below, and therefore were persistently absent, and 45.28% had an attendance rate of below 50%, and were therefore severely absent. Of the 14.7% of CYP with a 0% attendance rate for 2021/22, only 3 CYP (out of 70) were rated as being neurotypical (NT) by their parents. Of the remaining 67 CYP, 64 were identified as autistic by their parents: 48 (75%) had received diagnoses of autism, 13 (20.3%) were on an autism assessment pathway, and 3 (4.7%) were suspected to be autistic but had not yet been referred for assessment. Of the 3 CYP identified as ND but not autistic, 1 had suspected ADHD, 1 had sensory processing difficulties, auditory processing disorder and hypermobility, and 1 CYP's ND was not disclosed.

Reflecting back on the previous academic year (2020/21), 6.2% of the CYP in the Current SD group had not managed to attend school for a single day (i.e. 0% attendance rate), and 76.4% had an attendance rate of 90% or below (i.e. persistent absence), and 28.75% had an attendance rate below 50% (i.e. severely absent). Just 4.3% attended school every single day (i.e., 100% attendance rate).

During analysis, attendance rates were broken down by current educational setting (see Table 2). This revealed some notable differences, particularly with respect to those CYP who are currently experiencing SD and attending a mainstream school classroom and those attending a specialist school. Notably, the former group were, on average, earlier in their SD journey than CYP in the four other categories of education setting, with their SD duration averaging 3.46 years relative to 5.06 years for CYP now currently attending a specialist school (although this difference failed to reach significance statistically $p = .079$). Interestingly, CYP whose current setting was a mainstream classroom were found to have a relatively high attendance rate for the academic year 2020/21 (73.82%), compared to CYP now attending a specialist school, who had the lowest average attendance rates for the academic year 2020/21 (33.7%; note that we do not know where these CYP were educated in the 20/21 academic year). The difference between these two groups (i.e. CYP whose current setting is a mainstream classroom and CYP whose current setting is a specialist school) was statistically significant for this academic year (i.e. 2020/21) ($p < .001$), but not for the more recent time points (i.e. the academic year 2021/22 and the previous 20 days), likely indexing the longevity of the former group's difficulties (coupled with a potentially improving situation for the CYP now attending specialist schools).

***Current Access to Education*:**

***Current SD Group*: As evidenced below, a considerable proportion of the Current SD group cannot access their current educational setting [188/624 (30.13%) CYP for whom we have data; see Table 3, column 4]. When CYP whose parents are currently taking sole responsibility for providing their education are included in the tally (i.e. elective home education arrangements driven by SD), 35.31% (238/674) of CYP in the Current SD group do not have access to an educational provision provided by their local authority.**

As described in Table 2, the parents of 77 CYP did not select one of the educational provision categories for their child, as their child appeared to exist in a form of educational limbo. This was in addition to the parents who indicated that they have been forced to EHE their children. Consistent with our description of this group as being in an educational limbo, 88.3% of the parents in the "in limbo" group described their child as currently being without any form of educational provision (see Tables 3 and S2). The second largest group classified as being "currently without education" by their parents were CYP who were currently attending a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) or similar (33.3%).

In addition to past (column 2) and current (column 3) educational provision for the CYP in the Current SD group, Table 3 also outlines preferred and realistic future education provisions, with column 5 indicating the educational provision that parents indicated that they would like for their child to attend in the future, and column 6 indicating the provision that they believe their local authority will realistically provide their child in the future. Only 35.6% of parents in the Current SD group wished for their child to be educated in a mainstream school in the future (see Table 3, column 5), followed by EOTAS (28.3%), and education in a specialist school (20.2%). There were marked differences between the provision that parents wished for their child to receive in the future and the provision that they felt would be offered to them by their local authority (see Table 3, Column 6).

***Past SD group*: Of the CYP with historical difficulties with SAPs and/or SD for which data was provided (103/149), only 42.72% remain in an educational setting currently. This is broken down into 24.27% attending a mainstream school/college classroom; 2.91% attending a special unit within a mainstream school, 0.97% attending a private school, 13.59% attending a special-**

	Previous Setting(s)	Current Setting	Currently Without Education	Future (Preference)	Future (Realistic)
Mainstream School	97.2%	58.3%*	89/393 *(22.6%)*	35.6%	40.9%
Unit	5.8%	3.7%	7/25 *(28%)*	13.9%	8.9%
Special School	4.5%	5%	5/34 *(14.7%)*	20.2%	8.9%
Pupil Referral Unit	4.2%	4%	9/27 *(33.3%)*	9.4%	4.5%
Medical Absences	3.9%	3.7%	7/25 *(28%)*	9.4%	3.8%
EOTAS	2.5%	5.2%	1/35 *(2.9%)*	28.3%	5.5%
In-Limbo/Unspecified	-	11.4%	68/77 *(88.3%)*	-	-
EHE (Not Choice)	4.6%	7%	-	3.4%	7.3%
EHE (Choice)	0.6%	0.4%	-	2.3%	1.1%
Other	1.5%	1.2%	2/8 (25%)	3%	1.1%

Table 3. Educational Settings for CYP in the Current SD Group. For CYP who were currently registered at multiple settings, we selected the provision with the highest level of support (e.g. for a CYP currently registered at both a mainstream school and a pupil referral unit, the currently registered column shows them as being currently registered at a pupil referral unit). 88.31% of the CYP in the "In-Limbo/Unspecified" category previously attended a mainstream school at one point in their school career. Only 15.15% of their parents wished for them to attend a mainstream school in the future, but 32.88% felt that a mainstream setting was the realistic setting. *Includes 2.5% of CYP who are currently registered at a mainstream school but attend on a reduced timetable or with a flexi schooling arrangement in place. Flexi schooling is an arrangement whereby CYP access part of their total education at a school and part at home (via EHE). Note: Reduced timetables are only permitted if there is a specific need for a pupil, e.g. a medical condition prevents them from attending full-time education, and the reduced timetable forms part of a planned re-integration, or on a temporary basis with a specific deadline set with respect to when the CYP is expected to return to school full time.

ist school, and 0.97% attending an alternative education establishment. Of the remaining 57.28%, 2.91% had no access to education either through their local authority or parents, 7.7% had an EHCP Education Otherwise Than At School (EOTAS) provision, 0.97% attended a private online school, 0.97% had a supported internship, and 44.67% were described as EHE. Within this 'EHE' group, the majority of parents (67.4%) described this as *"coerced"* EHE (i.e. they had no choice about providing it), 17.4% indicated that they had eventually chosen this option, and 15.2% did not indicate either way.

***Academic Attainment*: Over half of the CYP in the sample were rated by parents as *"not meeting their academic expectations"*.**

***Current SD Group*: When broken down by group, 66.7% of CYP in the Current SD group were reported to not be meeting academic expectations, relative to only 8.1% in the No SD (control) group (see Table 1). Similarly, only 10.2% of CYP in the Current SD group were rated as *exceeding their academic expectations* by parents, relative to 34.5% of CYP in the No SD (control) group. Statistically, CYP in the Current SD group were significantly under-performing relative to their peers in all other groups (see Table S3). Table S4 shows the breakdown within each of the three academic attainment categories with respect to the CYPs' current educational settings.**

***Past SD Group*: Whilst CYP who have previously experienced SD (Past SD) were performing significantly better than Current SD CYP, they were still performing significantly worse than CYP in the No SD control group (all p-values < .001).**

***Lifelong EHE Group*: Ratings of academic attainment from parents of Lifelong EHE CYP and CYP in the No SD (Control) group did not differ (p = .238), and Lifelong EHE CYP were rated as performing better relative to the Current SD group (p < .001). This did not differ when the analysis was restricted to the groups age-matched to the Lifelong EHE CYP [Lifelong EHE = No SD Control: p = .263; Lifelong EHE > Current SD: p = .005; SD Past = Lifelong EHE: p = .226).**

***Support at School (SEN/EHCP)*: Of the CYP currently experiencing SD, 32.8% of parents indicated that their child received *no* support at school, 38.1% of CYP in the Current SD group were on a SEN register (or equivalent), and 48.5% of parents indicated that their CYP had an EHCP or were in the process of seeking one. This declined to 32.9% when cases where additional parent comments indicated that an EHCP was not yet in place were removed (n=111). Of those 111 cases, 95 indicated they were in the EHCP process [15 stated that they were in the process of applying, 16 had applied, 24 were at the assessment phase, 17 were at the draft stage or awaiting a finalised plan, 13 were at mediation/appealing (at first-tier SEND tribunal), and 10 indicated that their application had been rejected]. Some of the mediation/appeals were taking place following a refusal to assess (i.e. a rejected application) or a refusal to issue an EHCP following assessment, whilst others were appealing the content of sections B, F, and I (i.e. the description of the CYP's SEN, the provision needed to meet those needs, and placement).**

Parental dissatisfaction and frustration with the support their child is/was receiving from their school and/or LA was clear throughout parental responses to this question. For instance, many comments described a lack of support in place for their child e.g. *"no support and attends at less than 10%"*, *"Very limited support from school"*, *"Very little support is given"*, and *"We have had TAF [Team Around the Family] meetings but the deputy head was not in support and stopped these"*. Even when parents indicated that their child was on the school's SEN register (or equivalent) or had an EHCP in place, parental comments continued to indicate a lack of support for many CYP e.g. *"On SEN register at school but has no actual support"*, *"Is on the SEN register however no further support in school. Nothing in place"*, *"My child received support and was on the SEN register at Junior School but on moving to Secondary this wasn't recognised, accepted or acknowledge...No support whatsoever!"*, *"CSP but no real support"*, *"IEP in school but [needs] not being met"*, *"Has an EHC statement but very little if any support"*, *"EHCP recently received but specified support is unsuitable and not being provided"*, *"Off since Dec. Reassessment refused. Annual review also refused ehcp change... inappropriate "type of school"'in section I"*, and *"Has ehcp but currently homeschooling due to no suitable setting available and previous setting causing trauma due to excessive restraint and not meeting basic needs"*.

Application for and implementation of EHCPs was also a particular source of frustration for parents. For example, parental comments included: *"I am in the process of applying for this [EHCP] myself as school are unwilling"*, *"Parent application [for EHCP] no support from school"*, *"In mediation. I'd to self apply [for EHCP] as school delayed and blocked"*, *"Has EHCP but is ignored"*, *"School not following EHCP"*, *"Not that it [EHCP]*

was followed", *"School not named as current school can't meet needs. EHCP done by parental request"*, and *"School has put some reasonable adjustments in place after GP letter and a fight"*). For the additional 15.6% of parents of CYP currently experiencing SD who were in the EHCP process, comments with respect to this reflected the adversarial nature of this process which is well-documented elsewhere e.g. *"Currently fighting for EHCP which was refused"* and *"Currently awaiting tribunal as they stated mainstream which is totally unsuitable"*.

Occasionally comments reflected a more positive situation (e.g., *"My child's school currently provides reasonable adjustments for my daughter's needs while we await her ASC assessment"*, *"Some support at school. Under CAMHS"*, *"Working with the school to establish Sen support/be in the Sen register"*, *"After years of struggling school has finally applied for EHCP"*, *"My child is from wales, has a statement, now attends out of county independent specialist school in England. Finally."*, and *"The EHCP states elective home education with personal budget. Which covers 6 hours tutors and 6 hours 121 forest school."*). These latter two comments were from parents in the Past SD group, and only represented a small proportion of the parent voices.

Finally, some parental comments reflected the complexity of providing support in certain instances (e.g., *"He can receive support from a learning base but he is masking in school and doesn't want others to know he has autism so only accesses the base twice per week for 50 mins per time. So he receives a very small amount of support, he needs to help with work academically"*).

Exclusions/Off-Rolling: The rate of permanent exclusions were low amongst our sample (n=16, 1.4%). The majority of the CYP permanently excluded were autistic CYP (n=14/16; 87.5%). The use of fixed-term exclusions was higher (n=89, 7.9%); with the majority of cases again involving autistic CYP (n = 74/89; 83.15%).

Within our survey, we also considered "off-rolling" and provided parents with the following explanation: *"Off-rolling is the practice of removing a pupil from the school roll without using a permanent exclusion, when the removal is primarily in the best interests of the school, rather than in the best interests of the pupil. This includes pressuring a parent to remove their child from the school roll"*. 54 (4.8%) CYP were identified by their parents as having been "off-rolled" from their existing school. A small number of these CYP were off-rolled into another provision (n=9, 1.2%, all autistic CYP), however, the majority of "off-rolled" CYP (n=45) were off-rolled into Home-Education. 36 CYP from this group of 45 (80%) were autistic CYP (1 from the No SD group and 35 from the SD group), and 9 were non-autistic CYP (all with SD experience). This situation is best described as "coerced" home-education, although technically these CYP are classed as being "electively" home-educated. When asked how long the coerced home-education arrangement was in place for, responses varied from 'a few days' to '5 years'. The average duration was 13.9 months (StDev 15.1 months), with many parents indicating that this situation was ongoing.

Statistically, autistic CYP were more likely to be permanently excluded ($p < .001$), receive a fixed-term exclusion ($p < .001$), or be off-rolled ($p = .006$) than their NT peers (Fisher's Exact Tests).

4. Child Health and Neurodivergences

Child Health: When asked whether their child has any physical or mental health difficulties, only 7% of parents in the Current SD group responded 'No', with 69.8% responding 'Yes' and a further 23.3% responding 'Maybe'. This was notably different to the other groups, whereby 23.5% of parents in the Past SD group, 79.9% in the No SD control group, and 56% in the Lifelong EHE group, responded 'No'. Parents who responded 'Maybe' or 'Yes' were provided with a free text box option to specify details of their child's health difficulties if they wished. From their comments, it was apparent that some parents listed neurodevelopmental conditions such as autism and ADHD under health difficulties, whilst others (based on responses to later questions) did not consider these to be health difficulties. As we later gathered detailed information about a wide range of conditions that fall under the neurodivergent umbrella (see below), we excluded responses such as autism, ADHD, PDA, Dyslexia...etc. from this response. As data on sensory processing differences was also gathered separately, and is described below in detail, we also removed sensory processing differences/difficulties/disorder from this question.

Based on the remaining responses, we compiled a list of the described physical and mental health conditions. Whilst this cannot be considered an exhaustive list, as some parents did not opt to complete this, and others may not have listed all health concerns, Table S5 summarises the information that was provided by parents here with respect to mental and physical health difficulties experienced by their child. As evident, anxiety was the health condition mentioned most frequently, by 46.37% of parents in the Current SD group, 30.88% of parents in the Past SD group, 20% of parents in the Lifelong EHE group, and 10.07% of parents in the No SD control group. Depression, Hypermobility, PTSD/trauma, and Low mood/emotional regulation difficulties were the next most commonly listed health concerns in the two SD groups; with few incidences in either the No SD control group or the Lifelong EHE group. Hence, mental health (and, in particular, anxiety), as opposed to physical health concerns (with the exception of hypermobility, and excluding sensory processing difficulties), were the most frequently mentioned health difficulties by parents of children with experience of SD.

Table 4 further subdivided the above responses into three categories, i.e. CYP whose parents listed mental health difficulties only, those whose parents listed physical health difficulties only, and those whose parents listed both mental and physical health difficulties. CYP whose parents reported physical health conditions (other than sensory processing difficulties) in isolation was relatively low in all groups (see Table 4). However, having either a mental health difficulty (or difficulties) in isolation, or in combination with a physical health difficulty (or difficulties), was strikingly higher in both SD groups than in either the No SD control group or Lifelong EHE group. No formal statistical analyses were conducted here as more precise data (including anxiety data gathered using a clinical scale) is described below. Co-occurrence between neurodivergent conditions and health difficulties is also discussed further below.

Anxiety: When completing an additional set of questions relating to reasons underpinning their child's SAPs, 93.4% of parents in the Current SD group (453/485) and 82.7% of parents in the Past SD group (91/110) identified anxiety as a causal factor in their child's SAPs. When asked to describe this anxiety, generalised anxiety was selected by over half of these parents in both SD groups as a descriptor for their child's anxiety (see Table 5). This was followed by separation anxiety and uncertainty

	Physical Health	Mental Health	Both	None Listed
Current SD	3.73%	67.01%	14.48%	16.27%
Past SD	7.53%	49.46%	6.45%	36.56%
No SD	4.05%	10.14%	1.35%	84.46%
L. EHE	8.33%	25%	0%	66.67%

Table 4. Health Difficulties by Group. Neurodivergencies such as autism, ADHD, dyslexia and sensory processing difficulties were excluded as they were assessed separately (see below). The "None Listed" category includes CYP who do not have any health difficulties and CYP whose parents opted not to specifically describe these difficulties.

	Current SD	Past SD
Generalised Anxiety	58.7%	51.6%
Separation Anxiety	31.6%	40.7%
Uncertainty	30%	31.9%
Performance Anxiety	23.6%	24.2%
Selective Mutism	22.1%	18.7%
Anxious Arousal	14.1%	11.0%
Panic Disorder	14.1%	9.9%
Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder	11%	7.7%
I'm not sure	9.7%	11%
Other	9.7%	11%

Table 5. Types of anxiety identified by parents as relevant to their child school distress.

(selected by one in every three parents), performance anxiety (approximately one in four parents), and selective mutism (approximately one in five parents). The 'I'm not sure' and 'other' options were less commonly selected by parents (approximately 10%).

***Anxiety Scores*:**

A total of 638 parents in the Current SD group, 164 parents in the Past SD group, 142 No SD control parents, and 20 Lifelong EHE parents completed the ASC-ASD-Parent Version (95). Individual scores ranged from 0 to 72 (maximum score = 72). Mean scores for each of the four groups are represented in Figure 4, Panel A.

Highly consistent with parent reports, only 7.5% of CYP currently experiencing SD (i.e. 50 CYP out of a total of 638 CYP for whom we have this data) did not reach the cut-off indicative of significant anxiety. Hence, 92.5% of the Current SD CYP met or exceeded the cut-off indicative of significant anxiety. Moreover, 86.7% of CYP in the Current SD scored >24 and therefore exceeded the more specific cut-off score on the ASC-ASD-P, and 53.8% of CYP in the Current SD group scored at least twice the cut-off score (i.e. 40+). The results of a Chi-Square test of association found a significant difference in frequency of <20 and 20+ scorers across the Current SD and No SD groups $\chi^2(1, 771) = 353.661$, $p < .001$, and the odds ratio of a CYP experiencing SD if they scored 20+ on the ASC-ASD-P was 44.015 (95% CI 26.773, 72.362).



Fig. 3. Health Difficulties (as listed by parents in an optional free text box) x ND. Note: ND includes sensory difficulties. Health Difficulties includes conditions described in Table 3

Moreover, Kruskal-Wallis tests revealed significant between group differences in anxiety scores, with pairwise comparisons indicating that the No SD control group had significantly lower total anxiety scores than both the Past and Current SD groups. This was also observed for each of the four summed subscale total scores for Performance Anxiety, Anxious Arousal, Separation Anxiety, Uncertainty (see Figure 4: Panel C), where again, anxiety scores in each subscale were significantly lower for the No SD groups relative to the two SD groups.

Given the younger mean age of the Lifelong EHE group relative to the other three groups, an additional set of analyses were conducted using the Lifelong EHE age-matched comparison groups. Overall, the Lifelong EHE group's scores for Total Anxiety, and for all of the anxiety subscales, did not differ significantly from those of the No SD control group, but they were significantly lower than the Current SD group's scores. The Lifelong EHE group's Total Anxiety and Separation Anxiety scores were also significantly lower than the Past SD group's scores. This was not the case for Performance Anxiety, Anxious Arousal, and Uncertainty, where no significant differences between the Lifelong EHE and Past SD groups were found (see Table S6).

We also explored whether total anxiety scores on the ASC-ASD-P and the four anxiety subscales correlated with the markers of SD available to us i.e. CYP's school attendance, the duration of CYP SD (SD Duration), and the age at which SD began. Higher total anxiety correlated significantly with lower school attendance in the previous 20 days ($r_s = -0.41, p = .002$), lower school attendance in the most recent academic year (2021/22) ($r_s = -0.199, p < .001$), and lower school attendance in the previous academic year (2020/21) ($r_s = -0.137, p < .001$). This was also observed for higher Anxious Arousal, and higher Uncertainty but not for Performance and Separation Anxiety (see Table S4). SD Duration also correlated significantly with total anxiety ($r_s = 0.150, p < .001$), and all anxiety subscales [i.e. Performance Anxiety ($r_s = 0.102, p = .004$), Anxious Arousal ($r_s = 0.099, p = .005$), Separation Anxiety ($r_s = 0.101, p = .002$), and Uncertainty ($r_s = 0.157, p < .001$)]. Moreover, higher Separation Anxiety was associated with a lower age of onset of SD ($r_s = -0.203, p < .001$), whilst higher Anxious Arousal scores were associated with an older age of onset of SD (performance anxiety: ($r_s = 0.122, p < .001$)).

Considering autistic CYP relative to their non-autistic peers, independent-samples Mann-Whitney U Tests conducted separately for each group, found that total anxiety scores were significantly greater for autistic CYP than for non-autistic CYP in each of the four groups [Current SD Group: Autistic CYP Mdn = 42, non-autistic CYP Mdn = 32, U = 17809.0, $p < .001$; Past SD Group: autistic CYP Mdn = 38, non-autistic CYP Mdn = 26, U = 1646.0, $p < .001$; No SD control Group: autistic CYP Mdn = 20.5, non-autistic CYP Mdn = 8, U = 570.5, $p < .001$); Lifelong EHE Group: autistic CYP Mdn = 23, non-autistic CYP Mdn =



C

Measure	Current SD		Past SD		No SD		Lifelong EHE		H (3)	*p*	Significant group differences*
	Median	*IQR*	*Median*	*IQR*	*Median*	*IQR*	*Median*	*IQR*			
ASC-ASD-P Total	41	19	33	20	10	12	14.5	22	296.88	<.001	Current SD > Past SD > No SD = Lifelong EHE
Performance Anxiety	10	6	9	7	4	5	2	15	181.60	<.001	Current SD > Past SD > No SD = Lifelong EHE
Anxious Arousal	7	6	5	5	1	2	2	3.5	273.79	<.001	Current SD > Past SD > No SD = Lifelong EHE
Separation Anxiety	8	7	7	5	1	3.3	2	4	211.54	<.001	[Current SD = Past SD] > No SD = Lifelong EHE
Uncertainty	16	8	14	9	3	6	9	9	271.63	<.001	Current SD > Past SD > No SD = Lifelong EHE

IQR = Interquartile Range.
**Pairwise comparison. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.*

Fig. 4. Anxiety as measured using the ASC-ASD-P (95). Panel A: Mean Total Scores on the ASC-ASD-P for each of the four groups. Dashed lines represent the cut-off scores indicative of clinically significant levels of anxiety (i.e. a score of 20), and the more specific score (i.e. 24). Error bars represent +/- 1 SEM. Panel B: Mean item scores on each of the four ASC-ASD-P Subscales for each of the four groups. Item scores ranged from 0 (never) to 3 (always), and unlike the summed total scores (see Panel C), mean item scores can be compared across subscales. Error bars represent +/- 1 SEM. Panel C: Median, Interquartile Range, and Kruskal-Wallis Tests Investigating Differences in ASC-ASD-P Total and Subscale Scores between groups. Maximum possible scores for each subscale are as follows: Performance Anxiety = 15, Anxious Arousal = 18, Separation Anxiety = 15, Uncertainty = 24.

8, U = 6, *p* = .001]. This pattern (e.g. Ausitic > Non-Autistic) was replicated for each individual subscale's scores (for full details see Supplemental Note: Anxiety Scale for Children - ASD - Parents).

This represents a potential confound when interpreting the ASC-ASD-P scores as the significantly higher anxiety scores in the SD groups could have been driven by unequal numbers of autistic or non-autistic but otherwise neurodivergent (ND) CYP across the groups, as high anxiety is well documented in autistic CYP. This is of concern as, as described below, there are significant differences in the prevalence rates of autism and other ND conditions across our four groups. This is additionally problematic as it is possible that parents of NT, ND (non autistic) and autistic children interpreted and answered the ASC-ASD-P questions differently as a consequence of their child's specific neurodevelopmental profile (101).

To explore this further, CYP (n=951) were firstly subdivided into three further groups: a NT group, a ND (non-autistic) group, and an ND (autistic) group, and the above analysis was repeated to confirm whether anxiety scores differed with respect to NT/ND/autism status. An independent-samples Kruskal-Wallis found an overall between group difference in total anxiety (H = 260.70, df=2, *p* < .001), with bonferroni corrected pairwise comparisons indicating that total anxiety was significantly lower in the NT group relative to both the ND (non-autistic) and ND (autistic) groups (both *p* values < .001), and that total anxiety was significantly higher in the ND (autistic) group relative to the ND (non-autistic) and NT groups (both *p* values < .001; i.e. ND (autistic) > ND (non-autistic) > NT). This pattern was also evident when the same analyses were repeated for each group individually:

1. Current SD Group (n=630): H = 39.340, df=2, *p* < .001: ND (autistic) > ND (non-autistic) = NT;

2. Past SD Group (n=160): H = 21.965, df=2, *p* < .001: ND (autistic) > ND (non-autistic) = NT;

3. No SD Group (n=141): H = 24.343, df=2, *p* < .001: Autistic > NT.

Hence, these analyses confirmed the presence of significantly higher total anxiety in the group of autistic CYP relative to NT and ND (non-autistic) groups, regardless of the presence or absence of SD. It was therefore necessary to compare anxiety levels between the Current SD, Past SD, and No SD groups for the NT, ND (non-autistic) and ND (autistic) groups individually, to ensure that anxiety differences persisted between SD and no SD groups when differences in neurodevelopmental profiles were minimised.

Considering firstly the neurotypical group (n=182), independent-samples Kruskal-Wallis tests found significant between-group differences for Total Anxiety (H = 85.174, df=2, *p* < .001; Current SD = Past SD > No SD), Performance Anxiety (H = 34.877, df=2, *p* < .001; Current SD > No SD), Anxious Arousal (H = 81.357, df=2, *p* < .001; Current SD = Past SD > No SD), Separation Anxiety (H = 56.660, df=2, *p* < .001; Current SD = Past SD > No SD), and Uncertainty (H = 73.080, df=2, *p* < .001; Current SD = Past SD > No SD) (see Figure 5).

For the neurodivergent (non-autistic) group (n=87), independent-samples Kruskal-Wallis tests found between-group differences for Total Anxiety (H = 10.111, df=2, *p* = .006; Current SD > No SD), Performance Anxiety (H = 11.177, df=2, *p* = .004; Current SD > Past SD > No SD), Anxious Arousal (H = 8.613, df=2, *p* = .013; Current SD > No SD), and Separation Anxiety (H = 8.238, df=2, *p* = .016; Current SD > No SD), but not for Uncertainty (H = 4.89, df=2, *p* = .087).

For the neurodivergent (autistic) group (n=662), independent-samples Kruskal-Wallis tests found between-group differences



Fig. 5. Mean Item Scores for each of the four anxiety subscales as measured using the ASC-ASD-P for neurotypical CYP (NT), neurodivergent but non-autistic CYP (ND non-Autistic), and autistic CYP (ND Autistic), in the No SD control group, the Current SD group, and the Past SD group. Lifelong EHE CYP were excluded here due to low numbers in the NT group (n=2).

for Total Anxiety (H = 38.631, df=2, $p < .001$; Current SD > Past SD > No SD), Performance Anxiety (H = 15.46, df=2, $p < .001$; Current SD > Past SD = No SD), Anxious Arousal (H = 42.904, df=2, $p < .001$; Current SD > Past SD > No SD), Separation Anxiety (H = 29.873, df=2, $p < .001$; Current SD = Past SD > No SD), and Uncertainty (H = 28.208, df=2, $p < .001$; Current SD = Past SD > No SD).

Hence, differences in prevalence rates of autism and ND more broadly were insufficient to account for the anxiety differences observed between CYP with and without SD, as these persisted even when neurotype was held constant.

***Neurodivergence (ND)*: Most CYP currently experiencing SD (Current SD) were rated as Neurodivergent (ND) by their parents (92.05%), compared to 22.2% of those without SD experience (No SD). This high rate of ND was evident both in cases where the CYP's SD began after the Covid-19 related school closures (89.2%), and in cases where the SD preceded the Covid-19 pandemic (93.9%).**

As described above, frequencies reflect the number and percentage of parents who responded "yes" or "maybe" to their child being ND. Collapsing "yes" and "maybe" responses into one ND category, the results of a Chi-Square test of the association between ND and School Distress found a significant difference in frequency of ND CYP across the four groups $\chi^2(3, 1098) = 394.5$, p <.001. More specifically, CYP currently experiencing SD were significantly more likely to be described as ND than CYP who had experienced SD in the past, whilst CYP who experienced SD in the past were more likely to be described as ND relative to CYP in the No SD (control) group (i.e. Current SD > Past SD > No SD). Collapsing across SD groups (i.e. Current + Past SD), the odds ratio for a CYP to experience SD if neurodivergent was 32.57 (95% CI 20.903, 50.762). Restricting the criteria of ND to just the CYP whose parents responded "yes" (i.e. removing "maybe" responses from the analysis) increased the odds ratio to 42.25 (95% CI [24.53, 72.78]). Hence, ND CYP were significantly over-represented amongst CYP who experience SD.

Interestingly, CYP in the Lifelong EHE group were equally likely to be described as ND by their parents as CYP in both SD groups: Current SD = Lifelong EHE; Past SD = Lifelong EHE; Lifelong EHE > No SD ($p < .008$, bonferroni adjusted alpha level). The odds ratio for a CYP in the Lifelong EHE group being ND (yes and maybe responses combined) relative to a CYP in the No SD control group was 25.8 (95% CI 7.26, 91.46).

Co-occurrence between neurodivergencies was high, with many CYP having multiple neurodivergencies [overall mean = 3.14 (St Dev 2.62); Current SD = 3.70 (St Dev 2.51); Past SD = 3.0 (St Dev 2.54), No SD = 0.72 (St Dev 1.73); Lifelong EHE 2.52 (St Dev 2.0)]. Number of ND conditions per CYP differed significantly between the four groups (H = 218.123, df=2, $p < .001$), with the No SD group having significantly fewer ND conditions than all three other groups (pairwise comparisons with bonferroni adjusted p-values; all p-values <.001). In addition, no significant group differences were found between the Current SD group and the Lifelong EHE group ($p = 0.123$), nor between the Lifelong EHE group and the Past SD group ($p = 1.00$).

Co-occurrence between neurodivergencies and health difficulties, particularly mental health difficulties, was also high. Strikingly, 89.14% of CYP in the Current SD group whose parents listed one or more health difficulties were also neurodivergent. This figure includes CYP with mental health difficulties only, and those with both physical and mental health difficulties (see Figure 3). Having a physical health condition only accounted for 0.88% of cases, and being both ND and having a physical health condition but no mental health difficulties accounted for just 3.5% of cases. Neurotypical CYP currently experiencing SD alongside a mental health condition accounted for 6.13% of cases.

***Neurodivergence: Parents and Siblings*: We also explored the prevalence of ND within the Family. Rates of ND amongst the parents themselves were significantly different between the four groups. This was driven by significantly fewer ND parents in the No SD control group relative to all three other groups (all p's < .01). More specifically, whilst most parents in the No SD (control) group stated that they, and/or their child's other parent, were not neurodivergent (77.9%), only 30.7% of Current SD, 37.7% of Past SD, and 34.8% of Lifelong EHE parents endorsed this response. CYP who have experienced SD (either currently or in the past) were also significantly more likely to have a neurodivergent sibling(s) than the CYP in the No SD (control) group [(Current SD = Past SD) > No SD; p-values < .001]. Lifelong EHE children were not significantly more or less likely to have a ND sibling than Current SD CYP ($p = .054$), but they were significantly less likely to have a ND sibling than CYP in the Past SD group ($p < .05$). For further details see Table 7.**

***Autism*: Within the umbrella of neurodivergencies, autism was the most prevalent ND condition amongst CYP who have experienced SD (83.4% Current SD; 66.2% Past SD; see Table 6). This includes all cases of autism, diagnosed and suspected. When we restricted our analysis to include only CYP with a confirmed diagnosis of autism, our prevalence rates were more comparable with those in previous research (46.9% Current SD, 42.1% Past SD). However, this misses the 173 CYP in the Current SD group (23.4%), and the 20 CYP in the Past SD group (9.6%), who are currently on an autism assessment pathway. This method also excludes CYP who have had their referral rejected before assessment (often due to services requesting more evidence prior to accepting referral) which accounts for 15 (2%) CYP in the Current SD group and 3 (1.4%) CYP in the Past SD group. Finally, this also excludes 66 (8.9%) CYP in the Current SD group and 22 (10.5%) CYP in the Past SD group for whom autism is suspected but a referral has not yet been made.**

The results of a Chi-Square test of the association between



Fig. 6. Prevalence of Neurodivergence(s) (ND) in each group. Parents were provided with the following description of ND *"neurodivergence is a term for when someone's brain processes, learns and/or behaves differently from what is considered 'typical'. Autism is an example of a neurodivergence"*. Response options were: No, Maybe, Yes.

	Current SD	Past SD	No SD	Lifelong EHE
Neurodivergent (Yes/Maybe)	660 (92.1%)	168 (83.6%)	33 (22.2%)	22 (88%)
Autism	593 (83.4%)	131 (65.2%)	25 (16.8%)	13 (52%)
SPD/SID	405 (57.0%)	87 (43.3%)	10 (6.7%)	13 (52%)
ADHD	394 (55.4%)	86 (42.8%)	13 (8.7%)	12 (48%)
Dyslexia	181 (25.5%)	46 (22.9%)	8 (5.4%)	2 (8%)
Dyspraxia	176 (24.7%)	55 (27.4%)	12 (8.1%)	2 (8%)
APD	130 (18.3%)	26 (12.9%)	5 (3.4%)	3 (12%)
Speech	115 (16.2%)	21 (10.4%)	7 (4.7%)	4 (16%)
Gifted	103 (14.5%)	29 (14.4%)	6 (4.0%)	6 (24%)
Other	87 (12.2%)	16 (8.0%)	3 (2.0%)	3 (12%)
Dyscalculia	88 (12.3%)	19 (9.5%)	4 (2.7%)	0
Language	81 (11.4%)	20 (10.0%)	4 (2.7%)	2 (8%)
Visual Processing	69 (9.7%)	18 (9.0%)	0	0
Tic Disorder	61 (8.6%)	13 (6.5%)	5 (3.4%)	1 (4%)
Unspecified Learning	60 (8.4%)	10 (5.0%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (4%)
Intellectual Disability	47 (6.6%)	10 (5.0%)	2 (1.3%)	1 (4%)
Number of NDs	3.7 (StDev 2.5)	3 (StDev 2.5)	0.72 (StDev 1.7)	2.5 (StDev 2)

Table 6. Prevalence of individual neurodivergencies in each group, ordered with respected to prevalence (from most prevalent to least), plus average number of neurodivergencies per group. ADHD = Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder; APD = Auditory Processing Disorder; SPD = Sensory Processing Disorder; SID = Sensory Integration Disorder; Speech/Language = Speech/Language Difficulties

School Distress	AUTISM	SENSORY	ADHD	DYSLEXIA	DYSPRAXIA	APD	SPEECH DIFFICULTIES	GIFTED	DYSCALCULIA	LANGUAGE DIFFICULTIES	VISUAL PROCESSING	TIC DISORDER	UNSPECIFIED LEARNING	INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY	ANXIETY (≥20)	ANXIETY (≥24)	ANXIETY (≥40)	EDA (≥5)
Autism (N=731)	n/a	62.80%	59.20%	26.60%	28.70%	18.70%	17.30%	15.90%	13.30%	12.90%	11.10%	9.90%	8.80%	7.60%	94.00%	89.00%	56.70%	89.00%
SENSORY (N=493)	92.70%	n/a	62.10%	31.40%	36.50%	26.80%	22.10%	18.50%	16.80%	17.00%	15.00%	11.60%	11.60%	9.70%	94.70%	90.60%	60.10%	90.90%
ADHD (N=482)	89.40%	63.50%	n/a	32.20%	29.30%	23.20%	16.60%	14.70%	15.80%	13.90%	12.00%	10.80%	10.60%	8.90%	93.30%	87.70%	53.50%	91.70%
DYSLEXIA (N=228)	85.10%	68.00%	68.00%	n/a	38.20%	28.50%	23.20%	10.50%	28.50%	20.20%	24.60%	13.60%	17.10%	15.80%	94.00%	89.10%	57.70%	88.20%
DYSPRAXIA (N=232)	90.10%	77.60%	60.80%	37.50%	n/a	31.50%	26.30%	23.30%	22.40%	24.10%	18.10%	12.50%	14.20%	15.50%	95.10%	90.30%	57.30%	88.60%
APD (N=156)	87.20%	84.60%	71.80%	41.70%	46.80%	n/a	32.70%	20.50%	28.20%	28.20%	27.60%	14.10%	19.20%	19.20%	93.40%	89.80%	56.90%	91.30%
SPEECH (N=136)	92.60%	80.10%	58.80%	39.00%	44.90%	37.50%	n/a	14.70%	23.50%	50.00%	21.30%	9.60%	18.40%	27.90%	96.60%	93.20%	60.20%	92.50%
GIFTED (N=132)	87.90%	68.90%	53.80%	18.20%	40.90%	24.20%	15.20%	n/a	9.10%	11.40%	9.80%	9.10%	3.00%	2.30%	87.00%	78.00%	46.30%	88.80%
DYSCALCULIA (N=107)	90.70%	77.60%	71.00%	60.70%	48.60%	41.10%	29.90%	11.20%	n/a	28.00%	29.90%	14.00%	22.40%	21.50%	91.50%	88.30%	53.20%	89.50%
LANGUAGE (N=102)	92.20%	82.40%	65.70%	45.10%	54.90%	43.10%	66.70%	14.70%	29.40%	n/a	24.50%	12.70%	23.50%	34.30%	95.40%	92.00%	59.80%	92.10%
VISUAL PROCESSING (N=88)	92.00%	84.10%	65.90%	63.60%	47.70%	48.90%	33.00%	14.80%	36.40%	28.40%	n/a	15.90%	25.00%	21.60%	95.00%	91.30%	66.30%	92.60%
TIC DISORDER (N=74)	97.30%	77.00%	70.30%	41.90%	39.20%	29.70%	17.60%	16.20%	20.30%	17.60%	18.90%	n/a	18.90%	13.50%	97.20%	94.40%	67.60%	95.80%
UNSPECIFIED LEARNING (N=70)	91.40%	81.40%	72.90%	55.70%	47.10%	42.90%	35.70%	5.70%	34.30%	34.30%	31.40%	20.00%	n/a	42.90%	98.40%	96.70%	62.30%	95.20%
INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY (N=58)	94.80%	82.80%	74.10%	62.10%	62.10%	51.70%	65.50%	5.20%	39.70%	60.30%	32.80%	17.20%	51.70%	n/a	97.80%	95.70%	60.90%	93.80%
ANXIETY [≥20] (N=720)	83.30%	59.00%	53.80%	26.30%	27.20%	17.80%	15.80%	14.90%	11.90%	11.50%	10.70%	9.60%	8.30%	6.30%	n/a	93.60%	55.60%	86.80%
ANXIETY [≥24] (N=674)	84.30%	60.40%	54.00%	26.60%	27.60%	18.20%	16.30%	14.20%	12.30%	11.90%	10.80%	9.90%	8.80%	6.50%	100.00%	n/a	59.30%	87.40%
ANXIETY [≥40] (N=400)	90.50%	67.50%	55.50%	29.00%	29.50%	19.50%	17.80%	14.20%	12.50%	13.00%	13.30%	12.00%	9.50%	7.00%	100.00%	100.00%	n/a	89.50%
EDA [≥5] (N=673)	85.60%	61.10%	57.40%	26.70%	27.60%	18.70%	16.50%	16.50%	12.60%	12.20%	11.10%	10.10%	8.90%	6.70%	93.70%	88.30%	53.80%	n/a

No School Distress	AUTISM	SENSORY	ADHD	DYSLEXIA	DYSPRAXIA	APD	SPEECH DIFFICULTIES	GIFTED	DYSCALCULIA	LANGUAGE DIFFICULTIES	VISUAL PROCESSING	TIC DISORDER	UNSPECIFIED LEARNING	INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY	ANXIETY (≥20)	ANXIETY (≥24)	ANXIETY (≥40)	EDA (≥5)
Autism (N=25)	n/a	32.00%	36.00%	24.00%	40.00%	16.00%	24.00%	20.00%	16.00%	12.00%	0.00%	20.00%	4.00%	4.00%	54.20%	37.50%	16.70%	66.70%
SENSORY (N=10)	80.00%	n/a	50.00%	30.00%	40.00%	30.00%	20.00%	40.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	60.00%	30.00%	60.00%
ADHD (N=13)	69.20%	38.50%	n/a	23.10%	38.50%	38.50%	15.40%	7.70%	15.40%	15.40%	0.00%	23.10%	7.70%	0.00%	41.70%	33.30%	25.00%	58.30%
DYSLEXIA (N=8)	75.00%	37.50%	37.50%	n/a	75.00%	37.50%	37.50%	0.00%	37.50%	25.00%	0.00%	37.50%	12.50%	0.00%	85.70%	71.40%	42.90%	57.10%
DYSPRAXIA (N=12)	83.30%	33.30%	41.70%	50.00%	n/a	33.30%	41.70%	8.30%	33.30%	33.30%	0.00%	33.30%	8.30%	16.70%	63.60%	45.50%	27.30%	54.50%
APD (N=5)	80.00%	60.00%	100.00%	60.00%	80.00%	n/a	20.00%	0.00%	40.00%	40.00%	0.00%	40.00%	20.00%	0.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
SPEECH (N=7)	85.70%	28.60%	28.60%	42.90%	71.40%	14.30%	n/a	0.00%	28.60%	42.90%	0.00%	28.60%	14.30%	28.60%	33.00%	16.70%	0.00%	33.30%
GIFTED (N=6)	83.30%	66.70%	16.70%	0.00%	16.70%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.30%	0.00%	0.00%	66.70%	50.00%	0.00%	66.70%
DYSCALCULIA (N=4)	100.00%	25.00%	50.00%	75.00%	100.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	n/a	75.00%	0.00%	50.00%	25.00%	25.00%	100.00%	66.70%	66.70%	100.00%
LANGUAGE (N=4)	75.00%	0.00%	50.00%	60.00%	100.00%	50.00%	75.00%	0.00%	75.00%	n/a	0.00%	50.00%	25.00%	50.00%	66.70%	33.30%	33.30%	66.70%
VISUAL PROCESSING (N=0)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TIC DISORDER (N=5)	100.00%	40.00%	60.00%	60.00%	80.00%	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%	0.00%	n/a	20.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	25.00%	50.00%
UNSPECIFIED LEARNING (N=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%	-	n/a	-	-	-	-	-
INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY (N=2)	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	50.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	n/a	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%
ANXIETY [≥20] (N=31)	41.90%	19.40%	16.10%	19.40%	22.60%	9.70%	6.50%	12.90%	9.70%	6.50%	0.00%	12.90%	0.00%	3%	n/a	71.00%	16.10%	45.20%
ANXIETY [≥24] (N=22)	40.90%	27.30%	18.20%	22.70%	22.70%	13.60%	4.50%	13.60%	9.10%	4.50%	0.00%	18.20%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	n/a	22.70%	50.00%
ANXIETY [≥40] (N=5)	80.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	n/a	80.00%
EDA [≥5] (N=30)	53.30%	20.00%	13.30%	13.30%	20.00%	10.00%	6.70%	13.30%	10.00%	6.70%	0.00%	6.70%	0.00%	3.30%	46.70%	36.70%	13.30%	n/a

Fig. 7. Neurodivergent and anxiety profiles of the CYP with (top panel) and without (bottom panel) School Distress. Each row represents the number of CYP in that group with a specific neurodivergency, or who scores at or above a particular score on the ASC-ASD-P (Anxiety) and EDA-8 (Extreme Demand Avoidance) questionnaires. The columns then indicate the % of these CYP who fall in the other neurodivergencies and Anxiety/EDA groups.

Characteristics	Frequencies (% of sample)				
	All	Current SD	Past SD	No SD	Lifelong EHE
Parent Neurodivergence					
Yes	212 (19.9)	150 (21.3)	47 (24.6)	10 (6.7)	5 (21.7)
Maybe	443 (41.5)	338 (48.0)	72 (37.7)	23 (15.4)	10 (43.5)
No	412 (38.6)	216 (30.7)	72 (37.7)	116 (77.9)	8 (34.8)
Sibling Neurodivergence					
Diagnosed	203 (24.0)	162 (28.5)	33 (23.1)	6 (5.1)	2 (12.5)
Suspected	222 (26.3)	164 (28.9)	38 (26.6)	11 (9.3)	9 (56.3)
No	420 (49.7)	242 (42.6)	72 (50.3)	101 (85.6)	5 (31.3)

Table 7. Prevalence of ND within the families

autism and School Distress found a significant difference in frequency of autism across the four groups $\chi^2(3, 1092) = 269.7$, $p < .001$; whereby CYP in both SD groups were more likely to be autistic relative to CYP in the No SD control group, whilst CYP currently experiencing SD were significantly more likely to be autistic than CYP who had experienced SD in the past (i.e. Current SD > Past SD > No SD). This latter difference was not anticipated apriori.

The odds ratio of an autistic CYP (confirmed or not confirmed) experiencing SD (Current or Past) was 37.69 (95% CI [23.22, 61.18]) relative to NT CYP. This increases to 46.61 (95% CI [24.67, 88.07]) if the analysis is restricted to include only autistic CYP with confirmed autism diagnoses. These findings confirm and extend previous empirical evidence noting the high prevalence of autistic CYP amongst CYP experiencing SD.

CYP in the Lifelong EHE group were also significantly more likely to be autistic than control CYP, however they were less likely to be autistic than Current SD CYP (Current SD > Lifelong EHE > No SD). The odds of a CYP in the Lifelong EHE group having a confirmed autism diagnosis was also significantly greater than for a CYP in the No SD group [OR = 6.44 (95% CI 0.98, 42.46)]. This increased further when suspected autism cases were included [OR = 20.11 (95% CI 5.33, 75.85)]. There was no difference in the prevalence of autism between CYP in the Past SD group and Lifelong EHE CYP (Past SD = Lifelong EHE).

***Sensory Processing Difficulties*: The next most prevalent ND after autism was Sensory Processing Disorder/Sensory Integration Disorder (see Table 6). The results of a Chi-Square test of association found a significant difference in frequency of SPD/SID across the SD (Past and Current SD combined) and No SD groups [$\chi 2$ (1, 1064) = 114.372, $p < .001$]. Visual inspection alone of column 2 (SPD/SID: Fig 7) shows the markedly increased prevalence of sensory difficulties (SPD/SID) in CYP with SD (top panel) relative to those without SD (bottom panel), across the breadth of NDs and differing levels of anxiety and demand avoidance (with only a few exceptions e.g. giftedness, APD and anxiety levels >40).**

In cases where sensory processing difficulties were indicated, difficulties were reported in an average of 4.8 sensory systems (StDev 2.1). Broken down by group, the mean for Current SD CYP was 4.79 (StDev 2.08), for Past SD CYP it was 4.96 (StDev = 2.09), for the No SD control group it was 4.1 (StDev = 2.6) and for Lifelong EHE CYP it was 4.62 (StDev 2.53). The tactile system, followed closely by the auditory system (both >80%), were the sensory systems which parents identified most frequently as being problematic for their child (see Table S7, upper panel). Having sensory processing difficulties reported in just a single sensory system was rare, accounting for just 3.7% (n=19) of reported cases.

Across all CYP (including CYP whose parents did not endorse the SPD/SID option), difficulties were reported in an average of 2.28 (StDev 2.8) sensory systems [group breakdown: Current SD = 2.72 (StDev 2.8); Past SD = 2.19 (StDev 2.8); No SD = 0.27 (StDev 1.2); Lifelong EHE CYP 2.61 (StDev 3)]. A Kruskal-Wallis test indicated that the number of sensory systems impacted differed between groups, H(3) = 111.340, $p < .001$, with pairwise comparisons indicating that Current SD (Mdn = 2; IQR = 5) > No SD (Mdn = 0; IQR = 0) ($p < .001$), Past SD (Mdn = 0; IQR = 5) > No SD ($p < .001$), and Current SD > Past SD ($p = .046$).

Moreover, for CYP experiencing SD, the number of sensory systems impacted (range: 0-8) correlated significantly with their school attendance in the previous 4 weeks ($r_s = -0.141$, $p = .002$), school attendance in the academic year 2021/22 ($r_s = -0.199$, $p < .001$), school attendance in the academic year 2020/21 ($r_s = -0.137$, $p = .003$), the duration of their School Distress ($r_s = 0.153$, $p < .001$), and the age of onset of SD ($r_s = -0.214$, $p < .001$). Number of sensory systems impacted also correlated with total anxiety ($r_s = 0.422$, $p < .001$), performance anxiety ($r_s = 0.262$, $p < .001$), anxious arousal ($r_s = 0.293$, $p < .001$), separation anxiety ($r_s = 0.376$, $p < .001$), uncertainty ($r_s = 0.449$, $p < .001$), extreme demand avoidance ($r_s = 0.403$, $p < .001$), and the degree of emotional distress associated with school attendance ($r_s = -0.319$, $p < .001$).

***Autistic and Otherwise Neurodivergent CYP*: To explore prevalence of sensory processing difficulties further, we subdivided the CYP (for whom we had sensory information) into ND autistic CYP (n=766) and non-autistic but otherwise neurodivergent CYP (n=114). NT CYP were excluded as they, by definition, did not have any sensory processing differences. 61.6% of ND (autistic) group and 36.8% of ND (non-autistic) group were reported to have SPD/SID. The results of a Chi-Square tests of the association found a significant difference in frequency of SPD/SID across the ND (autistic) and ND (non-autistic) groups [$\chi 2$ (1, 880) = 25.648, $p < .001$].**

When only autistic CYP were considered, the results of a Chi-Square test of association found a significant difference in frequency of sensory processing difficulties across the SD (Past and Current SD combined) and No SD groups (Chi-Square: $\chi 2$ = 9.692, df = 1, $p = .002$). However, considering just ND (non-autistic) CYP, no significant difference in frequency of sensory

processing difficulties across the SD (Past and Current SD combined) and No SD groups was found (Fisher's Exact Test p = .708), although the number of non-autistic ND CYP was considerably lower in comparison to autistic CYP in this sample.

Finally, when SPD/SID was indicated, the mean number of sensory systems impacted for the ND (autistic) group (mean = 4.89, StDev = 2.08, Mdn = 5, IQR = 3) was higher than for ND (non-autistic) group (mean = 3.81, StDev = 2.23, Mdn = 0, IQR = 2.25). This represented a statistically significant difference, with the ND (autistic) group having a greater number of reported sensory systems impacted than ND (non-autistic) group (U = 56871.5, p < .001).

CYP within the Lifelong EHE group were also significantly more likely (n=13/25) than CYP without SD (n=5/50) to have sensory processing difficulties (Chi-Square: $\chi 2$ = 14.501, df = 1, p < .001; analysis constrained to include only the Lifelong EHE CYP and their age-matched No SD control group). Of the 13 CYP where sensory difficulties were indicated, the mean number of sensory systems with reported difficulties was 4.62 (StDev 2.53, Mdn = 5, IQR = 5).

Other NDs: As evidenced in Table 6, the most prevalent ND (after autism and sensory processing difficulties) amongst individuals with SD experience was ADHD, followed by Dyslexia, Dyspraxia, Auditory Processing Disorder (APD), Speech Difficulties, and Giftedness. The prevalence of intellectual disabilities was relatively low in both SD groups (6.7% Current SD; 5% Past SD). Under the "other" category, the most frequently mentioned neurodivergencies were hypermobility, PDA, and dysgraphia.

Given the high co-occurrence between ND conditions and the high proportion of autistic CYP amongst the ND CYP in the sample, there were insufficient cases to contrast prevalence rates for isolated ND conditions in the SD and No SD groups.

We did, however, compare prevalence of each ND condition across autistic and non-autistic neurodivergent CYP (see Table 8). Other than sensory processing differences [ND (autistic) group > ND (non-autistic) group], only Tic Disorders were reported more frequently in ND (autistic) CYP (10.2%) than in ND (non-autistic) group (1.8%) ($\chi 2$ (1,880) = 8.53, p < .001), and there were no instances where a ND condition was more prevalent in the ND (non-autistic) group relative to the ND (autistic) group.

5. Demand Avoidance:

EDA-8 scores for CYP experiencing SD were higher than scores for CYP without experience of SD (see Figure 8, Panel A). Specifically, a Kruskal-Wallis H test revealed significant differences between-groups in total EDA-8 scores (H = 242.945, df = 3, p < .001), with post-hoc analyses indicating that CYP in the Current SD group had significantly higher total EDA-8 scores than Past SD CYP, and that Current SD, Past SD, and Lifelong EHE CYP had significantly higher EDA-8 scores relative to No SD control CYP (all p's < .001). Total EDA-8 scores in CYP in the Lifelong EHE group did not differ from those in the Current and Past SD groups. This remained the case when the data was re-analysed using the Lifelong EHE age-matched control groups (see Table S6).

Higher extreme demand avoidance (EDA-8) scores correlated significantly with longer duration of SD ($r_s = 0.095, p = .008$), worse school attendance in the previous 20 days ($r_s = -0.126, p = .005$), worse attendance in the most recent academic year ($r_s = -0.106, p = .021$), and a younger age of onset of SD ($r_s = -0.205, p < .001$).



Fig. 8. Total Scores for EDA-8. Panel A: Overall group differences. Panel B: CYP in each group further sub-divided with respect to neurotype. *Neurodivergent but non-autistic CYP. Note: The Lifelong EHE group was not represented due to low numbers (n=2 in the NT group).

Higher extreme demand avoidance (EDA-8) scores also correlated significantly with number of sensory systems impacted ($r_s = 0.402, p < .001$), higher total anxiety ($r_s = 0.483, p < .001$), higher Performance Anxiety ($r_s = 0.345, p < .001$), higher Anxious Arousal ($r_s = 0.386, p < .001$), higher Separation Anxiety ($r_s = 0.423, p < .001$), and higher Uncertainty ($r_s = 0.488, p < .001$).

Considering autistic CYP relative to non-autistic CYP in each group separately, independent-samples Mann-Whitney U Tests found that EDA-8 scores were significantly greater in the ND (autistic) Current SD group (Mdn = 14) relative to the non-autistic Current SD group (Mdn = 7), U = 19741.5, p < .001; in the ND (autistic) Past SD group (Mdn = 11) relative to the non-autistic Past SD group (Mdn = 5), U = 1958.0, p < .001; in the ND (autistic) No SD group (Mdn = 6) relative to the non-autistic No SD group (Mdn = 1), U = 2177.5, p < .001; and in the ND (autistic) Lifelong EHE group (Mdn = 10) relative to the non-autistic Lifelong EHE group Mdn = 4), U = 21.5, p = .026.

More nuanced analyses further subdivided the non-autistic CYP into a ND (non-autistic) and a NT group (see Figure 8, Panel B). Independent-samples Kruskal Wallis tests, run separately for each group (Current SD, Past SD, No SD control Group, and Lifelong EHE Group), found overall significant between-group differences in each of the four groups: 1) Current SD (n=630): H = 47.889, df = 2, p < .001 [ND (autistic) > ND (non-autistic) > NT); 2) Past SD (n=161): H = 29.441, df = 2, p < .001 [ND (autistic) > ND (non-autistic) = NT]; 3); 3) No SD (n=140): H = 30.239, df = 2, p < .001 [ND (autistic) > ND (non-autistic) = NT]; and 4) Lifelong EHE (n=19): H = 6.627, df = 2, p = .036 [ND (autistic) > ND (non-autistic) = NT]. Hence, EDA

	ND Autistic (n=769)	ND Non-Autistic (n=114)	χ^2	df	n	Sig	No SD
Autism	**100% (n=769)**	**0%**	-	-	-	-	3.25% (n=25)
Sensory	**61.6% (n=474)**	**36.8% (n=42)**	**25.648**	**1**	**880**	**< .001**	1.94% (n=10)
ADHD	58.5% (n=448)	51.8% (n=59)	1.841	1	880	NS	2.56% (n=13)
Dyslexia	26.2% (n=201)	32.5% (n=37)	1.943	1	880	NS	3.36% (n=8)
Dyspraxia	28.9% (n=221)	21.9% (n=25)	2.360	1	880	NS	4.87% (n=12)
APD	18.5% (n=142)	19.3% (n=22)	0.038	1	880	NS	3.05% (n=5)
Speech Difficulties	17.6% (n=135)	10.5% (n=12)	3.593	1	880	NS	4.75% (n=7)
Gifted	16.2% (n=124)	17.5% (n=20)	0.133	1	880	NS	4.16% (n=6)
Dyscalculia	13.2% (n=101)	8.8% (n=10)	1.754	1	880	NS	3.6% (n=4)
Language Disorder	12.9% (n=99)	7.9% (n=9)	2.331	1	880	NS	3.7% (n=4)
Visual Processing Difficulties	10.6% (n=81)	6.1% (n=7)	2.168	1	880	NS	0%
Tic Disorder	**10.2% (n=78)**	**1.8% (n=2)**	**8.530**	**1**	**880**	**< .01**	6.25% (n=5)
Unspecified Learning Disorder	8.5% (n=65)	6.1% (n=7)	0.727	1	880	NS	1.39% (n=1)
Intellectual Disability	7.4% (n=57)	3.5% (n=4)	2.379	1	880	NS	3.22% (n=2)
Other	12% (n=92)	16.7% (n=19)	1.952	1	880	NS	2.6% (n=3)

Table 8. Other Neurodivergent conditions reported in autistic CYP and non-autistic neurodivergent CYP. Chi-square analysis show between-group differences in prevalence for individual ND conditions. No SD represents the percentage of ND CYP (out of the total number of ND CYP in the sample) that fell into the No SD control group.

scores were higher in the ND (autistic) group regardless of SD (or EHE) grouping.

However, exploring each neurotype group in isolation, significant between-group differences in EDA-8 scores were still evident [Neurotypical group (n=180): H = 59.009, df=2, *p* < .001, Current SD > Past SD = No SD; ND (non-autistic) group (n=87): H = 6.105, df=2, *p* = .047, no sig. pairwise comparisons; ND (autistic) group (n=671): H = 34.317, df=2, *p* < .001, Current SD > Past SD > No SD]. The Lifelong EHE group could not be included here due to low numbers in the NT group (n=2). Hence, in both the NT and the ND (autistic) groups, the No SD control groups had significantly lower EDA-8 scores than the Current SD group.

6. Impact of School on Mental Health

Impact of School Attendance on Mental Health:

Overall, 91.4% of parents in the Current SD group reported that attending school has a negative impact on their child's mental health. More specifically, 16% of parents in the Current SD group reported that attending school has a "somewhat negative" impact on their child's mental health (16%), 22.7% reported a "very negative" impact on their child's mental health, and 52.7% (i.e. 360 parents) reported an "extremely negative" impact (see Figure 9). This contrasted with just 0.4% of parents in the Current SD group who reported that attending school has an "extremely positive" impact on their child's mental health, the 1.3% who reported a "very positive" impact, and 2.8% who reported a "somewhat positive" impact. A similar pattern was evident in the Past SD group, where 81% of parents believed that school attendance has a negative impact on their child's mental health: 26.8% "somewhat" negatively, 20.7% "very" negatively, and 33.5% "extremely" negatively.

In contrast, only 11.5% of parents in the No SD control group reported that attending school has a negative impact on their child's mental health, and within this, only 0.7% believed that this impact was "extremely negative". Accordingly, 72.3% of control parents reported that school attendance has a positive impact on their child's mental health, with the most commonly endorsed response option amongst No SD control parents being "very positive" (38.5%).

In order to analyse the impact of school attendance on mental health further, each response type was assigned a numerical value so that a neutral impact (i.e. neither positive nor negative) was assigned a score of 0, a positive impact was assigned a score between +1 and +3 [+1 = somewhat positive, +2 = very positive, +3 = extremely positive], and a negative impact was assigned a score between -1 and -3 [-1 = somewhat negative, -2 = very negative, -3 = extremely negative]. These scores were averaged per SD group and by autism status, and represented in Figure 10. Wilcoxon signed rank tests assessed the impact of school attendance on mental health relative to zero (i.e. neutral). Only autistic CYP *without* SD were found to have a reported neutral response to attending school (*p* = .664); markedly different to their non-autistic No SD peers whose parents reported a statistically significant boost to their mental health as a consequence of school attendance (*p* < .001; see Figure 10, Panel A). On the contrary, parents reported a significant and detrimental impact to the mental health of their children as a consequence of school attendance in both SD groups (i.e. Current SD and Past SD), for both autistic and non-autistic CYP (all *p's* < .001; see 10, Panel A). Mann-Whitney U tests indicated that this detrimental impact was significantly more pronounced for the autistic Current SD group (Mdn = -3) relative to the non-autistic Current SD group (i.e. Current SD group, Mdn = -2), *U* = 26179.0, *p* = .002. This was replicated in the Past SD group, whereby the impact of attending school was reported by parents as being, on average, significantly more negative for the autistic CYP (Med = -2) relative to non-autistic CYP in the same group (Mdn = -1), *U* = 2810.0, *p* = .041. Similarly, the impact of attending school was reported by parents as being significantly less positive, on average, for autistic CYP without SD (Med = 0) than for non-autistic CYP without SD (Mdn = +2), *U* = 903.0, *p* = .001 (see Figure 10).

A more negative impact of school attendance on mental health correlated with higher total anxiety ($r_s = -0.545$, $p < .001$), higher Performance Anxiety ($r_s = -0.427$, $p < .001$), higher Anxious Arousal ($r_s = -0.505$, $p < .001$), higher Separation Anxiety ($r_s = -0.386$, $p < .001$), higher Uncertainty ($r_s = -0.543$, $p < .001$), greater number of impacted sensory systems ($r_s = -0.319$, $p < .001$), and more extreme demand avoidance (EDA-8) ($r_s = -0.101$, $p = .011$). A more negative impact of school attendance on mental health also correlated with all proxy markers of SD, i.e., age of onset of SD ($r_s = -0.103$, $p = .003$), duration of SD ($r_s = -0.077$, $p = .025$), school attendance in the previous 20 school days ($r_s = 0.454$, $p < .001$),



Fig. 9. Impact of School Attendance on Child's Mental Health x Group.

school attendance in the current academic year ($r_s = 0.431$,$\boldsymbol{p} < .001$)**, and school attendance in the previous school year** ($r_s = 0.317$,$\boldsymbol{p} < .001$)**.**

Following a set of questions which probed their child's SD presentation more explicitly, parents also provided free text comments that illustrated this negative impact on mental health further. Whilst responses to these questions and a more detailed qualitative analysis of free text comments will be published elsewhere, comments included descriptions of behaviours such as fatigue, limited communication, physical inaction, anxiety, avoidance, physical illness, vomiting, self-criticism, and over-compliance, e.g. ***"extreme withdrawal and a corresponding lack of expression/engagement"***, ***"sleeps immediately when returned home, stays asleep until morning"***, ***"wakes me in the night crying about school"***, ***"Sleep disturbance, tummy aches and bed wetting every night prior to school"***, ***"Vomiting and incontinence at home"***, ***"panic on way to school"***, **in addition to descriptions that included self-harm, suicidality, disordered eating, rage, regression, and violence/aggression e.g.** ***"aggressive, threatening controlling behaviour towards parents other children in the house"***, ***"lashing out at myself and car on way to school and on the way home"***, ***"attempt to run in front of traffic, attempts to eat nuts (nut allergy)"***, ***"Self harm after a difficult school day"***, **and** ***"Attempted suicide due to unmet needs within school"*****.**

Impact of Non-School Attendance on Mental Health**: Within this study, parents who reported a wellbeing-related reason for their CYP's SD were asked whether being out of school helps to improve their child's wellbeing (note: our full results regarding reasons for SD will be reported elsewhere). Results revealed that being out of school either 'definitely' or 'somewhat' improved the wellbeing of 81.2% of children currently experiencing SD, and improved the wellbeing of 77.7% of CYP who have experienced SD in the past.**

Engagement in Activities Outside of the Home**: Parents were also asked how often their child leaves the house and does something fun [response options: "Never", "Rarely", "Sometimes"**



Fig. 10. Impact of School Attendance on CYP's Mental Health. ***$p < .001$. NS = non-significant.

(once/week), "Frequently" (a few times a week), and "Everyday"]. Notably, the only group within which the majority of parents selected "everyday" was the Lifelong EHE group (50%) (see Table 9). The majority of parents in the No SD (Control) group (64.8%) indicated that their CYP leaves the house to do something fun "frequently" (i.e. a few times a week). This was also the most frequently selected option for CYP who have experienced SD in the past (39.4%). In contrast, the majority of parents in the Current SD group (38.9%) indicated that their CYP leaves the house to do something fun only "sometimes" (i.e. once per week). Moreover, the "rarely" and "never" options were endorsed considerably more frequently by this group relative to both the No SD control group and the Lifelong EHE group (Rarely: 24% relative to 5.6% and 5% respectively, and Never: 5.8% relative to 1.4% and 0% respectively). "Rarely" was often described as being "once per month" by the parents in the comment section, indicating that almost 30% of the CYP in the Current SD group leave their house at most once per month to do something fun.

These differences were statistically significant, with CYP in the Current SD [$\chi 2 = 86.3$, df = 4, $p < .001$] and Past SD [$\chi 2 = 22.95$,

	Current SD	Past SD	No SD	Lifelong EHE
Everyday	2.7%	7.9%	7.7%	50%
Frequently	28.6%	39.4%	64.8%	30%
Sometimes	38.9%	33.9%	20.4%	15%
Rarely	24%	12.7%	5.6%	5%
Never	5.8%	6.1%	1.4%	0%

Table 9. How often does your child leave the house to do something fun?



Fig. 11. *Impact of not attending school on mental health*

df = 4, $p < .001$] groups leaving their house, on average, significantly less frequently than CYP in the No SD control group, with CYP in the Current SD [$\chi 2 = 112.78$, df = 4, $p < .001$] and Past SD [$\chi 2 = 29.98$, df = 4, $p < .001$] groups leaving their house, on average, significantly less frequently than Lifelong EHE CYP, and with CYP in the Lifelong EHE group leaving their house, on average, significantly more frequently than CYP in the No SD control group [$\chi 2 = 28.21$, df = 4, $p < .001$]. This analysis was repeated for the groups precisely age-matched to the Lifelong EHE CYP and the pattern and results of the statistical analyses remained consistent (see Table S8 for data), with one exception whereby there was no longer a significant difference between CYP in the Past SD group and the No SD control group.

7. Is School "Suitable and Proper?"

A total of 975 parents responded to this question. Data analysis revealed an overall between-group difference with respect to whether parents believed that school-based education is *suitable* and *proper* for their CYP ($p < .001$). More specifically, significantly more parents of CYP without SD experience (i.e. No SD control parents) believed that school is the suitable and proper place for their child to be educated, than parents of children who currently are, or previously have, experienced SD ($p < .001$). Conversely, significantly more parents of CYP who have experienced SD (current or past) indicated that they believe that school is not *suitable and proper* for their CYP compared to parents of children without SD experience (i.e. the No SD control group) ($p < .001$) (for complete statistical analyses see Table S9).

Broken down further into parents of autistic and non-autistic CYP (Figure 13), it is notable that in both the Current SD (Panel A) and the No SD control groups (Panel C), parents of autistic CYP were significantly less likely to confidently believe that school is the suitable and proper place for their child to be educated (Current SD: $\chi^2 = 25.78$, $p < .001$; No SD: $\chi^2 = 22.27$, $p < .001$). The same trend (albeit a non-significant trend) was also evident in the Past SD group (Panel B).

Discussion

Through the use of an extensive online survey (including 947 parents of CYP who are currently, or have previously, struggled to attend school, and two control groups), this study identified several prevalent characteristics amongst CYP affected by what we term "School Distress". In the overwhelming majority of cases, SAPs were underpinned by significant emotional distress associated with school attendance. Parental accounts of their children's distress around school attendance were often harrowing, with extreme school distress noted in many instances.

Within the current literature, "school refusal" has been characterised into three distinct categories (100): self-corrective (i.e., absenteeism which lasts 2 weeks or less), acute (i.e., absenteeism that lasts between 2 weeks and 1 year), and chronic (i.e., absenteeism that lasts longer than 1 year). However, these categories failed to adequately describe the experiences of the CYP experiencing SD in this sample, with over a third of cases (37.1%) not fitting into one of these three categories. For example, some CYP continued to attend school (often against their will) despite the high levels of emotional distress they experienced. Parental descriptions of such cases included *"Will go but after huge amounts of upset and panic, odd day of refusal followed by managing to go in with difficulty a day or so later"*, *"We would manage to get him into school but he would beg not to go (heartbreaking) and feel nausea from waking until he got home (which he wouldn't tell anyone)"*, and *"He attended school but was very distressed, would cry, didn't want to go, found being at school pretty stressful (meltdowns at the end of the day)"*.

Such descriptions reinforce the utility of the 'School Distress' label relative to 'School Refusal' or similar terms, as it evidences the fact that some CYP who face difficulty attending school do not necessarily fail to attend school. Given their unaffected attendance rates, these CYP's distress and difficulties may fall under the radar of educational professionals (especially in the early stages), and the prior absence of an adequate typology enables such oversights. Notably, the 'School Distress' label also reinforces that for many CYP, the defining feature of their experience is not the "refusal" to go to school, but the severe emotional distress that they experience when they attempt to do so.

Hence, we propose that the 'School Refusal' label, which captures nothing of the emotional distress suffered by these CYP and is deeply unpopular with those with lived-experience of SD, should no longer be used by professionals. Instead, we propose that these difficulties are best described using the 'School Distress' (SD) descriptor. Further details with respect to how this school distress presented in the current cohort of CYP will be reported elsewhere.

Characteristic of the CYP with School Distress

***Age*: The CYP with experience of SD in our sample were young (mean current age of 11.6 years). The onset of their SD commonly occurred within their formative years, with an overall average age of onset of 7.9 years, and with 51.2% of cases of SD first occurring at 8 years or younger. These difficulties were also found to be enduring, with a mean duration of 4 years. The age of onset of SD in autistic CYP was significantly younger than for their non-autistic peers, and SD was more enduring in autistic CYP than in non-autistic CYP (see Figure 2). This replicates and extends previous findings showing that SAPs occur significantly earlier in autistic CYP than in non-autistic CYP (40), and**



Fig. 12. *Based you your experience as a parent, is school the suitable and proper place for your child to be educated?*



Fig. 13. Parents of autistic CYP were less likely to respond positively (Yes) to this question, even those who have not experienced school attendance difficulties.

aligns with the findings of Munkhaugen et al. (6), whose teacher-reports indicated greater severity of SAPs in autistic pupils. Notably, this pattern persisted when we subdivided the sample into CYP whose SD began after the Covid-19 related school closures and those whose SD preceded the Covid-19 pandemic.

***Neurodivergence*: The CYP who have experienced SD in our sample were significantly more likely to be neurodivergent than those who have not experienced SD, with 92.1% of CYP in the Current SD group and 83.6% of CYP in the Past SD group reported to be neurodivergent by their parent (see Figure 6). Such findings are comparable with those of Epstein et al. (102) who, in a smaller sample (n = 132), found that about 90% of CYP missing school had SEND (Special Educational Needs/Disability) or a health problem. Similarly, the Children's Commissioner's 2022 report (103) found that children with an EHCP were likely to have higher levels of absence from school than their peers receiving no SEND support. Moreover, this finding also aligns with those of Amundsen et al. (31), who found that 75% of their participants who were experiencing SAPs were neurodivergent, with just a quarter of the students in their sample having no known diagnosis.**

***Co-occurrence*: Co-occurrence between neurodivergencies was high (see Table 6 and Figure 7), with the CYP in our sample having a reported average of 3.14 ND conditions. CYP in the Current SD group were reported to have, on average, significantly more ND conditions (mean = 3.7) than CYP in the Past SD (mean = 3.0) and No SD (mean = 0.72) groups, and CYP in the Past SD and Lifelong EHE (mean = 2.52) groups were found to have a significantly higher number of reported ND conditions relative to the No SD control group. Similarly, co-occurrence between being ND and experiencing mental health difficulties was high, with 89.14% of CYP currently experiencing SD reported as being both ND and experiencing a mental health difficulty (see Figure 3). The high rate of mental health difficulties observed in the sample is consistent with previous findings showing high levels of depression, anxiety, and stress in CYP experiencing school-related emotional distress e.g. (25–27). However, neurotypical CYP currently experiencing SD alongside a mental**

health condition accounted for just 6.13% of cases in the Current SD group. Hence, exploring mental health difficulties alone (e.g. (25, 26)) is likely to obscure the wider functional profiles of CYP who experience SD, with this data suggesting instead that CYP with SD are predominantly neurodivergent CYP, who typically have multiple neurodivergent conditions alongside mental health difficulties (see Table 7).

Autism: Autism was the most prevalent ND condition reported in our sample, with 83.4% of CYP in the Current SD group and 66.2% of CYP in the Past SD group reported to be autistic (see Table 6). This included all cases of autism, diagnosed and suspected, and is higher than previous reports (e.g., (31), (6)), likely due to methodological differences. For example, Epstein et al. (102) found that about 40% of the CYP who were missing school in their sample were autistic, and Ochi et al. (40) found that 39.67% of their participants who were experiencing 'school refusal' were autistic. Notably, such previous research has typically only measured diagnosed cases of autism. Thus, when we restricted our analysis to include only CYP with a confirmed diagnosis of autism, our prevalence rates were more comparable with those in previous research (46.9% Current SD, 42.1% Past SD). However, such a method misses the 173 CYP in the Current SD group (23.4%), and the 20 CYP in the Past SD group (9.6%), who are currently on the autism assessment pathway. This typically only occurs after considerable evidence of autism has already been compiled across settings. This method also excludes CYP who have had their referral rejected before assessment (often due to services requesting more evidence prior to accepting referral), which accounts for 15 (2%) CYP in the Current SD group and 3 (1.4%) CYP in the Past SD group. Finally, this method also excludes 66 (8.9%) CYP in the Current SD group and 22 (10.5%) CYP in the Past SD group for whom autism is suspected but a referral has not yet been made.

Previous research, albeit in adults, has found no statistically significant differences in autism characteristics between individuals who have a confirmed autism diagnosis and individuals who suspect they are autistic or are awaiting diagnosis (104, 105), providing a robust rationale for a broader inclusion criteria. Relevant, too, are the very considerable waiting times for an autism diagnosis that CYP currently experience in the UK. Unfortunately, there is currently no requirement for NHS trusts to record waiting times from point of referral to point of diagnosis, or NICE guidelines with respect to autism assessment duration (106). Despite this, information published by The Observer newspaper earlier this year using data collected under the Freedom of Information Act, showed that autistic children in the UK are currently waiting up to five years for their first NHS appointment (107), and therefore even longer for an official diagnosis. Such considerable waiting times, coupled with the lack of significant differences in autism characteristics between individuals with confirmed and unconfirmed autism, strengthens the argument for the use of a broader inclusion criteria.

It is worth noting that when using these broader criteria, the odds ratio of autistic CYP experiencing SD was 37.69, however when we restricted our criteria to include only CYP with a confirmed diagnosis, the odds ratio increased to 46.61. This indicates that regardless of the strictness of the inclusion criteria, autistic CYP (with both confirmed and unconfirmed diagnoses) are far more likely than their NT peers to experience SD. This also indicates that receiving a diagnosis itself does not reduce the likelihood of experiencing SD. This is consistent with parental reports which describe a lack of appropriate support and provision for autistic CYP in UK schools, regardless of diagnostic status.

Anxiety: 93.4% of parents in the Current SD group and 82.7% of parents in the Past SD group (91/110) identified anxiety as a causal factor in their child's SAPs. Such high rates of anxiety are of considerable concern given the existence of research which has provided real-world examples of how anxiety may impact autistic CYP's ability to engage with learning in a classroom context (50). When parents were asked to specify the type of anxiety that their child experiences, over half of parents in both SD groups selected generalised anxiety. Generalised anxiety disorder (GAD) in a child or adolescent has been defined as *"excessive worry and tension about everyday events that the child or adolescent cannot control and that is expressed on most days for at least 6 months, to the extent that there is distress or difficulty in performing day-to-day tasks"* (108) (p 1). Separation anxiety and uncertainty were selected by one in every three parents, followed by performance anxiety (selected by approximately one in four parents), and then by selective mutism (selected by approximately one in five parents).

In addition to general anxiety questions, parents also completed the ASC-ASD parent version (95). This enabled a comparison of anxiety levels in the CYP in each of the four groups. Highly consistent with the above parental accounts, 92.5% of CYP currently experiencing SD met or exceeded the cut-off indicative of significant anxiety symptomatology (defined as a score of 20+), and the odds ratio of experiencing SD with a ASC-ASD-P score of 20+ was 44.02. Importantly, CYP who do not experience SAPs (i.e. the No SD control group) and CYP in the Lifelong EHE group had significantly lower total anxiety, performance anxiety, anxious arousal, separation anxiety, and uncertainty scores than CYP in either of the two School Distress groups (see Figure 4).

When grouped with respect to neurodevelopmental profile [Neurotypical, ND (non-autistic), and ND (autistic)], the NT group had consistently lower anxiety scores than both the ND (non-autistic) and the ND (autistic) groups regardless of SD condition, whilst the ND (autistic) group had significantly higher anxiety scores than the ND (non-autistic) and NT groups [ND (autistic) > ND (non-autistic) > NT]. This replicates previous studies showing the high prevalence of anxiety amongst autistic CYP (e.g. (109)) and that severe symptoms of anxiety frequently co-occur in autism (48), as well as the findings of Adams et al. (47), which revealed that 82.3% of autistic CYP (aged 6-14) report experiencing anxiousness whilst in their school environment. The addition of the ND (non-autistic) group relative to the NT and ND (autistic) groups is also informative.

Critically, however, in addition to these between-neurotype anxiety differences, CYP in the two SD groups had (on average) persistently higher anxiety scores relative to their comparable No SD group, even after controlling for neurotype (see Figure 5). Notably, the ND (autistic) Current SD group had particularly high anxiety scores, with a mean ASC-ASD-P score of 41.52 (StDev = 0.565), a mean item score of 1.746 (StDev = 0.024), and a median anxiety score of 42 (i.e. over twice the cut-off score for significant anxiety symptomatology). These scores are markedly higher than previously published scores using the ASC-ASD-P in similar populations. For instance, in a sample of 64 parents of autistic CYP aged between 5 and 16 years of

age (mean age = 10 years and 1 month), Adams et al. (110) reported a mean total anxiety score of 25.9 (StDev=14.6) and a mean item score per question of 1.1 (StDev = 0.65) - scores which are more comparable with the autistic CYP in our No SD control group (mean total score = 0.966, StDev = .120) and autistic CYP in our lifelong EHE group (mean item score = 1.221, StDev = 0.198). Such elevated scores are of concern, not least because higher anxiety severity is associated with a lower quality of life in both autistic and non-autistic children with anxiety disorders (111), and in autistic CYP more generally (110, 112). Moreover, such scores need to be considered with respect to the high prevalence of suicidality and death by suicide documented in autistic individuals e.g., (113–116) (see below for further discussion). Hence, supporting individual CYP who are experiencing such levels of anxiety, and their families, should be first and foremost in the minds of the educational and health-care professionals surrounding these CYP.

Overall, whilst these findings replicate those of Gonzalvez et al. (25), who also found significantly higher anxiety levels amongst school "refusing" CYP compared to CYP without SAPs, it also extends previous research by using a larger sample size and a broader typology (i.e. School Distress), and considers CYP's neurodevelopmental profiles. It also builds on previous 'School Refusal' research by using a clinical scale which has been devised using empirical evidence of the anxiety phenomenology in autistic CYP specifically, thus including items relating to sensory anxiety, intolerance of uncertainty, and phobias (95). This is important as the symptoms of anxiety in CYP differ in the context of autism (117), and autistic CYP, as already discussed, appear to be at considerably greater risk of SD.

As described previously, the ASC-ASD-P has four scales relating to performance anxiety, anxious arousal, separation anxiety, and uncertainty. Items such as "My child worries about being away from me" and "My child worries that something awful will happen to someone in the family" load onto the separation anxiety factor, whilst items such as "when my child has a problem, he/she feels shaky" have been found to load onto anxious arousal (95). In the case of performance anxiety, both social phobia items (e.g. "My child worries what other people think of him/her e.g. that he/ she is different" and "My child feels afraid that he/she will make a fool of him/herself in front of people"), and more traditional performance based items (e.g. "My child worries about doing badly at school work", and "My child worries when he/she thinks he/she has done poorly at something in case people judge him/ her negatively") load onto this factor, whilst the uncertainty-related anxiety factor incorporated a number of sensory items, such as "My child worries that people will bump into him/ her or touch him/ her in busy or crowded environments", and "My child worries about being in certain places because it might be too loud, or too bright or too busy". These loadings, plus the absence of a specific phobia factor, lead Rodgers et al. (95) to hypothesise that the uncertainty factor incorporates the atypical phobias commonly seen in autistic CYP, such as phobias of loud noises or crowded places (118–121), alongside items relating to intolerance of uncertainty (e.g. "My child always wants to know what will happen next", and "My child is afraid of new things, or new people or new places"). The link between intolerance of uncertainty and anxiety in autistic individuals has been established in a number of studies (121–123), and this difficulty tolerating uncertainty has been proposed to drive repetitive behaviours in order to impose predictability in the face of the intolerable uncertainty (95).

Using this scale thus enabled us not only to compare overall anxiety with previously published data from autistic CYP, but also to look at subscale patterns previously documented in this population. For instance Adams et al. (110), who also administered the ASC-ASD-P to parents of a similarly aged cohort (i.e. 5-16 years of age), found that the uncertainty-related anxiety factor had the highest mean score (1.33, StDev = 0.70), followed by the performance related anxiety factor (mean = 1.2, StDev = 0.8), the separation-related anxiety factor (mean = 1.0, StDev = 0.89), and lastly, by the anxious arousal anxiety factor (mean 0.65, StDev 0.62). This has been replicated in other studies, such as Keen et al. (124) who administered the ASC-ASD-P to parents of 5–6 year old autistic children, Den et al. (97) who administered the ASC-ASD-P to parents of 10–12-year old autistic children, and Adams et al. (47) who administered the ASC-ASD Child version to autistic CYP. In all instances the uncertainty subscale had the highest mean item score (1.36 in (124) and 1.39 in (97)).

Within the present study, we also observed the highest mean scores in the uncertainty subscale in the ND (autistic) SD Current and Past groups (see Figure 5). However, these mean uncertainty scores were roughly 50% higher than previous reports (97, 110, 124): 2.062 (StDev = 0.028) in the ND (autistic) Current SD group, and 1.952 (StDev = 0.063) in the ND (autistic) Past SD group. These notably elevated scores, particularly in the uncertainty domain, are concerning as difficulty with uncertainty (measured using the ASC-ASD child version) has been found to have the biggest deleterious impact on autistic children's quality of life (112).

Notably, in our cohort, we also observed equivalently elevated performance anxiety in these groups (2.023 (StDev = 0.77) in the ND (autistic) Current SD group and 1.819 (StDev = 0.848) in the ND (autistic) Past SD group). Interestingly, performance anxiety was also found at a similar level in the ND (non-autistic) Current SD group (mean = 2.10, StDev = 0.775), and to a lesser extent in the NT Current SD group (mean = 1.720, StDev = 0.874). Hence, both elevated uncertainty and performance anxiety may be particularly important factors in the autistic lived experience of SD, whilst elevated performance anxiety may be of particular relevance for the NT and ND (non-autistic) lived experience of SD. Future studies should seek to replicate these observations, and explore how these specific anxiety factors relate to the development and/or maintenance of SD. The contribution of separation anxiety and anxious arousal will also be relevant, as although these had lower mean item scores, they too were elevated in the SD groups.

Finally, the addition of these subscale scores enabled us to explore how each of the four anxiety subscales (in addition to total anxiety score) related to the proxy markers of School Distress collated here. We found that more extensive school distress (i.e. SD Duration) correlated significantly with total anxiety and all anxiety subscales (i.e. performance anxiety, anxious arousal, separation anxiety, and uncertainty), whilst higher uncertainty, higher anxious arousal, and higher total anxiety (but not performance or separation anxiety) were associated with lower school attendance in the previous 20 days, in the current academic year, and in the previous academic year. Higher separation anxiety was associated with a lower age of onset of SD, whilst higher anxious arousal scores were associated with an older age of onset

of SD (perhaps indexing an age-related difference in the experience and/or expression of SD). Total anxiety scores and scores on all subscales also correlated significantly with the number of sensory systems impacted, and with a greater level of emotional distress as a consequence of school attendance. Future research should seek to replicate and extend these findings. Longitudinal studies will likely be particularly informative.

Sensory Processing Differences: One possible explanation as to why SD is so prevalent amongst autistic CYP is due to the previously reported high prevalence of atypical sensory experiences in autistic individuals (37, 38), the high levels of overwhelming sensory overload (e.g. noise, crowds, smells...etc.) often present in the school environment, and the well-established association between sensory hypersensitivity and anxiety in autistic individuals (121, 125–127). Indeed, the overwhelming sensory demands of the school environment are well documented as reasons offered by autistic CYP, their families, and their teachers as to why they may find the school environment particularly distressing (e.g. (42, 43, 46, 50, 55)). Consistent with this, we found that: 1) Sensory Processing Disorder was significantly more prevalent in the SD groups relative to the No SD group; 2) ND (autistic) CYP were significantly more likely to have SPD/SID (61.6%) than ND (non-autistic) CYP (36.8%); and 3) SPD/SID was significantly more prevalent in autistic CYP with SD [affecting 64% of CYP in the ND (autistic) Current SD group and 54.9% in the ND (autistic) Past SD group] than in autistic CYP in the No SD group (32%);

Hence, CYP with SPD/SID, and in particular autistic CYP with SPD/SID, may have a particular vulnerability to SD. These findings are highly consistent with the hypothesis that co-occurring sensory processing difficulties increase risk of SD in autistic children, and offer one potential explanation as to why only some autistic children experience SD (6). Such between-group differences align with the relative differences observed with respect to the specific anxiety profiles of these CYP, particularly in relation to the uncertainty subscale.

In order to gain further traction about the nature of these difficulties, we sought to determine which, and how many, sensory systems were typically affected in CYP experiencing school distress. Thus, parents who reported that their child has SPD/SID were subsequently provided with a list of the eight sensory systems [i.e. Visual (Sight), Auditory (Hearing), Tactile stimulation (Touch), Olfactory (Smell), Gustation (Taste), Vestibular (Balance), Proprioceptive (Movement), and Interoceptive (Perception of sensations within the body)], and were asked to identify all of the sensory systems in which their child experiences difficulties. Instances of difficulties within a single sensory system were rare (accounting for just 3.74% of SPD/SID cases), with CYP with SPD/SID having difficulties across an average of 4.8 sensory systems (StDev = 2.1). Critically, CYP with SD (both current and past) had difficulties in significantly more sensory systems than CYP who did not experience difficulties attending school. Furthermore, the number of sensory systems impacted (range 0-8) correlated significantly with all of our proxy markers of school distress: school attendance in the previous 4 weeks, school attendance in the current academic year 2021/22, school attendance in the previous academic year 2020/21, the duration of School Distress, and the age of onset of SD, as well as with greater levels of emotional distress associated with school attendance, and ASC-ASD-P anxiety scores.

Further reinforcing the potential role played by sensory processing difficulties in SD was the observation that only 10 parents in the No SD control group reported that their CYP had SPD/SID, representing just 1.9% of the CYP reported to experience such difficulties. Hence, having no School Distress was extremely rare amongst the CYP identified by their parent/carer as having SPD/SID. Interesting also was the finding that the ND (autistic) group had sensory processing difficulties in more sensory systems than the ND (non-autistic) group, meaning that in addition to being more likely to have SPD/SID (relative to non-autistic ND CYP), autistic CYP were also more likely to have more pervasive sensory processing difficulties than non-autistic but otherwise neurodivergent CYP. Hence, whilst noisy and disorganised classrooms have been previously linked to "School Refusal" more broadly (22), these findings show that autistic CYP with pervasive sensory processing difficulties are particularly over-represented within samples of CYP with SD experience. These high rates of SPD amongst autistic CYP, coupled with the pervasive nature of the SPD experienced by autistic CYP, may mean that the school environment is a particularly uncomfortable/painful environment for many autistic CYP to be in, and lead to elevated uncertainty-related anxiety. This too may be the experience of non-autistic ND CYP with SD, but overall these difficulties appear less prevalent and less pervasive within this group. Hence, other factors (such as those tapped into in the performance anxiety subscale of the ASC-ASD-P, or indeed anxious arousal and separation anxiety) may play a more dominant role in the establishment and maintenance of SD for the majority of ND (non-autistic) CYP, whilst sensory processing differences (in addition to other anxiety subtypes) may contribute in tandem to the emergence and/or maintenance of SD for many autistic CYP.

Finally, the finding that difficulties were noted in the tactile system (touch) and auditory system (hearing) in four out of every five CYP with SPD/SID is of particular interest as tactile hypersensitivity and auditory filtering (i.e. the ability to process verbal instructions in noisy environments) have previously been found to be linked to cognitive inattention and academic under-performance in autistic CYP in mainstream classrooms (54), potentially providing some insight into why individuals with SPD/SID appear to be at increased risk of SD. Relevant too are the findings of Howe and Stagg (128), who explored sensory differences across four sensory systems (auditory, touch, smell, and vision) in 16 autistic pupils attending mainstream school, and found that these autistic pupils perceived auditory differences to be the most disruptive to their learning, followed by touch, smell, and vision. These difficulties were also reflected in the parental comments reported by Jones et al. (55), who explored the impact of sensory processing differences on learning and school life for autistic pupils. For example, one parent within their study explained that *"They try to protect themselves by covering their ears, closing their eyes, pulling their t-shirts over their noises to block out smells"* (p. 5)). Difficulties in the olfactory (smell) system were noted in two out of every three CYP with SPD/SID in our present study, resonating with the idea of autistic children trying to block out unpleasant smells with their t-shirts, and observations that *"PE changing room"* and *"incidental smells such as perfume and cleaning products"* are particularly challenging sensory experiences for autistic pupils in school (55) (p. 7). Olfactory processing difficulties may also explain why many autistic CYP find school halls/canteens particularly distressing, although this could also be linked with sensory

differences in the gustation (taste) system (indicated in half of the CYP with SPD/SID reported here; see also (55) e.g. *"[Autistic] Pupils getting stressed at lunchtimes because they don't like or are forced to try different foods"*). Notably, difficulties in the proprioceptive (movement) system were also noted in half of the CYP in SPD/SID in the current study. Of potential relevance here is the fact that Ashburner et al. (54) have previously linked movement sensitivity to oppositional behaviour in autistic CYP in mainstream classrooms.

In order to fully elucidate the role played by sensory processing differences in the establishment and maintenance of school distress, future studies should seek to further assess the severity of these sensory difficulties, the specific systems in which they occur, and explore these parameters with respect to anxiety, demand avoidance, autism, and ND more broadly. Such studies may also be well placed to explore the link between the uncertainty-related anxiety construct from the ASC-ASD (95) and the development of SD.

Demand Avoidance: CYP with SD experience also scored significantly higher on the Extreme Demand Avoidance Questionnaire (EDA-8, (84)) than CYP in the No SD control group (see Figures 8). Hence, consistent with parental accounts, CYP with SD do appear to display significantly more PDA/EDA/RDA behaviours than CYP who attend school without difficulties, on average. Scores on the EDA-8 correlated significantly with all proxy markers of SD severity, i.e. a younger age of onset of SD, longer duration of SD, worse school attendance in the previous 20 days, and worse school attendance in the current academic year. Higher demand avoidant scores also correlated significantly with higher total anxiety, higher performance anxiety, higher anxious arousal, higher separation anxiety, higher uncertainty, and greater levels of emotional distress associated with school attendance (see Figure S4). Such findings reinforces the link between demand avoidance and anxiety, and support previous anecdotal links between PDA/EDA/RDA and School Distress. This is consistent with the work of Truman et al. (90), who found that school is an even more negative experience for autistic CYP with PDA/EDA/RDA profiles than autistic CYP without PDA/EDA/RDA profiles, and can help to explain a previous report revealing that 70% of sampled school-aged CYP with a PDA profile were either not enrolled in a school or were unable to tolerate their school environment (89).

Interestingly, EDA-8 scores also correlated with the number of sensory systems in which CYP experience sensory processing difficulties, highlighting a potential link between sensory distress, anxiety, demand avoidance and SD.

Notably, autistic CYP had, on average, higher EDA scores compared to both the NT and ND (non-autistic) groups, confirming previous accounts that link high levels of demand avoidance to the autistic experience (a link which may potentially be mediated by sensory distress). Currently, however, most autistic individuals in the UK with demand avoidant profiles, and their families, are left without any PDA-specific guidance following an autism diagnosis. This is partly due to the fact that there is very limited access to multi-agency assessment pathways for CYP thought to have a PDA profile (88) in the UK. Moreover, although screening instruments have been designed for identifying extreme demand avoidance, such as the Extreme Demand Avoidance Questionnaire EDA-Q (98) and the more recent EDA-8 (utilised here (84)), there is no agreement with respect to the thresholds needed to be reached to confirm a diagnosis, or for the term "PDA profile" (or similar) to feature as part of a clinical formulation.

There are rare examples, such as in Solihull Local Authority, where a PDA-specific pathway has been developed to enable multi-agency co-operation aimed at better understanding the complexities of some CYP's needs and how best to support them (88). Moreover, others recognise the functional purpose of the term PDA (i.e. that it *"highlights an important known range of co-occurring difficulties for many children with autism spectrum disorder that can substantially affect families"* (129), p. 455), despite not recognising PDA as an independent syndrome. Additionally, there is increasing agreement that thinking about PDA/EDA/RDA dimensionally is beneficial, and increasing consensus that elucidating an autistic CYP's PDA/EDA/RDA profile within their clinical formulation can be useful in helping caregivers and educational professionals provide appropriate support (84).

Notably, in 2018, Summerhill and Collett argued that clinicians should apply the principle of "best interests" (Article 3 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, United Nations General Assembly, 1989) and consider a PDA diagnosis for autistic CYP for whom typical autism strategies are unhelpful. This was based on several factors, including the risk of demand avoidant behaviours being misconstrued by education professionals as defiance and deliberately challenging behaviour, which in turn leads to school exclusions (78) and a wider raft of educational, social, and mental health difficulties for these CYP (88), coupled with what has long been known about the risk for PDA CYP associated with "inappropriate handling and educational methods" (82). The present study's findings support Summerhill and Collett's argument and reinforce the personal cost of the current status quo within diagnostic services to PDA/EDA/RDA CYP.

Within their paper, they also highlight the importance of recognising the current dearth of understanding in the UK system more broadly regarding how best to support CYP with demand avoidant profiles. Debate as to how best this can be remedied needs to be supported by clinicians and those with a detailed understanding of the demand avoidant experience. Of note here is our finding that scores on the EDA-8 correlated significantly with scores on the ASC-ASD-P (total child anxiety scores and all subscale scores) and with the number of sensory systems in which CYP experience difficulties. These relationships warrant further consideration in order to develop an understanding into why and how demand avoidant behaviours become so pervasive in autistic CYP (and indeed in some otherwise ND and NT CYP), and how they relate to the emergence and maintenance of school distress.

Other Neurodivergent Conditions: Future studies are also required to fully explore the prevalence of SD in CYP with other neurodivergent conditions such as ADHD, dyslexia, dyspraxia, auditory processing disorder (APD), speech difficulties, dyscalculia, language difficulties, and giftedness, all of which were present at relatively high rates in our SD groups. Given the high co-occurrence between different NDs (see Figure 7), coupled with autism being so prominent amongst CYP in this sample, it was not possible to delineate the impact of each individual ND condition on SD. However, this in itself may be an essential finding here, such that it may be the complexity of managing multiple ND conditions that overwhelms these CYP, and ren-

ders the school environment so difficult and detrimental to their wellbeing. Support and planning will likely therefore need to be multidimensional and bespoke to the specific needs of individual CYP. Findings with respect to the specific support and interventions that these CYP have received to date will be reported elsewhere, alongside the efficacy of these supports from the parental perspective.

Accessing Assessment: Improving the provision of appropriate support and interventions for CYP is not only frustrated by all of the issues already mentioned (e.g., a lack of agreement with respect to PDA/EDA/RDA diagnostic criteria, a lack of understanding of how best to support autistic CYP's learning, both for autistic CYP with PDA/EDA/RDA profiles and more broadly, a lack of understanding of the complex intersection between multiple neurodivergent conditions and pervasive sensory processing difficulties, and how this impacts learning in a school environment), but it is likely also obstructed by the difficulties that CYP face with respect to securing basic diagnoses. Whilst these difficulties have already been discussed with respect to autism assessment/diagnoses, these sadly are not limited to autism. For instance, waiting times for ADHD assessments are often comparable to those for autism (107), and dual presentations (e.g. autism and ADHD) will inherently be more complex, and therefore likely involve a more complex and timely assessment process. In addition, for many CYP, an autism diagnosis may trigger a sensory processing assessment, which typically involves referral to a different service and hence new, additional waiting times, on top of the waiting times for autism assessment and diagnosis itself. With current waiting times, this may occur 1-2 years (or perhaps more) after their autism diagnosis.

Notably, in England, publicly funded schools are legally required to try to identify pupils with ND conditions such as dyslexia and other specific learning differences (SpLD), and publicly-funded schools and local authorities are legally required to help assess children suspected of having dyslexia and other SpLD. Despite this, funding for assessment and support is routinely cut or removed to meet schools' budget demands. The British Dyslexia Association estimates that 80% of dyslexic school children in England are unidentified by the time they leave school. Moreover, a 2019 report from an All-Party Parliamentary Group for Dyslexia and other SpLDs (*The human cost of dyslexia: The emotional and psychological impact of poorly supported dyslexia, April 2019* (130)) found that parents often report schools actively misinforming them about their children's needs in order to avoid potentially costly interventions, and teacher testimony is consistent with this (e.g. *"As a teacher, I'm told to tell parents that you can't test for dyslexia and that parents need to pay privately if they wish. But we, as a school, don't have to follow private assessments. Parents are also told it's not possible to recognise before seven."*). As noted in the report, this advice goes against current legislation directing schools on how to manage dyslexia.

The situation for CYP with Auditory Processing Disorder (APD) is also grave. Recent figures obtained following Freedom of Information requests by the APD Society UK found that only 54% of English and Welsh local authorities actually have an APD policy (131). This is consistent with empirical evidence showing that individuals themselves, and the families of individuals with APD, overwhelmingly report difficulties in getting access to diagnosis and support, and a lack of awareness of APD across health and education (132).

Given the above, it is clear that neurodivergent CYP face barriers to support at every level, undoubtedly playing a role in the challenges that they experience in education.

Family Neurodivergence and SAPs: To bridge a gap in past research and explore potential familial risk factors for SD, we also explored ND amongst the parents and siblings of children experiencing SD. Findings revealed that the parents and siblings of children experiencing SD were significantly more likely to be ND than parents/siblings of children with no experience of SD.

Notably, it is possible that the high rates of ND amongst parents of CYP experiencing SD may explain the higher rates of mental health difficulties found in parents of CYP experiencing SD in previous studies (e.g. (29)), and that these high rates of ND may have appeared to professionals working with them as markers of "family dysfunction" (133) when perceived through a neurotypical lens.

Also relevant here are the findings of Pohl et al. (134), who conducted a comparative study of autistic and non-autistic women's experiences of motherhood. This study found that as well as being more likely to have experienced additional psychiatric conditions, autistic mothers were also more likely to report feeling misunderstood by professionals, and reported experiencing higher levels of anxiety and selective mutism when interacting with professionals. They also had concerns with respect to not knowing which details were appropriate to share with professionals. Hence, considering inter-generational neurodiversity may be helpful for professionals who wish to establish supportive working relationships with the families of children experiencing SD and to provide them with appropriate support. Increased recognition and understanding of parental neurodiversity, including the strong bonds and intense connection and love that autistic mother's report sharing with their children (135), may also help prevent unnecessary referrals of SD families to children's social services.

Within the present study, we also replicated a previous observation in the literature which noted that a high rate of CYP who experience SAPs are the youngest child in their family. This was particularly evident in our Current SD group, where 39.2% of CYP were the youngest child in their family (see Table 1). This finding is important as previous work noting the same phenomenon (136) has indicated (based on the opinions of teachers and other professionals) that it is driven by some parents being *"unwilling to let [their child] leave the home"* (p. 14) due to their own separation anxiety. Such suggestions resort to parental (usually maternal) infantilization explanations as a possible driving factor of SD in some children. Such views are also evident in the stereotypic description of such families, i.e., *"a triangular relationship between an overprotective mother, a distant father and an over-dependent child"* (133) (p. 35), and are consistent with psychiatry's history of blaming mothers for psychopathology (137) - a phenomenon particularly intransigent within the autism literature and autism clinical practice (138).

We suggest that a more parsimonious explanation of the high rates of youngest children experiencing SD is the presence of within-family multiplier effects, whereby genetic (e.g., ND) and environmental factors (such as previous sibling and parental experiences), compound risk. Such explanations do not require professionals to offer non-evidenced and often unhelpful opinions, such as in Archer et al. (136) and Thambirajah et al. (133),

which often function to alienate families from the professionals around them at a time when compassionate, non-judgemental, and evidenced-based support is vital.

Gender identity: Consistent with the literature, we did not find compelling evidence of differential rates of SD amongst male and female CYP. Overall, 94.1% of parents identified their child's gender as cisgender (52.1% cisgender male and 42.5% cisgender female), 3.3% as non-binary or transgender, and 1% selected the 'self-describe' option. These latter options (i.e.. trans/non-binary/self-describe) were more frequently selected by parents of CYP with experience of SD. This is consistent with previous empirical evidence which has reported that transgender and gender-diverse individuals have, relative to cisgender individuals, higher rates of autism and other neurodevelopmental and psychiatric diagnoses (139), all of which are elevated in our SD groups. Notably, Warrier et al. (139) also found that for both autistic and non-autistic individuals, transgender and gender-diverse individuals scored higher on self-report measures of autistic traits and sensory sensitivity (amongst others). Future studies should explore this finding further to ensure that transgender and gender-diverse CYP are being appropriately supported in schools.

Consequences of School Distress

1. Impact of SD on Mental Health: In addition to the anxiety data discussed above, we also asked parents to quantify the impact of school attendance on their child's mental health. Strikingly, only the non-autistic No SD group were found to show a positive mental health benefit as a consequence of school attendance. For the two SD groups, attending school had a significant negative impact on mental health. More specifically, 91.4% of parents in the Current SD group reported that attending school has a negative impact on their child's mental health, and for 52.7% of the Current SD group, attending school was reported to have an "extremely" negative impact on their mental health. Moreover, just 4.5% of the Current SD group, relative to 72.3% of the No SD control group, reported a positive impact on their child's mental health (see Figures 9 and 10). Statistically, these group differences were highly significant.

Notably, this deleterious impact was significantly more pronounced in the Autistic SD groups than in the non-Autistic SD groups. In addition, the Autistic No SD group were found not to derive an equivalent boost to their mental health from school attendance, compared to non-Autistic No SD CYP. Hence, even in the best case scenario (i.e., when autistic CYP are not experiencing difficulties attending school), autistic CYP still do not appear to be deriving the same mental health benefit from school attendance relative to their non-autistic peers. Indeed, only one parent of an autistic CYP rated the impact of school attendance as "extremely positive" and this CYP (unlike the majority of autistic CYP in our sample) attended a specialist school. The strong positive benefit of school attendance on neurotypical CYP's mental health observed here is reassuring for this group of CYP and their parents.

This study's findings also indicated that being out of school can help to improve the mental health of CYP experiencing SD. Specifically, when parents of CYP currently experiencing SD were asked if being out of school improves their wellbeing, 81.1% said that it did, with 48.5% stating that being out of school 'definitely' improved their child's mental health and 32.7% stating that it 'somewhat' helped their child's mental health (see Figure 11). As above, significantly more parents of autistic CYP stated that being out of school helped their child's mental health (83%) relative to parents of non-autistic CYP (69.9%) (see Figure S3).

These findings run counter to the strong narrative in the media during the Covid-19 school closures regarding the importance of school attendance for CYPs' mental health. Instead, the positive benefit of school attendance on CYP's MH does not appear to extend to CYP experiencing SD, and indeed, to many autistic CYP, including those who do not show any obvious school distress. Interestingly, research comparing the effects of the Covid-19 related school closures on autistic and neurotypical CYP has found that whilst parents of autistic CYP reported greater negative changes in their children as a consequence of the school closures, and greater negative emotions at the initial peak of the school closures relative to the parents of neurotypical peers (with the loss of daily structure and uncertainty highlighted as key factors), they also reported significantly more positive changes and marginally more positive emotions in their children (such as them feeling relaxed, hopeful, and confident about the future) when compared to the parents of neurotypical children (140). Hence, whilst there is complexity here, and a clear negative impact of unexpected, profound change to daily routine, the impact of the school environment itself on autistic CYP's mental health does not appear to be equivalent to that derived by neurotypical CYP, and may instead be damaging for some autistic CYP. Whether this difference is driven by the social, sensory, or learning demands of the school environment (or a combination of these factors) needs urgent research attention and consideration.

Parents of CYP with experience of school distress also reported concerning differences with respect to their child's everyday functioning. Results revealed that CYP in the Current SD group leave the house to do something fun considerably less frequently than CYP in the No SD and Lifelong EHE groups, with 38.9% of parents in the Current SD group reporting that their CYP leaves the house just once a week, and almost one-third (29.8%) 'rarely' or 'never' leaving their house. Such findings align with the testimony of parents with respect to behaviours that they observe in their children following school attendance, such as fatigue, limited communication, physical inaction, anxiety, avoidance, physical illness, vomiting, self-criticism, over-compliance, self-harm, suicidality, disordered eating, rage, and regression.

This latter data also emphasised that, within this study, there was no evidence to suggest that CYP who experience SD are being motivated to skip school to pursue pleasurable activities outside of school or their homes, as has been suggested in the literature previously (100). Instead, there is clear evidence to indicate that these CYP are suffering from significant mental health difficulties that are impacting upon their basic everyday functioning, including their ability to engage in activities outside of the home. This reinforces the need for appropriate typology (i.e. School Distress as opposed to School Refusal) so that those cases which are driven by external factors, such as pursing pleasurable activities outside of school/home, can be more readily delineated.

2. Impact of SD on Education: The consequences of SD on school attendance rates were considerable, with a combined total of 6,197 possible school days missed by the CYP in the Current SD group in the previous 4 weeks alone. For the current academic

year, mean school attendance for CYP currently experiencing SD was below 50% (i.e., the criteria for 'severe absence'). Broken down further, 14.7% of CYP in the Current SD group had an attendance rate of 0% for the current academic year, 45.28% experienced severe absence (i.e., had an attendance rate <50%), and 87% experienced persistent absence (i.e., had an attendance rate of 90% or below).

Strikingly, almost one-third (32.8%) of parents in the Current SD group reported that their child received no support at school (e.g. *"no support and attends at less than 10%"*). Additionally, whilst 38.1% of parents reported that their child was on the school's SEN register (or equivalent) and 32.9% of parents indicated that their CYP had an EHCP in place, this did not appear to translate into ring-fenced SEN support at school for many of the CYP, with parental comments including: *"On SEN register at school but has no actual support"*, *"Has an EHC statement but very little if any support"*, *"Has EHCP but is ignored"*, *"School not following EHCP"*, and *"Has ehcp but currently homeschooling due to no suitable setting available and previous setting causing trauma due to excessive restraint and not meeting basic needs"*. Parent comments also frequently referred to a lack of support from their child's school when they attempted to seek additional support for their child, e.g. *"I am in the process of applying for this [EHCP] myself as school are unwilling"*, *"Parent application [for EHCP] no support from school"*, and *"In mediation. I'd to self apply [for EHCP] as school delayed and blocked"*. The likely reason for this lack of support is well documented elsewhere e.g., *"The fact that schools are forced to pay for the first ... of meeting an EHCP from their own budgets disadvantages those that do the right thing ... Would it not then be wiser for the Government to agree that EHCPs should be directly funded so that the money followed the pupil entirely, instead of penalising schools that do the right thing?"* (Tim Farron, MP (141)).

When considering current educational setting in relation to two markers of SD severity (i.e. attendance rates and SD duration), we found that the Current SD subgroup who are currently attending a mainstream school were earlier in their SD journey, with a mean SD duration of 3.43 years, relative to a mean SD duration of 5.29 years for the Current SD subgroup who are currently attending a specialist school. Moreover, the Current SD subgroup currently attending a mainstream school had a relatively high attendance rate for the previous academic year (i.e. 2020/21) (72.39%), relative to just 42.83% for the Current SD subgroup currently attending a specialist school, however it is important to note that it is unknown whether these CYP were already attending a specialist school in the 2020/21 academic year, or whether they moved to this provision later (see Table 2). Notably, whilst CYP in the Current SD group currently attending a specialist school had the lowest average attendance rates for the previous academic year (i.e. 2020/21), they had the highest recent attendance rates, attending school on an average of 10.69 of the previous 20 school days. This was the highest recent attendance rate reported for any of the five Current SD subgroups, including the subgroup currently attending a special unit within a mainstream school setting or the subgroup currently attending a PRU (or similar), whose recent attendance was 5.95 days and 6.45 days (out of 20) respectively. Future longitudinal research which tracks CYP as they transition between settings (e.g. from mainstream to a specialist school) is urgently needed in order to gain traction with respect to which educational provisions best support CYP experiencing SD. Based on the most recent attendance figures (i.e. attendance in the last 20 days), specialist schools appear to be outperforming specialist units within mainstream schools and pupil referral units, despite it appearing that they are supporting the CYP with the most persistent SD.

Notably, findings revealed that 30.13% of CYP within the Current SD group cannot access their current educational setting. Given this, some parents reported that financial responsibility for their child's education has fallen on them, for example *"Parent funded minimal package of activities (due to failure of LA to provide alternative provision)"*. Positively, a small number of parents did indicate that attendance at school was being supported by one-to-one support (e.g., *"Awaiting specialist provision. Attending mainstream on reduced timetable with full-time funded 1:1"*), however this was not the case for others (e.g., *"Without education due to 1-1 not being available and support not available - so unable to access the lessons at school. Taught at home instead."*. Notably, within the Current SD group, some parents also described a sort of "educational limbo" and were unable to name their child's current educational setting, e.g., *"No education due to being abandoned"*, *"When he could no longer cope with college nothing else was offered. We are trying to get an EHCP so that he can get something. He is not officially on the role of any school"*, and *"My son has been on no school roll since October 2021. We are currently in the EHCNA [Education, Health and Care Needs Assessment] process. In January LA panel agreed to medical needs alternative provision. A month later, we are still waiting"*.

Of the parents in "educational limbo", 88.3% described their child as currently being without any form of educational provision (see Table 3). This includes a combination of CYP who are unable to access their current provision, CYP whose placement is accepted to have failed, and/or CYP who are awaiting a specialist provision (see Table S2 for further details). However, being without education was not specific to the "in limbo" group. Indeed, the second largest group classified as being "currently without education" by their parents were CYP who were currently attending a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) or similar, with one third (33.3%) of these CYP falling into this category. Additionally, whilst not falling into the "currently without education" category (column 4, Table 3), several other parents expressed concerns about the education their child is receiving in their current provision (e.g., *"Waiting 2 years 6 months for a SEN school that can meet his needs. He is just making things from cardboard at school not doing any work."*.

Positively, CYP whose current setting was a specialist school were half as likely as CYP currently being educated in a unit within a mainstream school to be rated as "currently without education" (14.7% relative to 28%). This may again index a higher success rate for specialist schools relative to units within mainstream schools and PRU (or similar) with respect to supporting CYP with enduring SD.

Moreover, CYP with an EOTAS provision provided by their LA were the least likely group to be rated by their parents as being "currently without education", with only one out of the 35 EOTAS CYP (i.e., 2.9%) described by their parents as being without education. In this instance, this parent commented that their child is *"unable to engage in much EOTAS provision currently"*. Overall, this is reassuring, as EOTAS appears to be providing education to CYP with enduring SD (average duration 4.81 years) in the majority of cases (97.1%). Future re-

search exploring both short and long-term outcomes are needed to establish how best CYP with SD can be supported to access education, with this study providing some preliminary evidence that both specialist schools and EOTAS provisions may be outperforming other alternatives for CYP with persistent SD, perhaps due to the ability of these provisions to provide a more individualised, needs-based provision.

Notably, the above scenarios of children being "currently without education" are in addition to the parents who made the decision to de-register their child from the system altogether due to the severity of their child's mental health needs or level of unmet needs at school, with one parent stating *"I battled every single day to get her to school so she never missed a day. Unfortunately, this was not sustainable and she stopped eating and sleeping so I deregistered her from school four weeks ago"*, and another reporting that their CYP was *"Forced into school, dragged off us by assistant, until during the pandemic when we decided we weren't going to do that anymore. He was still marked present and we continued online schooling until the end of primary school. We declined a place in secondary school as there were no suitable provisions available"*.

Moving forward, only 35.6% of parents in the Current SD group wished for their CYP to be educated in a mainstream school in the future (see Table 3, column 5), despite 97% of the CYP in this group commencing their education in a mainstream school. Disillusionment with mainstream education also emerged in parent comments, for example *"I am now off sick and considering ALL options other than mainstream"*. Notably, over one-quarter of parents of CYP currently experiencing school distress (28.3%) wished for their child's future educational provision to be delivered via EOTAS. However, less than one fifth (19.43%) of these parents believed that their local authority will realistically support this (their preferred) option for their child's future education. Similarly, education in a specialist school was the next most frequently endorsed option, with one-fifth of parents (20.2%) selecting this as the educational setting that they desire for their CYP, however less than half (44.05%) of these parents believed that this is a realistic possibility. These figures are particularly concerning, given the success of EOTAS (97.1%), and the relative success of specialist schools (85.3%), in providing education to CYP with particularly entrenched SD (mean duration 4.81 years and 5.06 years, respectively).

Similarly, and despite 97% of CYP in the Past SD group commencing their education in a mainstream school, only 24.27% remain educated within a mainstream classroom environment currently, with 13.59% now attending a Specialist School, 2.91% attending a special unit within a mainstream school, 0.97% attending a private school, and 0.97% attending an alternative education establishment. Of the remaining 57.28%, 2.91% have no access to education either through their local authority or parents, 7.7% have an EHCP Education Otherwise Than At School (EOTAS) provision, 0.97% attend a private online school, 0.97% have a supported internship, and 44.67% were described as EHE. Within this 'EHE' group, the majority of parents (67.4%) described this as *"coerced"* EHE (i.e., they had no choice about providing it), 17.4% indicated that they had eventually chosen this option, and 15.2% did not indicate either way.

Hence, in both the Current and Past SD groups, a substantial number of CYP are currently without access to an accessible education provision provided by their local authority, despite Section 19 of the Education Act (1996). Under this Act, local authorities have a duty to *"make arrangements for the provision of suitable . . . education at school or otherwise than at school for those children of compulsory school age who, by reason of illness, exclusion from school or otherwise, may not for any period receive suitable education unless such arrangements are made for them"*. This is consistent with the findings of the recent Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman report ("Out of school, out of sight? Ensuring children out of school get a good education") (142). The present research thus highlights the importance of the Ombudsman's recent recommendations for local authorities regarding their management of CYP experiencing SD, which reiterate the legal responsibilities of local authorities with respect to the provision of accessible education for all CYP. Parental dissatisfaction and frustration with the support their child is/was receiving from their school and LA was evident throughout this research.

Within our survey, we also considered "off-rolling" and exclusions. Of concern was the finding that the majority of the CYP excluded or "off-rolled" from school were autistic CYP, with autistic CYP accounting for 87.5% of permanently excluded CYP, 83.15% of CYP who had received a fixed-term exclusion(s), and 80% of "off-Rolled" CYP. These concerns were supported by statistical analysis which showed that autistic CYP were significantly more likely to be permanently excluded, to receive a fixed-term exclusion, or to be off-rolled than their NT peers.

The majority of "off-rolled" CYP were "off-rolled" into home education, lasting for an average of 13.9 months, and for many this is still on-going. Existing Government guidance makes it clear that they consider "off-rolling" unacceptable and that exclusions for non-disciplinary reasons are unlawful. Despite this, as described above, high rates of coerced EHE were reported by parents, alongside the specific cases of "off-Rolling". Such findings, alongside parental comments throughout this research, raise serious questions about widespread unlawful practices both at school and the local authority level with respect to this practice, for example one parent reported that their CYP is *"Educated at home but not by choice. LA have failed to find a setting that can meet needs and due to refusal at PRU the LA are stated I am choosing to educate which is not the case"*.

It is already well-documented that autistic CYP are three times as likely as CYP without SEN to receive a fixed-term exclusion and to be permanently excluded (143). The current findings therefore replicate and extend previous findings, and raise the question of whether previous investigations have considered the emotional distress that the excluded CYP suffer when attending school. Moreover, they add to concerns with respect to whether such exclusions (and cases of "off-rolling") are lawful under the Equality Act 2010, or whether schools are taking punitive action against autistic CYP for disability-related behaviour.

As well as impacting attendance rates and often denying CYP access to their education setting, SD was also found to negatively impact upon academic performance. Specifically, 66.7% of CYP in the Current SD group were failing to meet academic expectations relative to just 8.1% of CYP in the No SD (control) group (see Table S3). Statistically, CYP in the Current SD group were significantly under-performing relative to their peers in all other

groups (including Lifelong EHE CYP), and CYP who have experienced SD in the past were also performing significantly worse than CYP in the No SD control group (all p-values < .001).

Considering the academic attainment of CYP in the Current SD group, in relation to their current educational provision, we found that the Current SD subgroup who are currently attending a mainstream school had the lowest proportion of CYP rated as "not meeting expectations", although this still equated to 6 in every 10 CYP failing to meet academic expectations. The Current SD subgroup who are currently attending a specialist school had the highest proportion of CYP rated as 'not meeting expectations' (91.2%). This difference likely relates to the fact that the CYP currently in specialist schools had significantly more enduring SD than CYP currently in mainstream classrooms, indicating they had had a longer period of affected education. Interestingly, the group of EOTAS CYP, whose SD duration matched that of the CYP now attending specialist schools, had the highest proportion of CYP with Current SD who were exceeding academic expectations (14.3%). However, 80% of this group were still categorised as 'not meeting expectations' (see Table S4). Hence, in addition to having low attendance rates and reduced access to education, our findings have revealed that CYP with SD are significantly under-performing academically, likely having significant life-long consequences.

Lifelong EHE CYP and their families

Interestingly, CYP whose parents had decided that school-based education was not appropriate for them at an early point in life (i.e., Lifelong EHE CYP) showed similar profiles to SD CYP, with comparable rates of ND in both the CYP themselves and within the child's immediate family (parents/siblings). Many of these parents often highlighted their child's neurodevelopmental profile as a key determinant in their decision to home educate, and appeared to recognise early in their child's life that, given their ND, they would likely face difficulties accessing school-based education (e.g., *"I am certain school would be damaging to my EHE child"* and *"We chose to EHE mostly to protect our children's mental health and well being"*). Moreover, many articulated that they considered EHE a better fit to their child's needs as it affords them flexibility to readily adapt their approach to meet the child's individual learning needs (e.g., *"As we EHE, adaptation to individual needs is inbuilt"*), or to provide the high level of support required (e.g., *"[CYP is] electively home educated due to needs, so has 1:1 support"*). Hence, Lifelong EHE CYP, and particularly ND Lifelong EHE CYP, are an important comparison group for this and future research.

Overall, however, the Lifelong EHE group and the No SD control group did not differ with respect to anxiety scores (either overall or on the individual subscales), and scores were consistently lower in the Lifelong EHE group than for the Current SD group. In line with this, whilst 92.2% of CYP in the Current SD group and 84.5% of CYP in the Past SD group met the clinical cut-off score indicative of significant anxiety on the ASC-ASD-P, only 40% of Lifelong EHE met this cut-off score. However, when further subdivided into autistic and non-autistic CYP, the Autistic Lifelong EHE group had significantly higher scores than the non-autistic Lifelong EHE group for Performance Anxiety, Separation Anxiety, and Uncertainty. This is consistent with an overall heightened anxiety in autistic CYP regardless of SD group. Notably, elevated EDA-8 scores were evident in Lifelong EHE CYP, alike in the two SD groups, and Lifelong EHE CYP were also significantly more likely to have sensory processing difficulties than CYP without SD. Such findings further illustrate the common neurodevelopmental profiles of CYP who experience SD and Lifelong EHE CYP.

However, despite the comparable neurodevelopmental profiles, Lifelong EHE CYP as a group did not show the equivalent educational and mental health difficulties described by the parents of the CYP who had attended school and consequently experienced SD. For instance, significantly more CYP in the Lifelong EHE group were rated as meeting their academic expectations, and significantly fewer were rated as not meeting expectations, relative to CYP in the Current SD group. Lifelong EHE CYP were also the most likely group to leave the house 'everyday' to do something fun, with just one Lifelong EHE CYP 'rarely' leaving the house, and no Lifelong EHE CYP 'never' leaving the house. Hence, despite overlapping neurodevelopmental profiles, overall developmental profiles of the Lifelong EHE CYP diverged from the SD groups with respect to these markers of academic and social engagement.

It is noteworthy that fewer Lifelong EHE CYP were reported to be 'diagnosed' with ND conditions than in the SD groups. Instead, there were high rates of 'suspected but yet to be confirmed' ND. This may reflect the difficulty accessing assessment pathways when out of school, as many NHS trusts prefer evidence from a nursery or educational setting before proceeding with assessment, or may need to prioritise assessment of CYP experiencing significant mental health difficulties, such as those reported in many of our SD CYP - difficulties which were not so prevalent in the ND Lifelong EHE CYP. It may also reflect a lower need to have a Lifelong EHE CYP's ND formally assessed, as a key purpose of such assessments and diagnostic labels is to provide educators outside of the CYP's family with information with respect to the CYP's strengths and weaknesses. However, as clinical diagnoses also provide the individual CYP, and their families, with valuable information with respect to their own strengths and weaknesses, further research is needed to ensure that diagnostic pathways are equally accessible to Lifelong EHE CYP.

Is School "SUITABLE" and "PROPER"?

Within this study, we also asked parents whether they believed, based on their experiences, that school was a suitable and proper setting for their child to be educated in. We selected the terms "suitable" and "proper" on the basis of current legislation, namely Section 19 of the Education Act (EA) 1996 (discussed above), and Section 61 of the Children and Families Act (CFA) 2014, which states that "A local authority in England may arrange for any special educational provision that it has decided is necessary...to be made otherwise than in a school" (s 61(1) CFA 2014), and that "an authority may do so only if satisfied that it would be inappropriate for the provision to be made in a school or post-16 institution or at such a place." When answering the question of whether it would be "inappropriate" for educational provision to be made in a school (or similar), local education authorities (LEA) are required "to give full effect to the word 'inappropriate'", and to do so, an LEA "has to see if a school 'would not be suitable' or 'would not be proper'...[taking] into account all the circumstances of the case at hand...[including] the child's background and medical history, the particular educational needs of the child;...the parents' wishes; and any other particular circumstances that apply

to a particular child" (Summary Guidance provided by NN -v- Cheshire East Council (SEN) [2021] UKUT 220 (AAC) Case no: HS/260/2021).

Parents with experience of SD (current or past) were significantly *more* likely to report that school is *not* a suitable and proper setting for their CYP to be educated, compared to parents without experience of SD. Specifically, 41.9% of parents in the Current SD group and 47.2% of parents in the Past SD group responded "no" when asked if school is suitable and proper for their CYP, compared to just 2.8% of those in the No SD group. Moreover, only 15.4% and 26.7% of Current SD and Past SD parents responded "yes" to this question, relative to 88.3% of parents in the No SD control group. The rest of the parents were unsure. Of additional concern was the finding that parents of autistic CYP were significantly less likely to confidently believe that school is the suitable and proper place for their child to be educated in compared to parents of non-autistic CYP, both in the Current SD and No SD groups. Hence, even without SAPs, parents of autistic CYP were significantly less convinced that school is a suitable and proper place for their child.

These findings are important as current legislation assumes that the correct place for all children to be educated in is a school setting and, where possible, their local mainstream school, as this is the cheapest form of provision. Concerns with respect to such policies have been raised ever since the move towards 'inclusion' in the 1980s that resulted in the closure of many specialist schools. For instance, Prof MacBeath of Cambridge University, who co-wrote a report titled "The Costs of Inclusion" for the National Union of Teachers in 2006 (144), is reported to have commented to journalists that "Physically sitting in a classroom is not inclusion. Children can be excluded by sitting in a classroom that's not meeting their needs....You might call it a form of abuse, in a sense, that those children are in a situation that's totally inappropriate for them". The current research exposes the very real cost of such policies to autistic, or otherwise neurodivergent, children and young people's mental health.

The current findings must be considered with respect to autistic individuals' increased vulnerability to severe mental health difficulties, suicidality (113), attempted suicide (145), and death by suicide (114, 115), with rates of suicidal ideation and suicide attempts being significantly higher for autistic children (14%) than for their neurotypical peers (0·5%) (116). In addition to such research showing increased risk of suicide in autistic individuals broadly, Hirvikoski et al.'s found that autistic people without a co-occurring intellectual disability are more likely to die by suicide (odds ratio = 9.40). This is of relevance here given the low rates of co-occurring intellectual disability reported here (6.6% Current SD group, 5% Past SD group). Hence, safeguarding the mental health autistic CYP needs to be considered as a priority area for schools/educational settings when considering the appropriateness of educational placements. This may be particularly relevant for mainstream school placements, given the findings reported here and previous work showing that attending a mainstream school is associated with school non-attendance in autistic pupils (41).

More widely, exploring the impact of mainstream and specialist school attendance on autistic CYP's mental health warrants urgent further research, clinical and policy attention. In the interim, and when asked to provide support and advice with respect to how best to support CYP with SD, professionals should also be mindful of the finding in the present study i.e. that for 81.2% of children currently experiencing school distress, and for 77.7% of CYP who have experienced school distress in the past, being out of school either "definitely" or "somewhat" improves their mental health.

Limitations

One key weakness of the present study is that all data was acquired from parents, and thus there is no certainty that our findings precisely mirror the experience of CYP themselves. Despite this, the consistency of responses across parents within each SD group is notable, particularly given the large sample size, giving weight to our findings and conclusions.

A further limitation of the present study is the lack of diversity amongst our sample, with an over-representation of white CYP. This is noteworthy as CYP in different ethnic groups have been reported to have varying experiences of education (e.g., YMCA, 2020), meaning their experience of SD, and the reasons underpinning their SD, may differ to those of the CYP in our sample. Thus, future research should aim to collect more diverse samples to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the experience of SD across all CYP, and to therefore guide more individualised support. Supporting the need for more diverse samples in SD research are the findings of a recent qualitative study by Brault et al. (146), which explored the "School Refusal" experienced by adolescents and young adults from immigrant and ethnic minority groups. The findings of this study provided several interesting insights into the experience of SD which have not been noted in the findings of previous studies whose samples have suffered from a lack of diversity. For example, results revealed that for young people from immigrant and ethnic minority backgrounds, SD can trigger "guilt, transgenerational traumatic memories, and the fear of marginalization", and can complicate their integration into society. In relation to the feelings of guilt commonly described in their study, Brault et al. found that several young people believed that they owe it to their parents to achieve academic success, given the difficulties that their parents faced in immigration and relocation: *"they have sacrificed for me, doing jobs they don't like, for their son's future, so I have to give back, doing the best I can, at school"*. Thus, when these young people experienced SAPs and began to feel that they could no longer fulfill their parents' hopes of academic success, they described being faced with a sense of guilt, shame, and worthlessness. Whilst it is possible that CYP from other backgrounds may also feel guilt or shame for experiencing SD, the reasons underlying such emotions are likely to differ between individuals. Thus, this study highlights the importance of collecting diverse samples in future SD research, and exploring the experience of SD from a range of perspectives.

Moreover, this study was limited to the United Kingdom, further reducing the generalisability of our findings. Given that education systems vary internationally, the experience of SD and the characteristics of individuals experiencing SD may differ between countries, providing an additional avenue for future research.

In addition, whilst this study was advertised widely on social media, the sites where it was shared may have influenced who participated. For example, within our No SD group, 16.8% of CYP were found to be autistic, despite the national prevalence

rates of autism standing at around 1-2% (39). However, as the advertisement was shared widely amongst groups that specifically support parents of CYP experiencing SD (such as Not Fine in School), and that these parents likely re-shared it further into groups that they felt appropriate, it is likely that the advertisement was distributed within appropriate and relevant parent networks.

We also used a broad criteria for ND conditions, including CYP currently awaiting assessment/diagnosis, CYP who have had a referral rejected, and CYP who have yet to be referred. The rationale behind this is discussed at length above, however, it is possible that this has lead to an over-estimation of prevalence rates in our groups.

A final weakness to this study is the differing sample sizes between participant groups, potentially influencing the accuracy of our comparisons between groups. The group of Lifelong EHE CYP recruited here was particularly small and had a lower average age than the CYP in the other groups. Future research should collect more evenly-sized participant groups, although this is challenging in rarer groups such as Lifelong EHE CYP.

One key drawback of the SD literature generally, as opposed to this study specifically, is the lack of a standardised questionnaire to assess SD which is suitable for use in autistic individuals. Given the prevalence of autism amongst CYP experiencing SD, the development of such a questionnaire which can be used in clinical, education, and research settings is vital. Thus, the next step should be to gather perspectives of autistic CYP and autistic adults, and to work collaboratively with them to develop a standardised questionnaire to assess SD severity and/or risk.

This study also had several strengths, including the large sample size of the Current SD group. This was much greater than in previous SD research, enabling stronger conclusions to be made.

Conclusions

In light of the severity of SD, duration of SD, and impact of SD on CYP documented here, we believe that there is an urgent need for further clinical research and guidance specific to SD. This would enable SD to be distinguished from more mundane and potentially benign forms of school "refusal", and consequentially, assist with the development of management strategies that are fit for purpose for CYP with SD. Without this, the severe and deleterious consequences of SD will continue to go unrecognised (e.g. (16)). Moreover, care needs to be taken to ensure that CYP with SD have access to timely assessments of underlying neurodivergent conditions, with autism, sensory processing differences, ADHD, dyslexia, dyspraxia, APD, speech difficulties, and giftedness (amongst others) all likely to be important to consider. Moreover, the evidence above suggests that considering the presence or absence of pathological/extreme/rational demand avoidance behaviours is likely to be important.

These results also suggest that wider discussion with respect to the appropriateness of school-based education for all CYP may be timely and helpful. The findings presented here suggest that this will likely be particularly relevant for autistic CYP, as even parents of autistic CYP without SD were significantly less likely to believe that a school setting is the suitable and proper place for their child to be educated relative to parents of non-autistic CYP. Further research, ideally co-produced with autistic and otherwise ND individuals, is needed to determine best practices in ND/autistic education, and to ensure appropriate understanding of how autistic/ND pupils best learn (78). Relatedly, research into best-pedagogical practice for pupils with SEND, including pupils with complex presentations, is urgently needed, especially within mainstream settings (77). Given the substantial heterogeneity in the neurobiology of autism, this will undoubtedly be complex, and efforts must include consideration of how learning needs will likely vary as a function of neurosubtypes (147, 148) and demand avoidant profile (88). Research exploring educational and life outcomes of lifelong EHE ND CYP, and CYP with provisions such as EOTAS, is also urgently required to better understand how CYP can be successfully educated outwith of school settings. Assumptions such as the view articulated here (*"A youth's absence from this [school] context has the potential to create or compound deviations in normal development"* (3), p 1.) need to be supported by empirical evidence that takes into account individual neurodevelopmental profiles in the first instance, and the impact of school-related-trauma on the CYP's development thereafter.

Finally, Article 2 Protocol 1 of the Human Rights Act (1998) states that *"No person shall be denied a right to an education"*. However, accessing that education should not come at the cost of the person's safety and mental health. In the foreward to the Children's Commissioner Attendance Audit interim report (2), Dame Rachel de Souza DBE (Children's Commissioner for England) stated that the absence of school during the pandemic *"confirmed what I already knew – schools, and the people who work in them, are vital. They are the place where children learn, where they make friends, where they find things they are passionate about and talented at. A place that is safe, with adults around them who care about their lives and that provides routine, structure, and discipline"*. The present study's findings shine a light on the fact that this may not be the reality facing a large number of autistic, or otherwise neurodivergent, CYP in UK schools, where attending school (especially mainstream school) may come at a considerable cost to their mental health. Additional research involving both autistic and non-autistic CYP who experience school distress, and their families, is urgently needed in order to further delineate this problem, and to develop workable solutions that ensure that <u>all</u> CYP can access education in a manner which causes them no harm. Potential changes to education legislation need to be informed through such research, as legislation changes without this evidence-base run the risk of making an already perilous situation even worse for those CYP at risk of harm within the UK school system.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We sincerely thank all the parents who generously gave up their time to take part in this research. We wish them, and their children, all the very best in the future. We also thank Kieran Rose for his advice on language.

References

1. Damian Milton. Natures answer to over-conformity': deconstructing pathological demand avoidance. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/'Natures-answer-to-over-conformity'%3A-deconstructing-Milton/c61528ea716b5d05b2bb1fa702bbb4b1147730d2, March 2013. Accessed on 2022-09-22.
2. Children's Commissioner. Where are england's children? interim findings from the children's commissioner's attendance audit. https://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/report/where-are-englands-children-interim-findings-from-the-childrens-commissioners March 2022. Accessed on 2022-09-22.

3. David Heyne, Malin Gren-Landell, Glenn Melvin, and Carolyn Gentle-Genitty. Differentiation between school attendance problems: Why and how? *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 26(1):8–34, 2019.
4. G Melvin, D Heyne, KM Gray, RP Hastings, V Totsika, B Tonge, and M Freeman. The kids and teens at school framework: The application of an inclusive nested framework to understand school absenteeism and school attendance problems. In *Frontiers in Education*, volume 4, 2019.
5. David Heyne. School refusal. In *Practitioner's guide to evidence-based psychotherapy*, pages 600–619. Springer, 2006.
6. Ellen Kathrine Munkhaugen, Elen Gjevik, Are Hugo Pripp, Eili Sponheim, and Trond H Diseth. School refusal behaviour: Are children and adolescents with autism spectrum disorder at a higher risk? *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 41:31–38, 2017.
7. NR Blagg and William Yule. The behavioural treatment of school refusal—a comparative study. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 22(2):119–127, 1984.
8. Cynthia G Last, Cheri Hansen, and Nathalie Franco. Cognitive-behavioral treatment of school phobia. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 37(4): 404–411, 1998.
9. Glenn A Melvin, Amanda L Dudley, Michael S Gordon, Ester Klimkeit, Eleonora Gullone, John Taffe, and Bruce J Tonge. Augmenting cognitive behavior therapy for school refusal with fluoxetine: A randomized controlled trial. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 48 (3):485–497, 2017.
10. Gerard McShane, Garry Walter, and Joseph M Rey. Characteristics of adolescents with school refusal. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 35(6):822–826, 2001.
11. Natalia Flakierska, Marianne Lindström, and Christopher Gillberg. School refusal: A 15–20-year follow-up study of 35 swedish urban children. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 152(6):834–837, 1988.
12. Natalia Flakierska-Praquin, Marianne Lindström, and Christopher Gillberg. School phobia with separation anxiety disorder: A comparative 20-to 29-year follow-up study of 35 school refusers. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 38(1):17–22, 1997.
13. Christopher A Kearney. School absenteeism and school refusal behavior in youth: A contemporary review. *Clinical psychology review*, 28(3):451–471, 2008.
14. Christopher A Kearney and Wendy K Silverman. Functionally based prescriptive and nonprescriptive treatment for children and adolescents with school refusal behavior. *Behavior Therapy*, 30(4):673–695, 1999.
15. Pina Filippello, Caterina Buzzai, Sebastiano Costa, and Luana Sorrenti. School refusal and absenteeism: Perception of teacher behaviors, psychological basic needs, and academic achievement. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10:1471, 2019.
16. MD S Kawsar, Musa Yilanli, and Raman Marwaha. School refusal. In *StatPearls [Internet]*. StatPearls Publishing, 2021.
17. Neville J King and Gail A Bernstein. School refusal in children and adolescents: A review of the past 10 years. *Journal of the American academy of child & adolescent psychiatry*, 40(2):197–205, 2001.
18. Jill Sewell. School refusal. *Australian family physician*, 37(6):406, 2008.
19. David Heyne, Neville J King, Bruce J Tonge, and Howard Cooper. School refusal. *Paediatric drugs*, 3(10):719–732, 2001.
20. Wanda P Fremont. School refusal in children and adolescents. *American family physician*, 68(8):1555–1560, 2003.
21. Julian G Elliott and Maurice Place. Practitioner review: school refusal: developments in conceptualisation and treatment since 2000. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 60(1):4–15, 2019.
22. Trude Havik, Edvin Bru, and Sigrun K Ertesvåg. Parental perspectives of the role of school factors in school refusal. *Emotional and behavioural difficulties*, 19(2):131–153, 2014.
23. Matt Baker and Felicity L Bishop. Out of school: a phenomenological exploration of extended non-attendance. *Educational psychology in Practice*, 31(4):354–368, 2015.
24. Moja Kljakovic, Aidan Kelly, and Andrew Richardson. School refusal and isolation: The perspectives of five adolescent school refusers in london, uk. *Clinical child psychology and psychiatry*, 26(4):1089–1101, 2021.
25. Carolina Gonzálvez, Christopher A Kearney, Carlos E Jiménez-Ayala, Ricardo Sanmartín, María Vicent, Cándido J Inglés, and José M García-Fernández. Functional profiles of school refusal behavior and their relationship with depression, anxiety, and stress. *Psychiatry research*, 269:140–144, 2018.
26. Anna M Jones and Cynthia Suveg. Flying under the radar: School reluctance in anxious youth. *School Mental Health*, 7(3):212–223, 2015.
27. Işıl Tekin, Seval Erden, Asiye Büşra Şirin Ayva, and Engin Büyüköksüz. The predictors of school refusal: depression, anxiety, cognitive distortion and attachment. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 15(3):1519–1529, 2018.
28. Jo Magne Ingul and Hans M Nordahl. Anxiety as a risk factor for school absenteeism: what differentiates anxious school attenders from non-attenders? *Annals of general psychiatry*, 12(1):1–9, 2013.
29. Kayhan Bahali, Aysegul Yolga Tahiroglu, Ayse Avci, and Gulsah Seydaoglu. Parental psychological symptoms and familial risk factors of children and adolescents who exhibit school refusal. *East Asian Archives of Psychiatry*, 21(4):164–169, 2011.
30. Charmaine K Higa, Eric L Daleiden, and Bruce F Chorpita. Psychometric properties and clinical utility of the school refusal assessment scale in a multiethnic sample. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 24(4):247–258, 2002.
31. Marie-Lisbet Amundsen, Anne Kielland, and Geir Møller. School refusal and school-related differences among students with and without diagnosis. *Nordisk tidsskrift for pedagogikk og kritikk*, 8, 2022.
32. Belinda Carless, Glenn A Melvin, Bruce J Tonge, and Louise K Newman. The role of parental self-efficacy in adolescent school-refusal. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 29(2): 162, 2015.
33. Fifth Edition et al. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. *Am Psychiatric Assoc*, 21(21):591–643, 2013.
34. Damian EM Milton. On the ontological status of autism: the 'double empathy problem'. *Disability & Society*, 27(6):883–887, 2012.
35. Damian Milton. *A mismatch of salience: Explorations of the nature of autism from theory to practice*. Pavilion Press, 2017.
36. Dinah Murray, Damian Milton, Jonathan Green, and Jo Bervoets. The human spectrum: A phenomenological enquiry within neurodiversity. *Psychopathology*, pages 1–11, 2022.
37. Scott D Tomchek and Winnie Dunn. Sensory processing in children with and without autism: a comparative study using the short sensory profile. *The American journal of occupational therapy*, 61(2):190–200, 2007.
38. Teresa Tavassoli, Lucy J Miller, Sarah A Schoen, Darci M Nielsen, and Simon Baron-Cohen. Sensory over-responsivity in adults with autism spectrum conditions. *Autism*, 18 (4):428–432, 2014.
39. Andres Roman-Urrestarazu, Robin van Kessel, Carrie Allison, Fiona E Matthews, Carol Brayne, and Simon Baron-Cohen. Association of race/ethnicity and social disadvantage with autism prevalence in 7 million school children in england. *JAMA pediatrics*, 175(6): e210054–e210054, 2021.
40. Marina Ochi, Kentaro Kawabe, Shinichiro Ochi, Tomoe Miyama, Fumie Horiuchi, and Shuichi Ueno. School refusal and bullying in children with autism spectrum disorder. *Child and adolescent psychiatry and mental health*, 14(1):1–7, 2020.
41. Vasiliki Totsika, Richard P Hastings, Yoko Dutton, Alison Worsley, Glenn Melvin, Kylie Gray, Bruce Tonge, and David Heyne. Types and correlates of school non-attendance in students with autism spectrum disorders. *Autism*, 24(7):1639–1649, 2020.
42. All Party Parliamentary Group on Autism. Autism and education in england 2017, 2017.
43. National Autistic Society. School report 2021, 2021.
44. Philip Whitaker. Provision for youngsters with autistic spectrum disorders in mainstream schools: what parents say—and what parents want. *British Journal of Special Education*, 34(3):170–178, 2007.
45. Autistic UK. Report regarding autistic school refusal/non-attendance and links to trauma. https://autisticuk.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Non-Attendance-andTrauma-Survey-Analysis.pdf, Feb 2021.
46. Craig Goodall. 'i felt closed in and like i couldn't breathe': A qualitative study exploring the mainstream educational experiences of autistic young people. *Autism & Developmental Language Impairments*, 3:2396941518804407, 2018.
47. Dawn Adams, Kate Simpson, and Deb Keen. Exploring anxiety at home, school, and in the community through self-report from children on the autism spectrum. *Autism Research*, 13(4):603–614, 2020.
48. Connor Morrow Kerns and Philip C Kendall. Autism and anxiety: Overlap, similarities, and differences. In *Handbook of autism and anxiety*, pages 75–89. Springer, 2014.
49. Mikle South and Jacqui Rodgers. Sensory, emotional and cognitive contributions to anxiety in autism spectrum disorders. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, 11:20, 2017.
50. Emily McDougal, Deborah M Riby, and Mary Hanley. Teacher insights into the barriers and facilitators of learning in autism. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 79:101674, 2020.
51. Winnie Dunn. The impact of sensory processing abilities on the daily lives of young children and their families: A conceptual model. *Infants and young children*, 9:23–35, 1997.
52. Brian A Boyd, Grace T Baranek, John Sideris, Michele D Poe, Linda R Watson, Elena Patten, and Heather Miller. Sensory features and repetitive behaviors in children with autism and developmental delays. *Autism Research*, 3(2):78–87, 2010.
53. Mirko Uljarević, Grace Baranek, Giacomo Vivanti, Darren Hedley, Kristelle Hudry, and Alison Lane. Heterogeneity of sensory features in autism spectrum disorder: Challenges and perspectives for future research. *Autism Research*, 10(5):703–710, 2017.
54. Jill Ashburner, Jenny Ziviani, and Sylvia Rodger. Sensory processing and classroom emotional, behavioral, and educational outcomes in children with autism spectrum disorder. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 62(5):564–573, 2008.
55. Elizabeth K Jones, Mary Hanley, and Deborah M Riby. Distraction, distress and diversity: Exploring the impact of sensory processing differences on learning and school life for pupils with autism spectrum disorders. *Research in autism spectrum disorders*, 72: 101515, 2020.
56. DP Oswald, MJ Coutinho, J Johnson, JH Larson, and CA Mazefsky. Student, parent, and teacher perspectives on barriers to and facilitators of schoo l success for students with asperger syndrome. *Autism frontiers: Clinical issues and innovations*, pages 137–151, 2008.
57. Beth Pfeiffer, Brian P Daly, Elizabeth G Nicholls, and Dominic F Gullo. Assessing sensory processing problems in children with and without attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Physical & occupational therapy in pediatrics*, 35(1):1–12, 2015.
58. Ahmad Ghanizadeh. Sensory processing problems in children with adhd, a systematic review. *Psychiatry investigation*, 8(2):89, 2011.
59. Serkan Pekçetin, Bagdagül Saridas, Zeynep Üstünyurt, and Hülya Kayihan. Sensory-processing patterns of preterm children at 6 years of age. *Infants & Young Children*, 32(1): 33–42, 2019.
60. D'Alessio S. Inclusive education in italy: a critical analysis of the policy of integrazione scolastica, 2011.
61. Rob Webster. *The Inclusion Illusion: How children with special educational needs experience mainstream schools*. UCL Press, 2022.
62. Rob Webster and Peter Blatchford. The educational experiences of pupils with a statement for special educational needs in mainstream primary schools: Results from a systematic observation study. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 28(4):463–479, 2013.
63. Rob Webster and Peter Blatchford. The making a statement project: Final report: A study of the teaching and support experienced by pupils with a statement of special educational needs in mainstream primary schools. 2013.
64. Rob Webster and Peter Blatchford. Worlds apart? the nature and quality of the educational experiences of pupils with a statement for special educational needs in mainstream primary schools. *British Educational Research Journal*, 41(2):324–342, 2015.
65. Rob Webster and Peter Blatchford. The special educational needs in secondary education (sense) study: Final report: A study of the teaching and support experienced by pupils with statements and education, health and care plans in mainstream and special schools. 2017.
66. Rob Webster and Peter Blatchford. Making sense of 'teaching','support'and 'differentiation': the educational experiences of pupils with education, health and care plans and

statements in mainstream secondary schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 34(1):98–113, 2019.
67. Peter Blatchford and Rob Webster. Classroom contexts for learning at primary and secondary school: Class size, groupings, interactions and special educational needs. *British Educational Research Journal*, 44(4):681–703, 2018.
68. Abbey J McClemont, Hannah E Morton, Jennifer M Gillis, and Raymond G Romanczyk. Brief report: Predictors of school refusal due to bullying in children with autism spectrum disorder and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, 51(5):1781–1788, 2021.
69. Scientific United Nations Educational and Cultural Organization. Policy guidelines on inclusion in education, 2009.
70. Ellen Kathrine Munkhaugen, Tonje Torske, Elen Gjevik, Terje Nærland, Are Hugo Pripp, and Trond H Diseth. Individual characteristics of students with autism spectrum disorders and school refusal behavior. *Autism*, 23(2):413–423, 2019.
71. Steven D Stagg, Lauren Thompson-Robertson, and Carina Morgan. Primary school children rate children with autism negatively on looks, speech and speech content. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 2022.
72. Maarten Selfhout, Jaap Denissen, Susan Branje, and Wim Meeus. In the eye of the beholder: perceived, actual, and peer-rated similarity in personality, communication, and friendship intensity during the acquaintanceship process. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 96(6):1152, 2009.
73. Ruth B Grossman. Judgments of social awkwardness from brief exposure to children with and without high-functioning autism. *Autism*, 19(5):580–587, 2015.
74. Noah J Sasson, Daniel J Faso, Jack Nugent, Sarah Lovell, Daniel P Kennedy, and Ruth B Grossman. Neurotypical peers are less willing to interact with those with autism based on thin slice judgments. *Scientific reports*, 7(1):1–10, 2017.
75. Steven D Stagg, Rachel Slavny, Charlotte Hand, Alice Cardoso, and Pamela Smith. Does facial expressivity count? how typically developing children respond initially to children with autism. *Autism*, 18(6):704–711, 2014.
76. Jackie Ravet. 'but how do i teach them?': autism & initial teacher education (ite). *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 22(7):714–733, 2018.
77. Jonathan Rix, Kathy Hall, Melanie Nind, Kieron Sheehy, and Janice Wearmouth. What pedagogical approaches can effectively include children with special educational needs in mainstream classrooms? a systematic literature review. *Support for learning*, 24(2):86–94, 2009.
78. Jennifer C Bullen, Matthew C Zajic, Nancy McIntyre, Emily Solari, and Peter Mundy. Patterns of math and reading achievement in children and adolescents with autism spectrum disorder. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 92:101933, 2022.
79. Mahmoud M Emam and Peter Farrell. Tensions experienced by teachers and their views of support for pupils with autism spectrum disorders in mainstream schools. *European journal of special needs education*, 24(4):407–422, 2009.
80. Kristen Robertson, Brandt Chamberlain, and Connie Kasari. General education teachers' relationships with included students with autism. *Journal of Autism and developmental disorders*, 33(2):123–130, 2003.
81. Jan Blacher, Erica Howell, Stacy Lauderdale-Littin, Florence D DiGennaro Reed, and Elizabeth A Laugeson. Autism spectrum disorder and the student teacher relationship: A comparison study with peers with intellectual disability and typical development. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 8(3):324–333, 2014.
82. E Newson and K Le Maréchal. Pathological demand avoidance syndrome: discriminant functions analysis demonstrating its essential differences from autism and asperger's syndrome. *Psychobiology of autism: current research and practice. University of Sunderland, UK*, 1998.
83. ELMK Newson, Kate Le Marechal, and C David. Pathological demand avoidance syndrome: a necessary distinction within the pervasive developmental disorders. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 88(7):595–600, 2003.
84. Elizabeth O'Nions and Judith Eaton. Extreme/'pathological'demand avoidance: an overview. *Paediatrics and Child Health*, 30(12):411–415, 2020.
85. Christopher Gillberg, I Carina Gillberg, Lucy Thompson, Rannvá Biskupsto, and Eva Billstedt. Extreme ("pathological") demand avoidance in autism: a general population study in the faroe islands. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 24(8):979–984, 2015.
86.
87. Richard Woods. Rational (pathological) demand avoidance: what it is not, what it could be & what it does. *Critical Perspectives on Pathological Demand Avoidance (PDA)*, 2018.
88. Lisa Summerhill and Kate Collett. Developing a multi-agency assessment pathway for children and young people thought to have a pathological demand avoidance profile. *Good Autism Practice (GAP)*, 19(2):25–32, 2018.
89. S Russell. Being misunderstood: Experiences of the pathological demand avoidance profile of asd, 2018.
90. Clare Truman, Laura Crane, Patricia Howlin, and Elizabeth Pellicano. The educational experiences of autistic children with and without extreme demand avoidance behaviours. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, pages 1–21, 2021.
91. Margaret Duncan, Zara Healy, Ruth Fidler, and Phil Christie. *Understanding pathological demand avoidance syndrome in children: A guide for parents, teachers and other professionals*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2011.
92. Elizabeth O'Nions, Francesca Happé, Essi Viding, and Ilse Noens. Extreme demand avoidance in children with autism spectrum disorder: Refinement of a caregiver-report measure. *Advances in Neurodevelopmental Disorders*, 5(3):269–281, 2021.
93. Janina Brede, Anna Remington, Lorcan Kenny, Katy Warren, and Elizabeth Pellicano. Excluded from school: Autistic students' experiences of school exclusion and subsequent re-integration into school. *Autism & Developmental Language Impairments*, 2: 2396941517737511, 2017.
94. Stefan Noble, David McLennan, Michael Noble, Emma Plunkett, Nils Gutacker, Mary Silk, and Gemma Wright. The english indices of deprivation 2019. 2019.
95. Jacqui Rodgers, Sarah Wigham, Helen McConachie, Mark Freeston, Emma Honey, and Jeremy R Parr. Development of the anxiety scale for children with autism spectrum disorder (asc-asd). *Autism Research*, 9(11):1205–1215, 2016.
96. Bruce F Chorpita, Letitia Yim, Catherine Moffitt, Lori A Umemoto, and Sarah E Francis. Assessment of symptoms of dsm-iv anxiety and depression in children: A revised child anxiety and depression scale. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 38(8):835–855, 2000.
97. Jacquiline Den Houting, Dawn Adams, Jacqueline Roberts, and Deb Keen. Exploring anxiety symptomatology in school-aged autistic children using an autism-specific assessment. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 50:73–82, 2018.
98. Elizabeth O'Nions, Phil Christie, Judith Gould, Essi Viding, and Francesca Happé. Development of the 'extreme demand avoidance questionnaire'(eda-q): preliminary observations on a trait measure for pathological demand avoidance. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 55(7):758–768, 2014.
99. Office for National Statistics. Census 2021: Families and households in the uk: 2021. https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/families/datasets/familiesandhouseholdsfamiliesandhouseholds, March 2022. Accessed on 2022-07-22.
100. Christopher A Kearney and Wendy K Silverman. The evolution and reconciliation of taxonomic strategies for school refusal behavior. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 3 (4):339, 1996.
101. Ramona Toscano, Jennifer L Hudson, Andrew J Baillie, Heidi J Lyneham, and Lauren F McLellan. Development of the macquarie anxiety behavioural scale (mabs): A parent measure to assess anxiety in children and adolescents including young people with autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 276:678–685, 2020.
102. Rona Epstein, Geraldine Brown, and Sarah O'Flynn. *Prosecuting Parents for Truancy: Who pays the price?: Prosecution of Children for Truancy*. Coventry University, 2019.
103. Children's Commissioner. Back into school: New insights into school absence. 2022.
104. Samuel Brice, Jacqui Rodgers, Barry Ingham, David Mason, Colin Wilson, Mark Freeston, Ann Le Couteur, and Jeremy R Parr. The importance and availability of adjustments to improve access for autistic adults who need mental and physical healthcare: findings from uk surveys. *BMJ open*, 11(3):e043336, 2021.
105. Heather L Moore, Samuel Brice, Lauren Powell, Barry Ingham, Mark Freeston, Jeremy R Parr, and Jacqui Rodgers. The mediating effects of alexithymia, intolerance of uncertainty, and anxiety on the relationship between sensory processing differences and restricted and repetitive behaviours in autistic adults. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, pages 1–13, 2021.
106. Marion Rutherford, Morag Burns, Duncan Gray, Lynne Bremner, Sarah Clegg, Lucy Russell, Charlie Smith, and Anne O'Hare. Improving efficiency and quality of the children's asd diagnostic pathway: Lessons learned from practice. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, 48(5):1579–1595, 2018.
107. Chaminda Jayanetti. Autistic children wait up to five years for an nhs appointment. https://www.theguardian.com/society/2022/apr/02/children-with-autism-wait-up-to-five-years-for-an-nhs-appointment, April 2022. Accessed on 2022-07-22.
108. Christopher K Gale and Jane Millichamp. Generalised anxiety disorder in children and adolescents. *BMJ clinical evidence*, 2016, 2016.
109. Francisca JA Van Steensel, Susan M Bögels, and Sean Perrin. Anxiety disorders in children and adolescents with autistic spectrum disorders: a meta-analysis. *Clinical child and family psychology review*, 14(3):302–317, 2011.
110. Dawn Adams, Megan Clark, and Kate Simpson. The relationship between child anxiety and the quality of life of children, and parents of children, on the autism spectrum. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 50(5):1756–1769, 2020.
111. Francisca JA van Steensel, Susan M Bögels, and Carmen D Dirksen. Anxiety and quality of life: Clinically anxious children with and without autism spectrum disorders compared. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 41(6):731–738, 2012.
112. Dawn Adams, Megan Clark, and Deb Keen. Using self-report to explore the relationship between anxiety and quality of life in children on the autism spectrum. *Autism Research*, 12(10):1505–1515, 2019.
113. Sarah Cassidy, Paul Bradley, Janine Robinson, Carrie Allison, Meghan McHugh, and Simon Baron-Cohen. Suicidal ideation and suicide plans or attempts in adults with asperger's syndrome attending a specialist diagnostic clinic: a clinical cohort study. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 1(2):142–147, 2014.
114. Sarah Cassidy, Sheena Au-Yeung, Ashley Robertson, Heather Cogger-Ward, Gareth Richards, Carrie Allison, Louise Bradley, Rebecca Kenny, Rory O'Connor, David Mosse, et al. Autism and autistic traits in those who died by suicide in england. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, pages 1–9, 2022.
115. Tatja Hirvikoski, Ellenor Mittendorfer-Rutz, Marcus Boman, Henrik Larsson, Paul Lichtenstein, and Sven Bölte. Premature mortality in autism spectrum disorder. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 208(3):232–238, 2016.
116. Susan Dickerson Mayes, Angela A Gorman, Jolene Hillwig-Garcia, and Ehsan Syed. Suicide ideation and attempts in children with autism. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 7(1):109–119, 2013.
117. Susan W White, Matthew D Lerner, Bryce D McLeod, Jeffrey J Wood, Golda S Ginsburg, Connor Kerns, Thomas Ollendick, Philip C Kendall, John Piacentini, John Walkup, et al. Anxiety in youth with and without autism spectrum disorder: Examination of factorial equivalence. *Behavior therapy*, 46(1):40–53, 2015.
118. Elen Gjevik, Sigmund Eldevik, Torill Fjæran-Granum, and Eili Sponheim. Kiddie-sads reveals high rates of dsm-iv disorders in children and adolescents with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, 41(6):761–769, 2011.
119. Ovsanna T Leyfer, Susan E Folstein, Susan Bacalman, Naomi O Davis, Elena Dinh, Jubel Morgan, Helen Tager-Flusberg, and Janet E Lainhart. Comorbid psychiatric disorders in children with autism: Interview development and rates of disorders. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, 36(7):849–861, 2006.
120. Nahit Motavalli Mukaddes and Rouzbeh Fateh. High rates of psychiatric co-morbidity in individuals with asperger's disorder. *The World Journal of Biological Psychiatry*, 11(2-2): 486–492, 2010.
121. Sarah Wigham, Jacqui Rodgers, Mikle South, Helen McConachie, and Mark Freeston. The interplay between sensory processing abnormalities, intolerance of uncertainty, anxiety

and restricted and repetitive behaviours in autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, 45(4):943–952, 2015.

122. Christina Boulter, Mark Freeston, Mikle South, and Jacqui Rodgers. Intolerance of uncertainty as a framework for understanding anxiety in children and adolescents with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, 44(6):1391–1402, 2014.
123. Paul D Chamberlain, Jacqui Rodgers, Michael J Crowley, Sarah E White, Mark H Freeston, and Mikle South. A potentiated startle study of uncertainty and contextual anxiety in adolescents diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder. *Molecular autism*, 4(1):1–11, 2013.
124. Deb Keen, Dawn Adams, Kate Simpson, Jacquiline Den Houting, and Jacqueline Roberts. Anxiety-related symptomatology in young children on the autism spectrum. *Autism*, 23(2): 350–358, 2019.
125. A Ben-Sasson, SA Cermak, GI Orsmond, H Tager-Flusberg, MB Kadlec, and AS Carter. Sensory clusters of toddlers with autism spectrum disorders: Differences in affective symptoms. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 49(8):817–825, 2008.
126. Shulamite A Green and Ayelet Ben-Sasson. Anxiety disorders and sensory overresponsivity in children with autism spectrum disorders: is there a causal relationship? *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, 40(12):1495–1504, 2010.
127. Jane Lidstone, Mirko Uljarević, Jillian Sullivan, Jacqui Rodgers, Helen McConachie, Mark Freeston, Ann Le Couteur, Margot Prior, and Susan Leekam. Relations among restricted and repetitive behaviors, anxiety and sensory features in children with autism spectrum disorders. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 8(2):82–92, 2014.
128. Fiona EJ Howe and Steven D Stagg. How sensory experiences affect adolescents with an autistic spectrum condition within the classroom. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, 46(5):1656–1668, 2016.
129. Jonathan Green, Michael Absoud, Victoria Grahame, Osman Malik, Emily Simonoff, Ann Le Couteur, and Gillian Baird. Pathological demand avoidance: symptoms but not a syndrome. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*, 2(6):455–464, 2018.
130. All-Party Parliamentary Group for Dyslexia and other SpLDs. The human cost of dyslexia. the emotional and psychological impact of poorly supported dyslexia. https://cdn.bdadyslexia.org.uk/uploads/documents/Final-APPG-for-Human-cost-of-dyslexia-appg-report.pdf?v=1573557026, April 2019.
131. Alyson Mountjoy. Local authority apd support statistics for england and wales 2021-22. https://apdsupportuk.yolasite.com/resources/LA%20APD%20survey%20data%2021-22.pdf, 2022.
132. Deepashri Agrawal, Giorgos Dritsakis, Merle Mahon, Alyson Mountjoy, and Doris E Bamiou. Experiences of patients with auditory processing disorder in getting support in health, education, and work settings: Findings from an online survey. *Frontiers in neurology*, 12:607907, 2021.
133. MS Thambirajah, Karen J Grandison, and Louise De-Hayes. *Understanding school refusal: A handbook for professionals in education, health and social care*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2008.
134. AL Pohl, SK Crockford, M Blakemore, Carrie Allison, and Simon Baron-Cohen. A comparative study of autistic and non-autistic women's experience of motherhood. *Molecular Autism*, 11(1):1–12, 2020.
135. Amber-Sophie Dugdale, Andrew R Thompson, Alexandra Leedham, Nigel Beail, and Megan Freeth. Intense connection and love: The experiences of autistic mothers. *Autism*, 25(7):1973–1984, 2021.
136. Tamsin Archer, Caroline Filmer-Sankey, and Felicity Fletcher-Campbell. *School phobia and school refusal: Research into causes and remedies*. National Foundation for Educational Research Slough, UK, 2003.
137. Michael Fitzgerald. The history of blaming the mother. https://www.academia.edu/42642392/Amended_The_History_of_Blaming_the_Mother, Dec 2020. Accessed on 2022-09-22.
138. Sean Cohmer. Early infantile autism and the refrigerator mother theory (1943-1970). *Embryo project encyclopedia*, 2014.
139. Varun Warrier, David M Greenberg, Elizabeth Weir, Clara Buckingham, Paula Smith, Meng-Chuan Lai, Carrie Allison, and Simon Baron-Cohen. Elevated rates of autism, other neurodevelopmental and psychiatric diagnoses, and autistic traits in transgender and gender-diverse individuals. *Nature communications*, 11(1):1–12, 2020.
140. Helen M Genova, Aditi Arora, and Amanda L Botticello. Effects of school closures resulting from covid-19 in autistic and neurotypical children. *Front Educ*, 6:761485, 2021.
141. HC Debate 20th March 2019. vol. 656. Special educational needs. https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2019-03-20/debates/E634FF56-CE68-4892-8DB0-0A9D79BB062D/details.
142. Michael King. Out of school, out of sight? ensuring children out of school get a good education. http://files.localgov.co.uk/lgo_637927867963040374.pdf, July 2022. Accessed on 2022-09-22.
143. Chris Hatton. School absences and exclusions experienced by children with learning disabilities and autistic children in 2016/17 in england. *Tizard Learning Disability Review*, 2018.
144. John MacBeath, Maurice Galton, Susan Steward, Andrea MacBeath, and Charlotte Page. The costs of inclusion. *London: University of Cambridge, National Union of Teachers*, 2006.
145. Gareth Richards, Rebecca Kenny, Sarah Griffiths, Carrie Allison, David Mosse, Rosemary Holt, Rory C O'Connor, Sarah Cassidy, and Simon Baron-Cohen. Autistic traits in adults who have attempted suicide. *Molecular Autism*, 10(1):1–10, 2019.
146. Camille Brault, Isaiah Thomas, Marie Rose Moro, and Laelia Benoit. School refusal in immigrants and ethnic minority groups: A qualitative study of adolescents' and young adults' experiences. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 13, 2022.
147. Eric Feczko, NM Balba, Oscar Miranda-Dominguez, Michaela Cordova, SL Karalunas, L Irwin, DV Demeter, AP Hill, BH Langhorst, J Grieser Painter, et al. Subtyping cognitive profiles in autism spectrum disorder using a functional random forest algorithm. *Neuroimage*, 172:674–688, 2018.
148. Hyoungshin Choi, Kyoungseob Byeon, Bo-yong Park, Jong-eun Lee, Sofie L Valk, Boris Bernhardt, Adriana Di Martino, Michael Milham, Seok-Jun Hong, and Hyunjin Park. Diagnosis-informed connectivity subtyping discovers subgroups of autism with reproducible symptom profiles. *NeuroImage*, 256:119212, 2022.

Supplementary Note 1: School Distress - Siblings



Fig. S1. SD in Youngest Children x Sibling(s) SD

Supplementary Note 2: Type of School Attendance Difficulties

Variable	Combined SD	Current SD	Past SD
Type of SD (%)			
Self-corrective	134 (15.6%)	105 (15.4%)	29 (16.2%)
Acute	198 (23.0%)	172 (25.2%)	26 (14.5%)
Chronic	210 (24.4%)	183 (26.8%)	27 (15.1%)
Other	320 (37.1%)	223 (32.7%)	97 (54.2%)
Emotionally-Based* (%)	813 (94.3%)	648 (94.9%)	165 (92.2%)

Table S1. Type of SD. *Reflects the number and percentage of parents who reported that their child's SD was either fully or partially emotionally based

Supplementary Note 3: Educational Setting Attended

Currently Without Education (Current SD Group):	Unable to Access	Failed Placement	Awaiting Specialist Placement
Mainstream School	18.3%	2.0%	2.3%
Unit within Mainstream	24%	-	4%
Special School	8.8%	5.9%	-
Pupil Referral Unit	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%
Education for Medical Absences	8%	12%	8%
EOTAS	2.9%	-	-
In Limbo/Unspecified	45.5%	28.6%	14.3%
Other	12.5%	-	12.5%

Table S2. Reasons underpinning CYP described as being currently without education. Note that for some CYP, more than one category applies. For example, a CYP may be unable to access their current provision, this placement is considered to have failed, and they may be awaiting a new specialist placement. However, as this is somewhat chronological, this CYP is represented here as 'awaiting a specialist placement'. Similarly, if a CYP was rated as both 'unable to access' and 'failed placement', they were placed in the 'failed placement' category.

Supplementary Note 4: Statistics: Academic Attainment

Variable	N	$\chi^2(6)$	p	Sig. Differences*
Academic Attainment	1033	212.04	<.001	–
Not Meeting Expectations	1033	209.56	<.001	Current SD > Past SD > No SD Current SD > Lifelong EHE
Meeting Expectations	1033	89.85	<.001	No SD > Past SD > Current SD Lifelong EHE > Current SD
Exceeding Expectations	1033	60.69	<.001	No SD > Past SD > Current SD
Meeting/Exceeding Combined	1033	209.56	<.001	No SD > Past SD > Current SD Lifelong EHE > Current SD

Table S3. Results of a Chi-Square Test of the Association Between School Distress Experience and Academic Attainment, With Post-Hoc Chi-Square and Fisher's Exact Tests. *p = .008 (Bonferroni adjusted).

Supplementary Note 5: Academic Attainment x Current Setting

Academic Attainment	Not meeting expectations	Meeting expectations	Exceeding Expectations
Mainstream School	60.3%	27.2%	12.5%
Unit within Mainstream	76%	24%	0%
Special School	91.2%	5.9%	2.9%
Pupil Referral Unit	85.2%	11.1%	3.7%
Education for Medical Absences	76%	16%	8%
EOTAS	80%	5.7%	14.3%
In Limbo/Unspecified	75.3%	14.3%	10.4%
Coerced EHE	74.5%	19.1%	6.4%
Other	62.5%	37.5%	0%

Table S4. Current SD Group: % of CYP falling within each of the three academic attainment categories broken down with respect to the CYP's current educational setting.

Supplementary Note 6: Physical and Health Conditions

Physical/Mental Health Difficulties	Current SD (n=731)	Past SD (n=204)	No SD (n=149)	Lifelong EHE (n=25)
Anxiety	339 (46.37%)	63 (30.88%)	15 (10.07%)	5 (20%)
Depression	70 (9.58%)	9 (4.41%)	2 (1.34%)	0%
Hypermobility/Ehlers Danlos Syndrome	46 (6.29%)	14 (6.86%)	1 (0.67%)	0%
PTSD/Trauma	37 (5.06%)	9 (4.41%)	0%	0%
Low Mood/Emotion Regulation Difficulties	37 (5.06%)	2 (0.98%)	1 (0.67%)	0%
Obsessive Compulsive Disorder (OCD)	24 (3.28%)	6 (2.94%)	1 (0.67%)	0%
Low Self Esteem	14 (1.92%)	0%	0%	0%
Asthma	12 (1.64%)	2 (0.98%)	1 (0.67%)	0%
Genetic/Chromosomal Disorder (e.g., Down syndrome, Fragile X syndrome)	12 (1.64%)	2 (0.98%)	0%	0%
Eating Disorder/Difficulties/ARFID	12 (1.64%)	1 (0.49%)	0%	0%
Self-Harm	12 (1.64%)	0%	0%	0%
Attachment Issues/Disorder	10 (1.37%)	3 (1.47%)	0%	0%
Co-Ordination Difficulties (including DCD)	10 (1.37%)	1 (0.49%)	0%	1 (4%)
Phobias (e.g., Agoraphobia, Emetophobia)	10 (1.37%)	0%	0%	1 (4%)
Unspecified Mental Health Difficulties	10 (1.37%)	0%	0%	0%
Selective Mutism	9 (1.23%)	2 (0.98%)	0%	2 (8%)
Suicidal Ideation/Suicide Attempts	9 (1.23%)	1 (0.49%)	0%	0%
Hearing Difficulties	6 (0.82%)	0%	0%	0%
Visual Impairment	5 (0.68%)	1 (0.49%)	2 (1.34%)	0%
Fine and/or Gross Motor Difficulties/Delays	5 (0.68%)	1 (0.49%)	0%	0%
Bladder/bowel difficulties (e.g., IBS)	5 (0.68%)	2 (0.98%)	2 (1.34%)	0%
Allergies	5 (0.68%)	1 (0.49%)	2 (1.34%)	0%
Sleep Difficulties/Disorder	5 (0.68%)	1 (0.49%)	0%	0%
Epilepsy	4 (0.55%)	1 (0.49%)	0%	0%
Anger Issues	4 (0.55%)	0%	1 (0.67%)	0%
Acid Reflux	3 (0.41%)	1 (0.49%)	0%	0%
Eczema	3 (0.41%)	0%	1 (0.67%)	0%

Table S5. Physical and mental health conditions listed by parents. As this was an optional free-text question, this should not be considered an exhaustive list. In addition, it does not included ND, sensory processing difficulties etc. as these were quantified more precisely in later questions. AFRID = Avoidant Restrictive Food Intake Disorder, DCD = Developmental co-ordination disorder, IBS = Irritable Bowel Syndrome, OCD = Obsessive Compulsive Disorder, PTSD = Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Supplementary Note 7: Anxiety Scale for Children - ASD - Parents

ASC-ASD-P Subscale Analysis:

In this set of analysis, CYP were further subdivided into autistic and non-autistic groups. Analysis 1 compared anxiety subscale scores for the autistic group relative to the non autistic group in each SD group individually, whilst Analysis 2 included only autistic CYP, compared between-group (i.e. Current SD, Past SD, No SD) differences for each individual subscale score.

***Analysis 1a. Current SD*: Autistic CYP in the Current SD group scored significantly higher than non-autistic CYP in the same group with respect to anxious arousal scores (autistic CYP Mdn = 7, non-autistic CYP = 5, U = 22907.0, p = .005), separation anxiety scores (autistic CYP Mdn = 8, non-autistic CYP Mdn = 6, U = 21316.0, p < .001), uncertainty scores (autistic CYP Mdn = 17, non-autistic CYP Mdn = 11, U = 14368.5, p < .001), but not performance anxiety (autistic CYP Mdn = 10, non-autistic CYP Mdn = 10, U = 25605.0, p = .206).**

***Analysis 1b. Past SD*: Autistic CYP in the Past SD group relative to non-autistic CYP in the same group also had significantly higher scores than their non-autistic peers for performance anxiety (autistic CYP Mdn = 9, non-autistic CYP Mdn = 7, U = 2025.5, p = .006), and uncertainty (autistic CYP Mdn = 16, non-autistic CYP Mdn = 10, U = 2025.5, p = .006).**

***Analysis 1c. No SD*: Autistic CYP in the No SD control group also scored significantly higher than non-autistic CYP in the same group with respect to anxious arousal scores (autistic CYP Mdn = 1.5, non-autistic CYP = 1, U = 948.5, p = .007), separation anxiety scores (autistic CYP Mdn = 2.5, non-autistic CYP Mdn = 1, U = 1008.5, p = .022), uncertainty (autistic CYP Mdn = 17, non-autistic CYP Mdn = 11, U = 442.5, p < .001), and performance anxiety (autistic CYP Mdn = 6.5, non-autistic CYP Mdn = 4, U = 764, p < .001).**

Analysis 2. Autistic CYP only

***Analysis 2a. Performance Anxiety*: Considering just autistic CYP, Kruskal-Wallis tests revealed an overall significant between-group difference in performance anxiety scores (n=685): H = 24.366, df=3, p < .001, with pairwise comparisons indicating that autistic CYP in the Current SD group had significantly higher total anxiety scores in the No SD (control) CYP, Current SD > No SD (p = .001).**

***Analysis 2b. Anxious Arousal*: Considering just autistic CYP, Kruskal-Wallis tests revealed an overall significant between-group difference in anxious arousal scores: H = 48.224, df=3, p < .001, with pairwise comparisons indicating: Current SD > Past SD > No SD (p's < .001).**

***Analysis 2c. Separation Anxiety*: Considering just autistic CYP, Kruskal-Wallis tests revealed an overall significant between-group difference in separation anxiety scores (n=685): H = 32.527, df=3, p < .001, with pairwise comparisons indicating: Current SD > No SD, and Past SD > No SD (p's < .001).**

***Analysis 2d. Uncertainty*: Considering just autistic CYP, Kruskal-Wallis tests revealed an overall significant between-group difference in uncertainty scores (n=685): H = 33.077, df=3, p < .001, with pairwise comparisons indicating: Current SD > No SD, and Past SD > No SD (p's < .001).**

Supplementary Note 8: Lifelong EHE Age-Matched Anxiety and EDA-8 Data and Statistical Analyses

A total of 20 parents of CYP in the lifelong EHE group completed the ASC-ASD-P and the EDA-8 questionnaires. For each of these 20 lifelong EHE CYP, the 2 CYP from each of the three other groups that most closely matched the age of each CYP were selected, resulting in a total of 140 CYP (20 Lifelong EHE CYP, 40 Current SD CYP, 40 Past SD CYP, and 40 No SD control CYP).

Measure	Current SD (n=40)		Past SD (n=40)		No SD (n=40)		Lifelong EHE (n=20)		H (3)	*p*	Significant group differences*
	Median	*IQR*	*Median*	*IQR*	*Median*	*IQR*	*Median*	*IQR*			
ASC-ASD-P Total	41	23.5	30.5	18.8	12	9	16	22	61.25	<.001	Current SD = Past SD > No SD = Lifelong EHE
Performance Anxiety	10.5	7.5	7.5	7.0	5	5	2	5	28.51	<.001	Current SD = Past SD > No SD = Lifelong EHE
Anxious Arousal	5.5	7.8	4	4	1	2	2	4	45.12	<.001	Current SD = Past SD > No SD Past SD = Lifelong EHE No SD = Lifelong EHE
Separation Anxiety	8	4.8	6.5	5.8	2	3	2	4	51.27	<.001	Current SD = Past SD > No SD = Lifelong EHE
Uncertainty	17	8.8	12	7.5	4	6	9	9	60.71	<.001	Current SD = Past SD > No SD Past SD = Lifelong EHE No SD = Lifelong EHE
EDA-8	14	10.8	9	10	2	5	7	8	45.68	<.001	Current SD = Past SD > No SD Past SD = Lifelong EHE Lifelong EHE > No SD

IQR = Interquartile Range.
**Pairwise comparison. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.*

Table S6. Medians, IQR, and Kruskal-Wallis Tests investigating differences in ASC-ASD-P Total and Subscale Scores between groups age-matched to the 20 Lifelong EHE CYP for whom ASC-ASD-P and EDA-8 data was available.



Fig. S2. Age-matched Lifelong EHE comparison Groups for Anxiety Subscales as measured using the ASC-ASD-P.

ASC-ASD-P Subscale Analysis:

Autistic Lifelong EHE CYP had significantly higher scores than their non-autistic peers for performance anxiety (autistic CYP Mdn = 6, non-autistic CYP Mdn = 2, U = 23.0, p = .040), separation anxiety (autistic CYP Mdn = 5, non-autistic CYP Mdn = 1, U = 22.0, p = .033), and uncertainty (autistic CYP Mdn = 12, non-autistic CYP Mdn = 3, U = 1.5, p < .001).

Supplementary Note 9: Supplemental Information pertaining to Sensory Processing Differences

Sensory System	Current SD	Past SD	No SD	Lifelong EHE
CYP with SPD:				
Tactile	84.6%	87.1%	80%	92.3%
Auditory	82.6%	81.2%	90.0%	84.6%
Interoceptive	67.4%	60.0%	70.0%	61.5%
Olfactory	67.4%	60.0%	70.0%	61.5%
Proprioceptive	52.0%	63.5%	50.0%	69.2%
Gustation	51.7%	55.3%	30.0%	53.8%
Visual	41.3%	40.0%	20.0%	23.1%
Vestibular	38.8%	42.4%	30.0%	30.8%
All CYP:				
Tactile	48.1%	38.3%	5.4%	52.2%
Auditory	47%	35.8%	6%	47.8%
Interoceptive	38.3%	26.4%	4.7%	34.8%
Olfactory	34.5%	29.5%	2.7%	26.1%
Proprioceptive	29.6%	28%	3.4%	39.1%
Gustation	29.4%	24.4%	2%	30.4%
Visual	23.5%	17.6%	1.3%	13%
Vestibular	22.1%	18.7%	2%	17.4%

Table S7. Sensory Processing Difficulties: Sensory systems affected + mean number of sensory systems affected

Supplementary Note 10: Impact of being out of school on CYP's mental health



Fig. S3. Impact of not attending school SD CYP's Mental Health

Supplementary Note 11: Lifelong EHE Age-Matched Data: Leaving the House

	Current SD	Past SD	No SD	Lifelong EHE
Everyday	12.5%	2.5%	0%	50%
Frequently	35%	55%	80%	30%
Sometimes	22.5%	35%	12.5%	15%
Rarely	30%	7.5%	5%	5%
Never	0%	0%	2.5%	0%

Table S8. How often does your child leave the house to do something fun? n=140 [Current SD = 40, Past SD = 40, No SD = 40, Lifelong EHE = 20]

Supplementary Note 12: Is School "Suitable" and "Proper"? - Statistics

Variable	df	χ^2	p	Sig. Differences
Current SD v Past SD v No SD:				
Suitable/Proper	4	321.0	<.001	–
Yes	2	310.5	<.001	No SD>Past>Current
Maybe	2	66.4	<.001	Current>Past>No SD
No	2	87.4	<.001	Current=Past>No SD
Autistic v Non Autistic:				
Suitable/Proper	2	176.8	<.001	–
Yes	1	173.1	<.001	non autistic > autistic
Maybe	1	18.7	<.001	autistic > non autistic
No	1	64.2	<.001	autistic > non autistic

Table S9. Based on your experience as a parent, do you believe that school is the suitable and proper place for your child to be educated? alpha level = .017 (Bonferroni adjusted).

Supplementary Note 13: Correlations

Correlations

			Sensory Count	Anxiety Total Score: ASC-ASD-P	Anxiety Subscale: Performance Anxiety	Anxiety Subscale: Anxious Arousal	Anxiety Subscale: Separation Anxiety	Anxiety Subscale: Uncertainty	EDA-8 Total Score	Age of Onset of SD	Duration of SD	Attendance - Previous4 weeks (# days attended)	Attendance - Academic Year 2021/22 (0-100%)	Attendance - Academic Year 2020/21 (0-100%)	Impact of School Attendance on MH [-3 to +3]
Spearman's rho	Sensory Count	Correlation Coefficient	--												
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.												
		N	1083												
	Anxiety Total Score: ASC-ASD-P	Correlation Coefficient	.421**	--											
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.											
		N	951	951											
	Anxiety Subscale: Performance Anxiety	Correlation Coefficient	.260**	.785**	--										
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.										
		N	956	951	956										
	Anxiety Subscale: Anxious Arousal	Correlation Coefficient	.290**	.831**	.597**	--									
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.									
		N	955	951	952	955									
	Anxiety Subscale: Separation Anxiety	Correlation Coefficient	.374**	.819**	.518**	.608**	--								
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.								
		N	964	951	956	955	964								
	Anxiety Subscale: Uncertainty	Correlation Coefficient	.450**	.897**	.592**	.656**	.665**	--							
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.							
		N	955	951	952	954	955	955							
	EDA-8 Total Score	Correlation Coefficient	.402**	.483**	.345**	.386**	.423**	.488**	--						
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.						
		N	958	948	953	952	958	951	958						
	Age of Onset of SD	Correlation Coefficient	-.214**	-.037	.061	.122**	-.203**	-.069	-.205**	--					
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.307	.088	.001	.000	.053	.000	.					
		N	851	781	786	784	793	784	788	851					
	Duration of SD	Correlation Coefficient	.153**	.150**	.102**	.099**	.108**	.157**	.095**	-.497**	--				
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.004	.005	.002	.000	.008	.000	.				
		N	851	781	786	784	793	784	788	851	851				
	Attendance - Previous4 weeks (# days attended)	Correlation Coefficient	-.141**	-.130**	-.028	-.136**	-.053	-.170**	-.126**	-.083	-.161**	--			
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.004	.534	.002	.235	.000	.005	.062	.000	.			
		N	504	500	502	501	504	501	503	501	501	504			
	Attendance - Academic Year 2021/22 (0-100%)	Correlation Coefficient	-.199**	-.167**	-.023	-.141**	-.070	-.232**	-.106*	-.050	-.205**	.741**	--		
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.619	.002	.127	.000	.021	.280	.000	.000	.		
		N	477	473	475	474	477	474	476	474	474	476	477		
	Attendance - Academic Year 2020/21 (0-100%)	Correlation Coefficient	-.137**	-.175**	-.060	-.152**	-.080	-.208**	-.069	.020	-.355**	.470**	.702**	--	
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.000	.194	.001	.086	.000	.137	.663	.000	.000	.000	.	
		N	466	464	465	465	466	465	466	463	463	464	458	466	
	Impact of School Attendance on MH [-3 to +3]	Correlation Coefficient	-.319**	-.545**	-.427**	-.505**	-.386**	-.543**	-.403**	-.103**	-.077*	.454**	.431**	.317**	--
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.003	.025	.000	.000	.000	.
		N	1010	931	936	935	944	935	938	851	851	504	477	466	1010

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Fig. S4. Correlations between Anxiety, Extreme Demand Avoidance, the Number of sensory systems impacted, and a variety of proxy-markers of SD severity i.e. Age of Onset of SD, Duration of SD, Attendance Rates (in previous 20 possible school days, in the current academic year (2021/22), in the previous academic year (2020/21), and impact of school attendance on child's mental health (-3, -2, -1, 0, +1, +2, +3).