School Distress in UK School Children: The Parental Lived Experience

Sophie E. Connolly[1,2] **and Sinéad L. Mullally**[1,✉]

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

Abstract

Background - School Distress (SD) refers to a young person's difficulty attending school due to the emotional distress experienced as a result of school attendance. It is thought to affect around 1% of school-aged children, although prevalence rates are higher amongst autistic children and young people (CYP). To date, there is limited research into the impact that having a child who experiences SD has on parents, carers, and other family members.

Aims - We aim to describe the lived-experience of the parents of CYP experiencing SD in the UK, and quantify the impact of the current status quo on their physical and mental health, and lives more broadly.

Method - A concurrent embedded mixed-method design was adopted. The survey link was shared widely via social media in February 2022 and participants were recruited via volunteer-sampling. Participants consisted of parents of CYP who are currently experiencing (n=738), or who had previously experienced (n=209), extreme distress whilst attending school, parents of age-matched CYP without school attendance difficulties (n=149), and parents of CYP who had never attended a school setting (n=25); giving a total of 1121 participants. All participants were currently living in the UK and 97% were mothers.

Results - Findings revealed that the experience of SD can have a devastating impact on the mental health of parents, with over half of parents developing a new mental health condition since their child's difficulties began (51.7%). Parents supporting CYP with SD had significantly higher levels of all the negative emotions measured (i.e., anger, anxiety, sadness, disgust, and fear), alongside significantly lower levels of positive emotions (i.e. relaxation and happiness) than parents of age-matched control CYP who did not experience school attendance difficulties. Heightened daily anxiety, stress, and low mood were pervasive, and a significant deleterious impact was reported across all aspects of the parents' lives, including their careers and finances, and their other children.

In addition, parents of children experiencing SD reported overwhelmingly negative treatment from professionals, whereby they frequently reported feeling blamed for their child's difficulties, threatened with fines or court action, spoken to in a dismissive and critical manner, and feeling threatened, vulnerable, and disbelieved following interactions with school staff and other professionals (including Children's Social Services, Local Authorities, and CAMHS staff). A lack of support from family, friends, other parents, and work colleagues were also mentioned by many, although others described family, friends, and other parents with similar lived experiences to be their most important sources of support. Finally, parents of CYP currently experiencing SD rated the experience of a child school-refusing as the second most threatening life event, superseded only by the death of a first-degree relative, including a child or a spouse.

Conclusions - This study highlights a bleak, adversarial, and lonely picture for the parents of CYP struggling to attend school. More specifically, the findings depict a system rife with parental blame; a system that appears to isolate parents through hostile, threatening, and punitive actions. A wider lack of societal understanding of the experience of School Distress further compounds this dearth of support for parents, placing parental mental health in further peril.

School Attendance Problems | School Distress | School Refusal | Mental Health | Family | Parental Blame | Neurodiversity | Autism

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

DRAFT

Introduction

School Distress (SD) refers to a young person's difficulty attending school due to the emotional distress experienced as a result of school attendance (1). We coined this term to replace labels such as 'School Refusal' and 'School Avoidance' which are frequently used throughout the literature and educational settings, given that these children and young people (CYP) are typically unable to attend school due to the emotional distress associated with school attendance, as opposed to simply refusing to attend. SD is thought to affect around 1% of school-aged children (2), although prevalence rates are higher amongst autistic CYP (3).

Our Research So Far

Early in 2022, we conducted a bespoke online questionnaire to better understand the situation for children and young people (CYP) in the UK who experience SD, and their parents. Through a series of papers, we aim to use our findings from this questionnaire to: describe the characteristics of CYP experiencing SD and the consequences that SD has on their lives, explore the reasons underpinning their difficulties attending school, describe how their school attendance problems present, identify how CYP experiencing SD are currently supported and how successful this support is, and recount the experiences of parents of CYP who are experiencing SD.

We have already addressed the first aim within our paper entitled 'School Distress in UK School Children: Characteristics and Consequences' (1), where we described the characteristics of CYP experiencing SD, and the educational and mental health consequences for these CYP. Contrary to common perceptions of truancy-related school attendance difficulties, CYP with SD were found to typically begin experiencing school attendance problems at a young age (mean age 7.9 years), and these difficulties appeared to be enduring (mean duration = 4 years). SD in this cohort was associated with poor school attendance, poor academic attainment, significant anxiety symptomatology, and

extreme demand avoidant behaviour. Moreover, neurodivergent CYP (92.1%) and, in particular, autistic CYP (83.4%) were significantly over-represented amongst CYP with SD, and co-occurring multi-modal sensory processing difficulties, ADHD, and anxiety were common. Interestingly, mental health difficulties in the absence of a neurodivergent profile were relatively rare (6.17%), and there was a high prevalence of neurodiversity amongst the parents of CYP with SD. A similar profile was evident both in the CYP and in the parents in the Lifelong EHE group.

Within the present paper, we intend to focus on the final aim described above, which is to explore the lived experiences of parents of CYP experiencing SD.

Familial Experience of School Distress

SD has been suggested to have a substantial negative impact upon a child's parents and other family members, with potential consequences including missed time from work, legal and financial difficulties, and conflict with school staff (4). Providing some insight into this impact, Blandin et al. (5) investigated the parental experience of SD by interviewing five mothers of school-refusing adolescents, aged 14-18 years. Results of their interpretative phenomenological analysis revealed several consequences of SD, including parental careers being endangered, and increased conflict between parents, potentially increasing risk of separation. Furthermore, they highlighted that the whole family unit is impacted by SD due to the necessary reorganisation of daily life. However, whilst this study provides useful insight into the familial experience of SD, its value is limited by its small sample size.

Furthermore, a recent report published by Michael King, the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman, also indicated the impact that the experience of having a child who is undergoing school attendance difficulties can have on parents. Specifically, within one of the case studies presented within this report, King described the significant anxiety and distress which one young person's parents experienced due to the council's poor management of their daughter's difficulties. King highlights that they were particularly upset by the threat of prosecution they faced when they asked their local authority for help.

Truman et al. (6) also provided some insight into the parental experience of SD in their mixed-method study exploring school experiences of autistic children. Specifically, they found that parents often felt misunderstood by professionals, and were often blamed for their children's difficulties attending school. In line with this, parents in a study by Autistic UK (7) suggested that professionals often blame parents/carers and autistic children themselves for SD, with reasons such as 'non-compliance', 'overprotective parenting' and 'poor parenting' emerging.

Despite the lack of further formal research investigating the familial experience of SD, several online resources provide additional insight into this topic, typically produced by parent-led organisations. For example, a survey conducted by Not Fine In School (NFIS) (8) revealed that the consequences of having a child who struggles to attend school can be catastrophic for parents, with 63% of parents being blamed for their child's difficulties, 38% being reported to social services, and 23% being accused of Fabricated or Induced Illness (FII). Additionally, parents were often threatened with fines due to schools recording their child's absence as unauthorised, and a small number were prosecuted for their child's non-attendance. Moreover, individual parent reports provide additional insight into the parental experience, for example those provided within a recent episode of the podcast Rethinking Education (9). Within this episode, the founder and director of Team Square Peg, Fran Morgan and Ellie Costello, described experiencing feelings of guilt and shame after being encouraged to force their children to attend school, explaining that such forced attendance breaks the trust between parents and their child. Furthermore, they described experiences of gaslighting and feeling unheard and disbelieved by professionals. Given these ranging impacts, several support groups exist for families of children experiencing SD, including NFIS and Team Square Peg.

Aims

To date, there is limited research in the psychological literature exploring the impact that having a child who experiences SD has on parents, carers, and other family members. Therefore, given the gaps and methodological limitations within the current literature, the present study aims to formally document the lived-experiences of parents/carers of children who experience SD.

Due to the exploratory nature of this study, this study has no specific hypotheses or predictions.

Methods

Participants - Participants were required to live within the UK and to be parents/carers of school-aged children. 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 (e.g., lifelong elective home education [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. This ensured that children in 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 than CYP in the other three groups [Current SD = Past SD = No SD) > Elective EHE ($p<0.001$)]. However, as CYP who have never attended school are rarer than CYP in the other groups, this was accepted. Results of the Lifelong EHE group do however need to be considered despite this demographic difference.

On average, participants completed 77.35% of the survey, with 62.5% of respondents completing 100%. The majority of participants were mothers across all four SD groups (96.6-100%). Table 1 displays key characteristics of the CYP in our sample, including current age, gender, ethnicity, country of residence, and position in family, and Figure 1 shows a map of CYP experiencing SD, by county.

As described above, significantly more CYP in the Current SD (92.05%), Past SD (83.6%), and Lifelong EHE (88%) groups were rated as neurodivergent (ND) by their parents, than in the

No SD group (22.2%). Amongst CYP with experience of SD, co-occurrence between neurodivergencies was high, with CYP currently experiencing SD having a mean of 3.7 neurodivergencies, and CYP who have experienced SD in the past having a mean of 3.0 neurodivergencies. Within the Current and Past SD groups, autism was the most prevalent ND condition (83.4% Current SD; 65.2% Past SD), with the odds of experiencing SD being almost 47 times more likely in autistic CYP relative to their neurotypical peers. Sensory Processing Disorder/Sensory Integration Disorder (SPD/SID) (57.0% Current SD; 43,3% Past SD) and ADHD (55.4% Current SD; 42.8% Past SD) were the next most prevalent ND conditions amongst CYP with SD experience, respectively. Amongst the No SD group, autism was again the most prevalent (16.8%), followed by ADHD (8.7%) and dyspraxia (8.1%). For the Lifelong EHE CYP, autism and SPD/SID were equally common (52%), followed by ADHD (48%).

Rates of ND amongst the parents themselves also differed significantly between the four SD groups, with significantly fewer ND parents in the No SD group compared to the Current SD, Past SD, and Lifelong EHE groups. Specifically, whilst 77.9% of parents in the No SD group stated that they and/or their child's other parent were not ND, this option was selected by just 30.7% of parents in the Current SD group, 37.7% of parents in the Past SD group, and 34.8% of parents in the Lifelong EHE group, with all other parents selecting either 'yes' or 'maybe'.

Interestingly, CYP in the Lifelong EHE group showed similar neurodevelopmental profiles to CYP in the Current and Past SD groups, with comparable rates of ND in both the CYP themselves and their immediate family. Specifically, Lifelong EHE CYP and their parents were not significantly more or less likely to be ND compared to the CYP and parents in the two SD groups.

For more information regarding the neurodevelopmental profiles of the CYP in our sample, as well as their parents and siblings, see (1).

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

Design - The study employed a case-control, concurrent embedded mixed-methods design, within which qualitative data was collected to supplement quantitative data. This 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.

Materials - A new survey was developed for this research. To begin, participants were asked to indicate whether their child currently, or has previously, experienced difficulties attending school. An additional option was provided for parents of children who have never attended a school-setting, and a fourth for those whose children attend school without any attendance difficulties. The children and young people in the former group are referred to as Life-Long Elective Home Educated (EHE) CYP, whilst the latter are referred to as the No SD control group.

Responses to this question informed subsequent questions. In total, the survey contained four sections and 76 questions. Only



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

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 SD, and the parental experience of SD (including the treatment of parents by professionals and the impact of SD on their daily life, relationships, other children, finances, careers, and physical and mental health). Analysis of questions related to the characteristics of CYP experiencing SD, the consequences of SD, the ways in which SD presents, the impact of school on CYP's mental health, the reasons for SD from a parental perspective, and the impact (both positive and negative) of interventions/supports will be presented elsewhere.

Questions relating to the parental lived experience of SD will be analysed and discussed here, and will be considered under three related categories: firstly, the direct impact of parenting a child or young person experiencing SD on the parent themselves, secondly, the interactions that parents have with others, including the professionals/services surrounding the child and family, and wider family, friends, and acquaintances, and thirdly, the key sources of support available to parents of CYP experiencing SD.

Direct Impact of Parenting a Child with School Distress

Discrete Emotions Questionnaire

In order to comprehensively describe the emotional lived experience of parenting a CYP with SD, parents in all groups were asked to complete the Discrete Emotions Questionnaire (10). This self-report scale consists of 32 items, aiming to measure eight distinct state emotions: anger, disgust, fear, anxiety, sad-

Characteristic	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
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)
Academic Attainment					
Not Meeting Expectations	543 (52.6)	462 (67.6)	65 (36.1)	12 (8.1)	4 (18.2)
Meeting Expectations	323 (31.3)	151 (22.1)	74 (41.1)	85 (57.4)	13 (59.1)
Exceeding Expectations	167 (16.2)	70 (10.2)	41 (22.8)	51 (34.5)	5 (22.7)

Table 1. Key characteristics of the CYP.

ness, happiness, relaxation, and desire. Each of these distinct emotions has its own subscale, consisting of four items each, with each item naming a different emotion (e.g., mad, terror, happy, and calm). Individuals respond along a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all, 7 = an extreme amount), stating the extent to which they experience the given emotions. Total scores are calculated by summing participant's responses to each subscale. Parents with SD experience were asked to think specifically about their emotions during a period of time where their child was experiencing SD. Parents of Lifelong EHE CYP were asked to think about any period of time over the last year (excluding Covid-19 lockdowns), and parents of children who do not experience school attendance difficulties (i.e. No SD CYP) were asked to think about a period of time over the last year where their child has been attending school. This scale has excellent internal consistency (α>0.82 for each subscale).

Wider Impact of SD on Parent and Wider Family Life

Using a likert scale ranging from 0 to 10, parents in the two SD groups (Current SD and Past SD) were asked to rate the impact that supporting a CYP with SD has on their own physical health, relationships, career, and financial situation, as well as the impact on their other children, wider family, and family friends (0 = no impact, 5 = some negative impact, 10 = considerable negative impact). Participants were also provided the opportunity to discuss 'Other' impacts.

Comparison of SD to Other High and Low Threat Life Events

In order to understand how the experience of parenting a child with SD compares to other stressful or threatening life events, we utilised the List of Threatening Life Experiences (LTE) (11). The LTE is a list of twelve life event categories with considerable long-term contextual threat. These include 'serious illness or in-

jury to self', 'death of a first-degree relative, including spouse or child', and 'major financial crisis'. The LTE has high reported test-retest reliability, good agreement with informant information, and both high specificity and sensitivity (12). The LTE has also been found to have good validity and stability over time, making it suitable for use as a measure of stress in epidemiological population-based cohort studies (13). For current purposes, we adapted this questionnaire to include the original 12 threatening life event categories, and added 6 additional life event categories. Five of the additional life event categories were taken from Burghal et al. (1985) Appendix B, which presents a list of 15 prescribed life event categories considered to have mild or no long-term threat (i.e. 'had a baby', 'a minor injury or illness to self', 'started a different type of job', 'had moderate financial difficulties', and 'moved house within own town/city'), whilst the sixth was 'child school-refusing'. All four groups of participants were asked to select what they considered to be the top 10 most stressful life events from this amended list of 18 life event categories (i.e. the 12 original items from the LTE, 5 items associated with mild/no threat, and 'child school-refusing'). Participants were then required to sort their selected 10 life event categories in order, starting with the life event category that they considered to be the most threatening of the 10 events and ending with the life event category that they considered to be the least threatening of the 10 events. Participants were reminded that they did not need to have experienced all events personally to rank them. Note: the terminology 'school-refusal' was used here as this was prior to data analysis and before it became evident that this was not an appropriate terminology (at which point we moved to the use of the term School Distress).

Impact of SD on Parental Mental Health

Using a scale from 0-10, all parents were asked to quantify the level of daily stress/anxiety that they currently experience (0 = none... 10 = high), and to quantify their typical daily mood (0 = very negative... 10 = very positive). In addition to these current ratings, parents of CYP currently experiencing SD were asked to rate their typical level of daily stress/anxiety (0-10), and their typical daily mood (0-10), prior to the onset of their child's school attendance problems. Parents who rated their children's school attendance problems as historical (Past SD) were asked to quantify their typical level of daily stress/anxiety and mood both before and during their child's school attendance difficulties. This enabled us to retrospectively track changes in anxiety and mood relative to the onset and attenuation of their child's school attendance difficulties. Of note, and as reported in (1), the majority of the CYP in the Past SD group are now home-educated.

Finally, participants who had parented a child with SD (Current or Past) were also asked whether they had developed a new mental health condition since the onset of their child's school attendance difficulties.

Interactions with Individuals Surrounding Child and Family

Tone of Communication used by Professionals

Parents were presented with a list of 27 adjectives ('Adversarial', 'Aggressive', 'Calm', 'Caring', 'Compassionate', 'Conspiratorial', 'Critical', 'Disrespectful', 'Dismissive', 'Friendly', 'Guarded', 'Helpful', 'Hostile', 'Hurtful', 'Informed', 'Intimidating', 'Kind', 'Optimistic', 'Respectful', 'Unclear', 'Understanding', 'Uninformed', 'Unsupportive', 'Secretive', 'Supportive', 'Sympathetic', 'Threatening'), plus an 'Other' option (which included a free-text box for participants to enter the appropriate adjective). Using this list, all parents were asked to select the words that they felt appropriately described the tone of communication used by professionals when communicating with them. Professionals in this context was defined for participants as being "anyone who is working in a professional (e.g. paid) capacity with your child (e.g. health care professionals, children's social services, local authority EHE staff...etc.)".

Feeling Not Believed by School Staff, Health Care Professionals, and Others

All parents were then asked whether they have ever felt that they have not been believed when they have raised concerns about their child's difficulties. Four response options were provided: 'No', 'Yes, by school staff', 'Yes, by health care professionals', and 'Yes, by others (please specify)'. The latter included a free text box for parents to provide further details.

Experience of Professional Gaslighting

Next, all parents were asked if they have ever experienced professional gaslighting. Professional gaslighting was defined as an interaction "where a professional makes you question your own reality". The three response options provided were 'No, never', 'Yes, occasionally', and 'Yes, frequently'.

Feeling Threatened or Vulnerable

All parents were also asked whether, as a parent/carer, they have ever felt threatened or vulnerable as a result of an interaction with a member of school staff. The three response options were 'No', 'Unsure', and 'Yes, definitely'.

Action Taken Against Parents to Enforce Attendance

Parents in the Current SD, Past SD, and Lifelong EHE groups were also asked whether they have ever had any action taken against them as parents to enforce their child's school attendance, and if so, to describe this action. Ten response options were provided: 'No', 'Yes, a fine (sometimes known as a 'penalty notice')', 'Yes, a Parenting Order', 'Yes, an Education Supervision Order', 'Yes, a School Attendance Order', 'Yes, I was prosecuted and given a Community Order', 'Yes, I was prosecuted and given a jail sentence', 'Yes, a Fabricated or induced illness (FII) accusation', 'Yes, Child Protection Procedures', and 'Other (please provide details below)'. Parents were asked to select all options that applied to their situation.

Support for Parents

Finally, all parents were asked: "As a parent, what has been your most important source(s) of support?". To answer this question, parents were presented with a free text box to add their own comments.

Procedure - Data was collected using Qualtrics. The survey link was advertised and widely shared on social media (Facebook and Twitter) and was open for 14 days (22/2/22-8/3/22).

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 SD

and their responses throughout the survey. 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.

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 Mann-Whitney U post-hoc analyses examined differences in anxiety and mood scores between SD groups). A significance level of α=0.05 was adopted for all analyses, except during post-hoc tests where Bonferroni adjustment was applied.

Qualitative analysis was used to analyse additional comments provided by parents in response to some survey questions. In the interest of space, a thematic analysis of just one question is reported here: free text comments in response to the question "Have you ever had any action taken against you to enforce school attendance?". This question was chosen as in this instance, the 'Other' options was the second most endorsed option (after 'No') and 106 parents provided a free text comment. The volume of free text responses, coupled with a low rate of endorsement of the provided options, meant that it was necessary to consider these additional comments to accurately answer the question.

Qualitative data analysis followed the six phases of thematic analysis recommended by Braun and Clarke (2006), aiming to identify key themes within the data to help answer our research question. During analysis, an inductive approach was taken, such that codes and themes were developed from the content of the data-set itself, rather than any prior theoretical commitments. Given the current lack of in-depth research into the experience of SD, this enabled us to identify new, valuable information. Furthermore, an essentialist/realist position was taken, assuming a unidirectional relationship between the participants' experiences and their language used. Each comment was read multiple times and labelled with a code. Where appropriate, comments were split apart, and each section was given a separate code. Coding focused primarily on the semantic content of comments, extracting parents' explicit accounts, rather than any latent meanings in the data. A total of 31 codes were identified. Codes which dealt with similar issues were clustered to form initial themes and data relating to each theme was gathered. Themes were discussed and refined by the research team until consensus was reached, ensuring the themes made sense in terms of the coded extracts and the whole data set. Final themes were then defined and given a label.

Word clouds are also used in this study to represent portions of both the quantitative and qualitative data. These were generated using https://www.wordclouds.com/.

Results

Direct Impact of Parenting a Child with School Distress

Discrete Emotions Questionnaire

Mean parental responses to each of the 32 emotions in the DEQ (10) are represented at the group level both quantitatively in Figure 2 and qualitatively in Figure 3.

For formal statistical analysis, a score for each of the eight distinct emotion states (i.e. anger, disgust, fear, anxiety, sadness, happiness, relaxation, and desire) was computed and compared between groups. Kruskal-Wallis H tests revealed that scores on all eight of the DEQ emotions were significantly different between SD groups (see Table 2). Mann-Whitney U post-hoc tests revealed that parents in the Current and Past SD groups experienced significantly higher levels of all the negative emotions measured using the DEQ (i.e., anger, anxiety, sadness, disgust, and fear) during their child's SD, relative to the parents in the No SD group. Moreover, results revealed that parents in the No SD group, in addition to experiencing significantly lower levels of all negative emotions, also experienced significantly higher levels of relaxation and happiness than parents in the Current and Past SD groups.

Notably, parents in the Lifelong EHE group scored significantly higher than parents in the No SD group in terms of anger, anxiety, sadness, desire and fear, however, they did not differ significantly in their experience of relaxation, disgust, or happiness. The Lifelong EHE parent group is an important comparison group, as (unlike in the No SD control group) the number of neurodivergencies amongst both the children and the parents in this group resembles the Current and Past SD groups (see (1) for full details).

Wider Impact of SD on Parent and Wider Family Life

As shown in Figure 4, having a child who experiences SD negatively impacts various aspects of a parent's life. To examine the significance of these negative effects, one-sample t-tests were conducted. Results revealed that the mean scores for each variable were significantly greater than 0, indicating that SD had a significant, negative impact on every aspect of the parents' lives measured (i.e. parental physical health, relationships with partners, parental careers and financial situation, their other children within the family, their wider family unit and family friends, and 'other').

From these response options, both the Current and Past SD groups reported the most negative impact as being on their own careers, followed closely by on their other children, their financial situation, and their relationship with their partner.

When parents reported 'Other' negative impacts, free text comments indicated that this most frequently referred to the deleterious impact on their own mental health. This was followed by an negative impact on their confidence in their parenting abilities, and on their confidence in themselves, their self-esteem and self-belief. Breakdowns in parents relationships with their child experiencing SD were also referred to by multiple parents. In addition, parents described a loss of leisure time, loss of friendships (both personal friendships and their child's friendships), loss of sexual relationships, loss of self-care time to support their own mental health needs, an inability to carry out normal daily activities, and a personal loss of trust in the system and in professionals. A number of parents also noted a deleterious impact on their partner's mental health and career. One parent noted a positive impact resulting from being at home.

Comparison of SD to Other High and Low Threat Life Events



Fig. 2. The mean ratings of each of the 32 emotions in the DEQ as endorsed by parents within each group. Error bars represent +/- 1 SEM.



Fig. 3. Word Clouds where the size of the word represents that mean ratings of each of the 32 emotions in the DEQ as endorsed by parents within the NO SD control Group, the Current SD group, and the Lifelong EHE parent group. The bigger the word, the more strongly it was endorsed by parents within each group.

In relation to the 12 threatening life events categories in the LTE (11) plus the five mild to no threat life events selected from Appendix B (11), parents in the No SD control group perceived the experience of a 'Child School Refusing' being the 10th most threatening life event; superseded by Serious Illness or Injury to Close Relative, Death of a 1st degree relative including child or spouse, Serious Illness or Injury to Self, Major financial crisis, Separation due to marital difficulties, Death of close family friend or 2nd degree relative, Sacked from job, Problems with police/court appearance, and Unemployed seeking work for more than 1 month (see 3). Similarly, parents who children have never attended school also placed the experience of having a 'Child School Refusing' relatively low on the list of possible threatening life event categories; falling in joint 12th place with the experience of having moderate financial difficulties.

On the contrary, parents with direct experience of parenting a 'Child School Refusing' placed this life event higher on their list of threatening life events. More specifically, parents with historical experience parenting 'Child School Refusing' (i.e. the Past SD group) collectively rated this experience as the 5th most threatening life event category, superseded by Death of a 1st de-

Measure	Current SD		Past SD		No SD		Lifelong EHE		H(3)	p	Significant group differences*
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*			
Anger	3.75	1.73	3.31	1.97	1.64	1.06	2.36	1.47	166.30	<0.001	Current SD = Past SD > No SD; Current SD > EHE > No SD; Past SD = EHE
Desire	2.76	1.33	2.21	1.14	1.74	0.87	2.61	1.32	76.19	<0.001	Current SD > Past SD > No SD; Current SD = EHE > No SD; Past SD = EHE
Anxiety	5.43	1.38	4.99	1.54	2.17	1.24	3.61	1.55	242.35	<0.001	Current SD > Past SD > EHE > No SD
Sadness	4.73	1.52	3.93	1.53	1.58	0.82	3.16	1.55	267.58	<0.001	Current SD > Past SD > No SD; Current SD > EHE > No SD; Past SD = EHE
Relaxation	1.57	0.82	1.45	0.68	4.12	1.67	3.47	1.58	220.30	<0.001	No SD = EHE > Current SD = Past SD
Disgust	1.97	1.14	1.75	1.05	1.19	0.45	1.25	0.39	82.98	<0.001	Current SD = Past SD > No SD; Current SD > EHE = No SD; Past SD = EHE
Happiness	1.63	0.81	1.56	0.70	4.29	1.72	3.89	1.46	224.44	<0.003	No SD = EHE > Current SD = Past SD
Fear	3.64	1.82	3.03	1.88	1.33	0.75	2.27	1.67	182.72	<0.001	Current SD > Past SD > No SD; Current SD > EHE > No SD; Past SD = EHE

*p<0.008 (Bonferroni adjusted)

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations and Kruskal Wallis H Tests Investigating Differences in DEQ Scores Between School Distress Groups. Post-Hoc Mann-Whitney U Tests Determined the Location of Significant Differences.



Fig. 4. The Mean Extent to Which School Distress Has a Wider Negative Impact on the Respondent's Life. Error bars represent +/- 1 SE. Note: Responses were rated on a scale of 0-10, where 0 indicates no negative effect and 10 indicates a very large negative effect. One-sample t-tests revealed that the mean scores for each variable were significantly greater than 0.

gree relative including child or spouse, Serious Illness or Injury to Self, Death of close family friend or 2nd degree relative and a Major financial crisis.

Parents currently experiencing SD collectively rated a 'Child School Refusing' as their 2nd most threatening life event category, only superseded by the 'Death of a 1st degree relative including child or spouse'.

Impact of SD on Parental Mental Health

Within this study, parents were also asked to formally quantify the amount of anxiety they currently experience, and their current mood. A Kruskal-Wallis test revealed a significant difference in current mood levels between parents in the four SD groups, H(3)=182.620, $p<0.001$ (see Figure 5). Post-hoc Mann-Whitney U tests revealed that parental mood levels were significantly lower in the Current SD group (M = 4.4, StDev = 1.96) compared to the Past SD group (M=6.13, StDev=1.79), U=25863.5, z=-9.713, $p<0.001$, the No SD group (M=6.45, StDev=1.85), U=215557.0, z=-10.368, $p<0.001$, and the Lifelong EHE group (M=6.75, StDev=2.17), U=2299.5, z=-4.878, $p<0.001$ [(Past SD = No SD = Lifelong EHE) > Current SD].

Moreover, a Kruskal-Wallis test also revealed a significant difference in current anxiety levels between parents in the four SD groups, H(3)=168.438, $p<0.001$ (see Figure 5). Post-hoc Mann-Whitney U tests revealed that parents of children currently experiencing SD had significantly higher anxiety levels than parents in the other three groups [Current SD > Past SD > No SD; Current SD > Lifelong EHE]. Specifically, parents in the Current SD group (M=7.39, StDev=1.84) had significantly higher anxiety levels than parents in the Past SD group (M=5.73, StDev=2.08), U=27246.5, z=-9.141, $p<0.001$, the No SD group (M=4.92, StDev=2.59), U=19703.0, z=-10.447, $p<0.001$, and the Lifelong EHE group (M=5.15, StDev=2.92), U=3204.5, z=-3.759, $p<0.001$. Parents of CYP who have experienced SD in the past also had significantly higher current anxiety levels than parents of CYP who have never experienced SD, U=9380.5, z=-2.797, p=0.005. No other group differences were significant after Bonferroni adjustment.

Moreover, Friedman tests revealed significant differences between the mood ($\chi2(2)$ = 84.75, $p<0.001$) and anxiety ($\chi2(2)$=229.19, $p<0.001$) levels of parents in the Past SD group pre-, during-, and post-SD (see Figure 6). Post-hoc Wilcoxon Signed-Rank tests revealed that parental mood levels were significantly lower during their child's SD (M=3.99, StDev=2.77) than they were pre-SD (M=6.48, StDev=2.18), z=-6.132, $p<0.001$. Moreover, parental mood levels were also significantly lower during their child's SD compared to post-SD (M=6.13, StDev=1.79), z=-6.715, $p<0.001$ (Pre-SD > During SD; Post-SD > During SD). There was no significant difference between mood levels pre-SD and post-SD after Bonferroni adjustment.

Post-hoc Wilcoxon Signed-Rank tests also revealed that parental anxiety levels were significantly higher during their child's SD (M=8.57, StDev=1.87) than they were pre-SD (M=4.09, StDev=1.86), z=-10.391, $p<0.001$. Parental anxiety levels were also significantly higher during their child's SD than they were post-SD (M=5.73, StDev=2.08), z=-9.720, $p<0.001$. Notably, parental anxiety levels post-SD remained significantly higher than those pre-SD, z=-7.766, $p<0.001$ (During SD > Pre-SD; During SD > Post-SD; Post-SD > Pre-SD).

Likewise, Wilcoxon Signed-Rank tests revealed significant differences between the anxiety (z=-20.27, $p<0.001$) and mood (z=-17.60, $p<0.001$) levels of parents in the Current SD group before their child's SD began and at the time of survey completion (i.e., during their child's SD) Investigation of the means revealed that the parents' average mood levels were significantly lower during SD (M=4.40, StDev=1.96) compared to pre-SD (M=7.06, StDev=1.83), and their average anxiety levels were significantly higher during SD (M=7.39, StDev=1.84), compared to pre-SD (M=3.80, StDev=1.94) (see Figure 7).

In line with the above findings, results revealed that 51.7% of parents in the Current SD group, and 42% of parents in the Past SD group, developed a new mental health condition (diagnosed or suspected) since their child's SD began.

Interactions with Individuals Surrounding Child and Family

Tone of Communication used by Professionals

Table 4 displays the most common tones of communication used by professionals with parents. In line with the aforementioned findings, 'dismissive', 'critical', 'unsupportive', and 'uninformed' were amongst the tones used most frequently with parents of children who have experienced SD, whilst 'friendly', 'calm', 'caring' and 'helpful' were amongst the main tones used with parents of children who have not experienced SD.

Feeling Not Believed by School Staff, Health Care Professionals, and Others

Over 75% of parents with SD experience (either current or in the past) reported feeling like they have not been believed by school staff when raising concerns about their child, compared to just 17.8% of those in the No SD group (see Figure 8 Panel A). Notably, 52.9% of parents in the Lifelong EHE group reported that they have felt disbelieved by health care professionals previously, along with 38.7% of those in the Current SD group and over a quarter of those in the Past SD group. Additional comments provided by parents in response to this question provided further insight into the treatment received by professionals, for example: *"All through primary I felt shamed and blamed"*, *"I always get the sense people think it's just our parenting and we should have done something differently"*, *"I have a Parent Carer Needs Assessment that essentially accused me of Fii (Fabricated or Induced Illness)"*, *"Dismissed and told they are fine in school"*, *"...they minimise my concerns"*, and *"As my child masks in school I often get a look from the teachers and told he doesn't do that in school he's playing you up"*.

As evident in Panel A, some parents indicated that they felt that they have not been believed about their child's difficulties 'by others', with the majority of these parents falling into the SD or Lifelong EHE groups (i.e. the groups in which the CYP have the most neurodivergent and other health conditions). A total of 84 parents provided free text comments with respect to who they were referring to. Responses are represented in Figure 8 Panel B. Family, Friends and Local Authorities were mentioned by 14, 11, and 10 parents respectively. Different descriptor terms were used for Children's Social Services (i.e., Social Workers x 5, Social Care x 4, Social Services x 3, Early Help x 3, Disability Social Worker x 1, Family Support Worker x 2), which when combined, makes this the largest group in the 'Other' category. In addition to family and friends, partners, ex-partners, and ex-husbands were mentioned by a number of parents, as well as other parents, work colleagues, and parent's own parents. More

Most to Least Stressful	Current SD	Past SD	No SD	Lifelong EHE
1st	Death of a 1st degree relative including child or spouse	Death of a 1st degree relative including child or spouse	Serious Illness or Injury to Close Relative	Death of a 1st degree relative including child or spouse
2nd	**Child School Refusing**	Serious Illness or Injury to Self; Death of close family friend or 2nd degree relative	Death of a 1st degree relative including child or spouse	Serious Illness or Injury to Self
3rd	Serious Illness or Injury to Self	-	Serious Illness or Injury to Self; Major financial crisis	Serious Illness or Injury to Close Relative
4th	Serious Illness or Injury to Close Relative	Major financial crisis	-	Major financial crisis
5th	Death of close family friend or 2nd degree relative	**Child School Refusing**	Separation due to marital difficulties	Death of close family friend or 2nd degree relative
6th	Major financial crisis	Serious Illness or Injury to Close Relative	Death of close family friend or 2nd degree relative	Separation due to marital difficulties
7th	Separation due to marital difficulties	Separation due to marital difficulties	Sacked from job	Serious problem with close friend, neighbour or relative; Sacked from job
8th	Problems with police/court appearance	Problems with police/court appearance	Problems with police/court appearance	-
9th	Sacked from job	Sacked from job	Unemployed seeking work for more than 1 month	Had a baby
10th	Serious problem with close friend, neighbour or relative	Had a baby	**Child School Refusing**	Problems with police/court appearance
11th	Had a baby	Serious problem with close friend, neighbour or relative; Unemployed seeking work for more than 1 month	Serious problem with close friend, neighbour or relative	Unemployed seeking work for more than 1 month
12th	Had moderate financial difficulties	-	Had moderate financial difficulties	Had moderate financial difficulties; **Child School Refusing**
13th	Unemployed seeking work for more than 1 month	Had moderate financial difficulties	Had a baby	-
14th	Moved house within own town/city	Moved house within own town/city	Moved house within own town/city	Moved house within own town/city
15th	Broke off a steady relationship	Broke off a steady relationship	Broke off a steady relationship	Minor illness or injury to self
16th	Started in a different type of job	Started in a different type of job	Something valuable lost or stolen	Started in a different type of job
17th	Something valuable lost or stolen	Minor illness or injury to self	Minor illness or injury to self	Something valuable lost or stolen
18th	Minor illness or injury to self	Something valuable lost or stolen	Started in a different type of job	Broke off a steady relationship

Note. Events are ordered based upon the mean position they were placed by participants.

Table 3. Most to Least Threatening Life Events, as Rated by Parents With and Without Experience of School Distress. Events are ordered based upon the mean position they were placed by participants. Note. Events separated by ; were chosen as equally threatening.



Fig. 5. Mean (a) Mood and (b) Anxiety Levels Currently Experienced by Respondents, Split by Experience of SD. Error bars represent +/- 1 SE.



Fig. 6. Mean (a) Mood and (b) Anxiety Levels of Parents of Children Who Have Previously Experienced School Distress, Assessed Based on Their Mood and Anxiety Pre-SD, During SD, and now (Post-SD). Error bars represent +/- 1 SE.



Fig. 7. Mean (a) Mood and (b) Anxiety Levels of Participants Whose Children Currently Experience School Distress, Assessed Based on Their Mood and Anxiety Pre-SD and Now. Error bars represent +/- 1 SE.

Position	Current SD	Past SD	No SD	Lifelong EHE
1st	Dismissive	Dismissive	Friendly	Caring/Friendly
2nd	Critical/Unsupportive	Unsupportive	Calm	Helpful
3rd	Uninformed	Uninformed	Helpful	Calm
4th	Calm	Caring/Critical	Respectful	Compassionate/Respectful
5th	Caring	Compassionate/Friendly	Caring	Kind/Uninformed

Table 4. Five Tones of Communication Used Most Frequently by Professionals With Parents of Children During Their SD, and Parents of Children Who Have Never Experienced SD (from most to least commonly used).

specialist mental health services, such as CAMHS, educational psychology, and an ASD-team were also mentioned. One parents disclosed that they felt that they were not believed about their child's difficulties by *"just about everyone"*.

Experience of Professional Gaslighting

Moreover, 77.6% of parents of children currently experiencing SD, and 69.9% of parents of children who have experienced SD in the past, reported either occasionally or frequently experiencing professional gaslighting (see Figure 8 Panel C), which is where individuals are manipulated "into doubting his or her perceptions, experiences, or understanding of events" (American Psychological Association, n.d.). In contrast, 76.3% of parents in the No SD group, and 58.8% of parents in the Lifelong EHE group (i.e., those with no experience of SD) reported that they have never experienced professional gaslighting.

A Kruskal-Wallis H test with Mann-Whitney U post-hoc analyses revealed that significantly more parents in the Current and Past SD groups reported either occasionally or frequently experiencing gaslighting, compared to parents in the No SD group ([Current SD = Past SD] > No SD; Past SD = Lifelong EHE; Current SD > [No SD = Lifelong EHE]).

Feeling Threatened or Vulnerable

Furthermore, 47.7% of parents in the Current SD group, and 52% of those in the Past SD group, reported that they have felt threatened or vulnerable due to an interaction with a member of school staff (see Figure 8 Panel D). In contrast, just 8% of parents in the No SD group and 16.7% of parents in the Lifelong EHE group reported feeling this way.

A Kruskal-Wallis H test with Mann-Whitney U post-hoc analyses revealed that significantly more parents in the Current and Past SD groups have felt threatened or vulnerable compared to parents in the No SD and Lifelong EHE groups ([Current SD = Past SD] > [No SD = Lifelong EHE])

Action Taken Against Parents to Enforce Attendance

When asked about action which has been taken against parents to enforce school attendance, the majority of participants reported 'no action' (see Table 5). However, 106 participants did provide additional comments in response to this question. By analysing these comments, nine themes were identified relating to action which parents have faced: Pressure and Threat From School; Accusation/Accusatory Response; Enforced Action; Traumatic Experiences; "Living in Fear"; Bullying and



Fig. 8. Panel A. Percentage of parents who have ever felt as if they have not been believed by School Staff, Health Care Professionals, or 'Others', when they have raised concerns about their child's difficulties. Panel B. A word cloud of the free text responses provided by parents to the question of who else (i.e. the 'Others' in Panel A) did not believe them when they raised concerns about their child's difficulties. The bigger the word, the more frequently this option was disclosed by parents. Panel C. Percentage of parents who reported 'never', 'occasionally', and 'frequently' experiencing professional gaslighting i.e., where a professional made them question their own reality. Panel D. Percentage of parents who have ever felt threatened or vulnerable as a result of an interaction with a member of school staff.

Cruel Behaviour; Local Services/Agencies; Lack of Interest; and Supportive/Protective Actions.

Figure 9 displays the thematic map, highlighting links between themes. See Sup. Note 1 for several quotes which demonstrate each theme.

Theme 1: 'Pressure and Threat From School' highlights that parents were commonly placed under pressure to enforce attendance (e.g., *"constant pressure from school"*), and were often threatened with action by school if they did not enforce attendance, for example *"I was threatened with fines/court orders"* and *"threatened with social services"*.

Theme 2: 'Accusations/Accusatory Response' highlights that several parents were accused of making up or causing their child's difficulties by school staff and other professionals, including GPs. Several parents were also required to provide proof of their child's difficulties, further indicating that professionals did not believe them. Example quotes underlying this theme included *"have been suspected of fii by GP"*, and *"verbally implied I was making it up during a meeting with a head teacher"*.

Theme 3: 'Enforced Action' highlights that, for some parents, action was taken against them to enforce school attendance, beyond those options provided in the survey (see Table 5). This action included a *"parenting course"*, *"teachers showing up at my door to 'take control'"*, being *"told I have to attend a formal interview under caution"*, and being *"taken to court for my son's attendance"*.

Theme 4: 'Traumatic Experiences' highlights that, for some parents, extreme physical action was taken due to their child's difficulties, likely having severe psychological consequences for the parents and their children. Examples of such experiences include *"I had my son removed as SS did not believe that I was trying to get him into school"*, and *"Attendance team visit to house...Didn't have a problem with using physical force on a disabled child to get them to attend school"*.

Theme 5: '"Living in Fear"' highlights that several parents were concerned about action which may be taken against them in the future, despite no action having been taken yet. For example, one parent reported *"no action taken, however I am living fear of this"*, another said *"not yet but it worries me that I will in the future"*, and a third stated *"not yet, but it's coming"*.

Theme 6: 'Bullying and Cruel Behaviour' highlights that some professionals bullied parents due to their child's attendance difficulties, including school staff and Education Welfare Officers. Strikingly, some parents highlighted that this behaviour was used with their child too. Quotes underlying this theme include *"primary school Head teacher used bullying tactics on us as parents and on my child"*, and *"I was called into a meeting and made to feel very small, lectured a lot. They then called my daughter in went through it all again upset her"*.

Theme 7: 'Local Services/Agencies' highlights that several external services often became involved, typically via referral from school staff. Such agencies included social services (*"social services family risk assessment"*), County Attendance Officers (*"County attendance officer involvement and several meetings etc."*), Education Welfare Officers (*"EWO was involved and I was at risk of being taken to court"*), and the multi-agency safeguarding hub (*"school contacted MASH for Child in Need assessment"*).

**Themes 8 and 9: The final two themes emerged as separate to the others. Firstly, 'Lack of Interest' (theme 8) highlights that one school was uninterested in children's lack of attendance, meaning no action was taken (*"this does not apply at private*

Action	Current SD	Past SD
No Action	77.32	82.50
Fine	1.99	0.63
Parenting Order	0.17	0
Education Supervision Order	0.17	0
School Attendance Order	3.48	0.63
Prosecuted (Community Order)	0	0
Prosecuted (Jail)	0	0
Fabricated or Induced Illness Accusation	3.48	3.13
Child Protection Services	4.30	1.25
Other (Additional Comments)	14.9	9.38

Table 5. Percentage of Parents Who Have Had Different Types of Action Taken Against Them to Enforce School Attendance.



Fig. 9. Thematic Map Representing the Actions Taken by Professionals in Response to School Distress. Arrows indicate the direction of relationships between themes.

***school, they just don't care less you are not there, as long as you keep paying fees!"*).**

The final theme, 'Supportive/Protective Actions' (theme 9), highlighted positive action which had been taken by professionals to protect parents of children experiencing SD. One parent highlighted this to be a member of school staff (*"court action threatened but protected by headteacher"*), whilst the others referred to external professionals, including doctors and solicitors. For example, one participant described that *"having a GP and therapist backing me was absolutely crucial as they diagnosed my grandson with PTSD, insomnia, anxiety and OCD"* and another stated that *"I got taken to court for my sons attendance but eventually they dropped the charges after lots of fighting with the help of a solicitor"*.

Support for Parents

Five hundred and forty-eight parents responded to the question "As a parent, what has been your most important source(s) of support?". Broken down by SD group, this question was answered by 367 parents of CYP currently experiencing SD, 84 parents of CYP who have experienced SD in the past, 82 parents of CYP who have never experienced SD, and 15 parents of CYP in the Lifelong EHE group. Whilst a variety of sources were mentioned, there was consensus between a large proportion of parents with experience of SD regarding their most important sources of support. For example, of the 451 parents who responded to this question from the Current SD and Past SD groups, 124 referred to other parents (with similar experiences)/parent support groups/communities, 71 referred to their own family/husband/partner, 56 referred specifically to Facebook support groups/communities, and 52 referred to their friends. A smaller number of parents mentioned teachers, SENCOs, support workers, SENDIASS, GPs and clinical/educational/private psychologists.

Discussion

Through an extensive online survey, this study provided valuable insight into the experiences of parents of CYP experiencing SD in the UK, including the ways in which parents are treated by educational professionals, and the impact of their experiences on their mental health.

Strikingly, the only event rated as more stressful than 'child school refusing' by parents of children currently experiencing SD was 'death of a 1st degree relative'. This highlights that the experience of SD can be highly distressing for parents, especially considering that 'Death of a close family friend', 'Serious Illness or Injury to Self', and 'Serious Illness or Injury to Close Relative' were amongst the options rated as less stressful/threatening by parents of CYP currently experiencing SD.

Providing some insight into why this experience is so distressing, parents of children experiencing SD reported quantitatively and qualitatively different treatment from professionals than parents without SD experience. For instance, parents in both the No SD control group and parents in the Lifelong EHE group reported that the tone of their interactions with professionals are typically calm, helpful, friendly and caring. On the contrary, parents of CYP currently experiencing SD reported a much less supportive tone to their interactions with professionals, collectively rating the tone of these interactions as dismissive, critical, unsupportive and uninformed. Parents whose CYP have historical school attendance difficulties described a similar tone.

In addition, a much higher percentage of parents with SD experience reported not feeling believed about their child's difficulties by school staff, health professionals and other professionals (including Local Authority staff and Children's Social Services), compared to parents of CYP with no SD experience. Significantly more parents also reported experiencing professional gaslighting in the two SD groups, compared to parents in the No SD group, and they were also more likely to report feeling threatened and vulnerable as a result of an interaction with school staff.

Whilst this is one of the first studies to investigate the parental experience of SD, previous research indicates that parents of autistic children face similar treatment when seeking initial educational placements for their child, including feeling intimidated by school staff, and not believed regarding their child's difficulties (14). Given the prevalence of autism amongst our SD groups, such similarities open the possibility that our findings reflect the interactions of educational professionals with parents of autistic children generally, rather than parents of children experiencing SD specifically.

The outcomes of our thematic analysis complemented these results by highlighting actions taken by professionals against parents directly as a consequence of their child's school attendance difficulties. Specifically, analysis of participants' comments revealed that many parents have received threats from schools regarding fines and prosecution, have faced referrals to agencies including to Children's Social Services, and some have been accused of fabricating their child's difficulties. Moreover, several parents reported facing enforced action, including attendance of parenting courses, and, in the most extreme case, having their child taken away. Whilst the rate of actions taken against parents were lower here than reported elsewhere, several parents who have not had action taken against them yet reported living in fear of what may be to come. These findings corroborate and expand upon the results of Truman et al. (6) and NFIS's recent survey (8), where several parents reported being threatened with fines and blamed for their child's difficulties.

In contrast to past research, some parents in the present study also reported being supported by professionals, including their child's GP. However, this support was typically required in the face of punitive action from others, further emphasising their overwhelmingly negative experiences. Such findings indicate that professionals hold a flawed understanding of SD, as they appear to be blaming and punishing parents for their children's difficulties despite the existing literature indicating that SD does not occur due to a child's parents (15–17). Instead, the existing studies which have been conducted with parents and young people themselves highlight factors such as anxiety, fear of teacher behaviour, social exclusion/isolation, and the sensory environment as causing or contributing to SD (15–19). Hence, the present study emphasises the need for increased training for professionals regarding the underpinnings of SD.

Importantly, this qualitative analysis was based upon comments provided by a minority of parents in an optional free text response option, with most other respondents selecting that 'no action' had been taken against them due to their child's SD. Thus, these experiences may only apply to some parents of children experiencing SD. Future research may benefit from explicitly asking parents about their concerns with respect to future action being taken against them, as this was not explicitly probed here.

The present study's findings also revealed the negative impact that SD, and associated events, can have on various aspects of a parent's life, including their career, their financial situation, their other children, and their own mental health, with over half of parents in the Current SD group reporting that they developed a new mental health condition since the onset of their child's SD. Moreover, using the Discrete Emotions Questionnaire (10), parents supporting CYP with SD were found to have significantly higher levels of all the negative emotions measured (i.e., anger, anxiety, sadness, disgust, and fear), alongside significantly lower levels of positive emotions (i.e. relaxation and happiness), than parents of age-matched control CYP who did not experience school attendance difficulties.

Relatedly, parents in the Current and Past SD groups reported experiencing significantly poorer mood and higher anxiety during their child's difficulties compared to pre-SD, with parents in the latter reporting that their mood and anxiety then significantly improved post-SD. Although the retrospective nature of assessment may have impeded the accuracy of parents' past mood and anxiety scores (20), the clear pattern across both groups indicates that SD does impact parental mental health.

In line with this, parents of children currently experiencing SD were found to have significantly poorer current mood and higher current anxiety levels than parents in the other three groups. These findings appear somewhat unsurprising given the distress that parents witness their child experiencing, and the treatment they face from professionals. Notably, it could be suggested that the low mood and high anxiety levels in the Current SD group are a result of the high rates of parental ND in this group, given that ND and mental health difficulties often co-occur (21–23). However, it is important to recognise that there were comparable rates of parental ND in the Lifelong EHE and Past SD groups, who had significantly lower current anxiety and significantly higher current mood levels than the parents in the Current SD group, and whose mood levels did not differ from those of the No SD parents. As such, it appears that the poorer current mental health of the parents in the Current SD group is not simply a result of the high rates of ND in this group, but instead seems to be a consequence of these individuals parenting and supporting a CYP experiencing SD. This conclusion is supported by the pre-SD anxiety and mood levels of the Current SD parents, which were actually better (i.e., lower anxiety and higher mood) than the current anxiety and mood levels of the parents in the No SD group, again indicating that their current poor mental health is a result of SD, and not their ND.

Supporting our findings is a case study included within the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman's recent focus re-

port titled 'Out of school, out of sight? Ensuring children out of school get a good education'. Within this case study, the Ombudsman highlights the anxiety and distress experienced by a young girl's parents due to the way the local authorities handled their daughter's school attendance difficulties, particularly with regards to the threats of prosecution that they faced when asking the council for help. Also in line with the present results, Bahali et al. (24) found higher depression and anxiety scores amongst parents of children experiencing SD, compared to controls. However, from their findings, the authors inferred that poor parental mental health may cause SD. The present study questions such conclusions, indicating instead that SD negatively impacts parental mental health. Further research may aim to investigate whether this relationship is bidirectional. Nonetheless, the present study highlights that the experience of SD can have an overwhelmingly negative impact on parents. Thus, routine professional support should be made available for parents of children experiencing SD.

Investigation of the current sources of support available for parents of CYP experiencing SD revealed that support groups (including online support groups) and other parents with similar experiences are particularly important, alongside family, friends, and partners. Such findings align with those of NFIS's 2020 report (8), which also revealed social media support groups, friends, and family members to be of most value, as opposed to schools, local authorities, and CAMHS. Whilst it is reassuring to hear that parents are receiving some helpful support, it should not be the responsibility of other parents who are already experiencing their own difficulties to provide this support. As such, it is vital that more valuable professional support for parents is developed and implemented in the near future, particularly given the deleterious impact that SD can have on children (1), parents and the wider family network (discussed above).

Strengths and Limitations

One limitation of the present study is that most participants were mothers, meaning that our findings regarding the parental experience of SD may not be representative of the experience of fathers. Future research should therefore explore the experiences of fathers, as any differences may have implications for the support offered to parents (25). However, it may also be telling that most respondents were mothers, as some mothers commented on how differently their partner was treated by professionals, and others called for further research on the topic to explore whether the treatment that mothers experience in this context may be underpinned by systemic misogyny. This study was not however designed to explore these issues.

In addition, this study was limited to the United Kingdom, further reducing generalisability of findings. Given that education systems vary internationally, the experiences of parents may differ between countries, providing an additional avenue for future research.

This study also had several strengths, including its large sample size. This was much greater than in previous SD research, enabling stronger conclusions to be made. Furthermore, this study was one of the first to formally investigate the parental experience of SD, bridging a gap within current research.

This study's concurrent embedded mixed-method design represents another strength, as this enabled us to develop a comprehensive understanding of the experiences of parents, whilst still obtaining a large sample.

Finally, the comparison with parents and CYP who have never attended school (i.e. the Lifelong EHE group) is novel and enables families with similar neurodivergent profiles as the majority of SD families to be compared. Hence, this may offer a more appropriate control group than the No SD group (as there is a comparative under-representation of neurodivergent children, young people and parents in this group relative to the SD groups). Unfortunately, the EHE group was the smallest of all four groups recruited here.

Conclusions

To our knowledge, this is the first study of this scale to explore the familial experience of SD. Findings revealed that parenting and supporting a child with SD is an overwhelmingly negative experience for parents, with parental blame and hostile and punitive treatment from the professionals surrounding the family compounding this experience. The responses in this study also revealed that those experiencing SD from the perspective of a parent perceive this experience as being one of the most threatening possible life events, superseding even a serious illness or injury to themselves. Moreover, this study documents for the first time the extent of the deleterious impact that parenting a child with SD has on all aspects of parents' lives, not least on the parents' own mental and physical health, their careers, their financial situation, and their wider family (including their other children). Urgent recognition of the most common antecedent of SD (i.e. unmet need at school often stemming from complex neurodevelopmental profiles (1)), alongside recognition of the daily stressors and serious threats facing these parents, is urgently required by educational, health and social care professionals, so that supportive and non-threatening relationships can be fostered with the parents of CYP experiencing SD.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We sincerely thank all the parents who generously gave up their time to take part in this research and to share their stories with us. We wish them all the very best in the future. We also thank Katherine Patterson and Eliza Hockey for their assistance with the thematic analysis, and Hannah Constable for her assistance with the manuscript preparation.

Bibliography

1. Sophie Connolly, Katherine Patterson, Eliza Hockey, and Sinéad Louise Mullally. School distress in uk school children: Characteristics and consequences. *medRxiv*, pages 2022–09, 2022.
2. David Heyne, Neville J King, Bruce J Tonge, and Howard Cooper. School refusal: Epidemiology and management. *Paediatric drugs*, 3:719–732, 2001.
3. 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.
4. Christopher A Kearney and Arva Bensaheb. School absenteeism and school refusal behavior: A review and suggestions for school-based health professionals. *Journal of school health*, 76(1):3–7, 2006.
5. Marion Blandin, A Harf, and MR Moro. Le refus scolaire anxieux au risque de l'adolescence: une étude qualitative du vécu adolescent et parental. *Neuropsychiatrie de l'Enfance et de l'Adolescence*, 66(4):194–202, 2018.
6. 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.
7. Autistic UK. Report regarding autistic school refusal/non-attendance and links to trauma, 2021.
8. Not Fine in School. School attendance difficulties: Parent survey results (including a comparison with our 2018 survey results), 2020.
9. James Mannion. Fran morgan and ellie costello on speaking up for young people who struggle to attend school, 2021.

10. Cindy Harmon-Jones, Brock Bastian, and Eddie Harmon-Jones. The discrete emotions questionnaire: A new tool for measuring state self-reported emotions. *PloS one*, 11(8): e0159915, 2016.
11. Traolach Brugha, Paul Bebbington, Christopher Tennant, and Jane Hurry. The list of threatening experiences: a subset of 12 life event categories with considerable long-term contextual threat. *Psychological medicine*, 15(1):189–194, 1985.
12. Terry S Brugha and D Cragg. The list of threatening experiences: the reliability and validity of a brief life events questionnaire. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 82(1):77–81, 1990.
13. JGM Rosmalen, EH Bos, and P De Jonge. Validation of the long-term difficulties inventory (ldi) and the list of threatening experiences (lte) as measures of stress in epidemiological population-based cohort studies. *Psychological medicine*, 42(12):2599–2608, 2012.
14. Micaela Connolly and Irvine Gersch. Experiences of parents whose children with autism spectrum disorder (asd) are starting primary school. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 32(3):245–261, 2016.
15. 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.
16. 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.
17. 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.
18. 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.
19. 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.
20. Linda J Levine and Martin A Safer. Sources of bias in memory for emotions. *Current directions in psychological science*, 11(5):169–173, 2002.
21. Mikle South and Jacqui Rodgers. Sensory, emotional and cognitive contributions to anxiety in autism spectrum disorders. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, 11:20, 2017.
22. 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.
23. 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.
24. 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.
25. Christelle Vernhet, Cécile Michelon, Florine Dellapiazza, Cécile Rattaz, Marie-Maude Geoffray, Herbert Roeyers, Marie-Christine Picot, and Amaria Baghdadli. Perceptions of parents of the impact of autism spectrum disorder on their quality of life and correlates: comparison between mothers and fathers. *Quality of Life Research*, 31(5):1499–1508, 2022.

Supplementary Note 1: Action Taken Against Parents - Qualitative Analysis

Example Quotes For Each Theme

Theme 1 - Pressure and Threat From School:

"Constant pressure from school"

"I was threatened with fines/court orders"

"Threatened with fine and threatened with social services"

"Threatened with legal action and fine"

"Threats of safeguarding referral"

Theme 2 - Accusations/Accusatory Response:

"Have been suspected of fii by GP"

"No legal/official action but verbally implied I was making it up during a meeting with a head teacher"

"Told my anxiety causes child's anxiety ie FII"

"Not yet but have been asked to provide proof of illness"

"Suggestion of FII but no formal accusation"

"Parental blame"

Theme 3 - Enforced Action:

"Parenting course, lots of meetings"

"Prosecution started, but dropped when I contested it"

"teachers showing up at my door to "take control""

"I have been told I have to attend a formal interview under caution"

"I got taken to court for my sons attendance"

Theme 4 - Traumatic Experiences

"Attendance team visit to house...Didn't have a problem with using physical force on a disabled child to get them to attend school"

"I had son removed as SS did not believe that I was trying to get him into school"

Theme 5 - "Living in Fear:

"No action taken, however I am living in fear of this"

"Not yet but it worries me that I will in the future"

"Not yet, but it's coming"

Theme 6 - Bullying and Cruel Behaviour

"I was called into a meeting and made to feel very small, lectured a lot. They then called my daughter in went through it all again upset her"

"Primary school Head teacher used bullying tactics on us as parents and on my child."

"School did everything they could to get rid of my child."

"Malicious safeguarding referral"

"No formal supervision order but punitive regime of daily phone calls to justify absence imposed by Ed Welfare Officer and attempts to impose home school behaviour contracts"

Theme 7 - Local Services/Agencies

"County attendance officer involvement and several meetings etc"

"Attendance meetings with local attendance officer from local authority"

"EWO was involved and I was at risk of being taken to court"

"Referred to social work and young people's attendance service"

"Safeguarding referral to children's service"

"School contacted MASH for Child in Need assessment and issued many letters about attendance"

"Social services family risk assessment"

Theme 8 - Lack of Interest

"No this does not apply at private school, they just don't care less you are not there, as long as you keep paying fees!

Theme 9 - Supportive/Protective Actions

"Court action threatened but protected by headteacher"

"NB. Only no problems as doctor and fought our corner"

"Having a gp and therapist backing me was absolutely crucial as they diagnosed my gs with ptsd, insomnia, anxiety and ocd"

"I've had school try to enforce attendance, but I countered this by providing a Doctor's letter…"

"Had to provide a GP letter about child's severe mental health crisis before they backed off."

"I got taken to court for my sons attendance but eventually they dropped the charges after lots of fighting with the help of a solicitor."