



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

Access to Electronic Thesis

Author: Kate Warham
Thesis title: Engaging with two young people who are looked after in local authority care and who have experienced exclusion from school: co-constructing narratives.
Qualification: DEdCPsy

This electronic thesis is protected by the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. No reproduction is permitted without consent of the author. It is also protected by the Creative Commons Licence allowing Attributions-Non-commercial-No derivatives.

This thesis was embargoed until 30 August 2012.

If this electronic thesis has been edited by the author it will be indicated as such on the title page and in the text.

Abstract

The aim of this research was to explore narratives co-constructed with two young people who were looked after in local authority care and who had experienced school exclusion. Dominant narratives within the research literature surrounding looked after children were identified as those of underachievement, social exclusion and disadvantage. Statistically, school exclusion is one measure in which looked after children are over-represented and previous research has developed our understanding of the processes by which looked after young people come to be excluded from school. By co-constructing and exploring rich and detailed narratives, this study extends and contributes to previous research through developing an insight into the complexities of these two care-experienced young people's stories.

Adopting a social constructionist approach, I used narrative interviewing to facilitate the co-construction of narratives with two participants. These were reflected upon and analysed by adapting Emerson and Frosh's (2009) development of Gee's (1991) micro and macro and analytic tools to privilege participants' meanings within a thematic analysis. This enabled me to explore our co-constructed narratives and how the young people were positioned within these. I discussed how I interpreted their stories to both construct narratives which dominate the research literature, and to resist these and construct contradictions and counter-narratives. I acknowledge that I had a powerful influence within the research process, both through the design and implementation of the research and through my interpretations of the narratives.

I concluded the thesis by discussing the implications of this study for my practice and the educational psychology profession, specifically that a narrative approach has much to offer the practising psychologist.

Contents

Introduction	5
Chapter 1: Literature Review	7
Introduction	7
Terminology.....	7
Demographics.....	8
Predominant discourses	9
Poor attainment and life chances	9
Explanations constructed for the current situation.....	11
Resilience	14
Children’s voices	15
School exclusion.....	17
Conclusion.....	24
Chapter 2: Methodology	26
Overview	26
Epistemological position	26
Narrative	27
Narrative research	28
Why a narrative methodology?	31
Small Scale Study	33
Pilot	33
Co-construction: generating narrative data	35
Ethical considerations	40
Power	42
Therapeutic Possibilities through Narrative	43
Critical reflexivity	44

Evaluation	45
Chapter 3: Specific Procedures	48
Approaching and Selecting Potential Participants.....	48
The Participants	51
Meetings	51
Analysis	52
Chapter 4: Interpretation and discussion.....	57
Zacharay’s Story	57
Jimbo’s Story	83
Chapter 5: Further discussion and conclusions	103
Overview	103
Beyond Categorisation.....	103
Narrative Resonances	104
Cautions	113
Future possibilities	115
Implications for my practice	116
Implications for the profession	118
References	121
Appendices	125
Appendix I: Information letters and consent forms for participants.....	132
Appendix II: Prompts for first narrative interviews	137
Appendix III: School History Grids.....	138
Appendix IV: Transcripts and Analysis	140
Transcript 1: Analysis of First interview with Zacharay	141
Transcript 2: Analysis of Second interview with Zacharay.....	191
Transcript 3: Analysis of first interview with Jimbo	217

Transcript 4: Analysis of second interview with Jimbo.....	249
Appendix V: Feedback interview raw transcript.....	255
Appendix VI: Examples of my 'raw' working to trace themes through the narratives	260

Introduction

We cannot rid ourselves of the cultural self that we bring with us to the field anymore than we can disown the eyes, ears and skin through which we take in our interactive perceptions about the new and strange world we have entered.

Scheper-Hughes, 1992, p.28.

It is essential to acknowledge the history which I have brought to this research to help me to illuminate my position and motives within it (Pomerantz, 2007; Wellington, 2000). My interest in looked after children has been ongoing throughout my lifetime, starting almost as a family legacy. My grandfather was raised in a Barnardo's children's home and although as a child I knew of this fact, his history and life experiences were almost hidden and whispered about. As a child, I found it difficult to imagine what his childhood had been like and felt scared by the thought of being parentless. As a young adult, and after my grandparents had died, my family and I investigated his early life further, finding siblings whom he had never talked about and perhaps had not known about. Reading the sparse notes, logs and information provided to us by Barnardo's left me with a sense of sadness; from the bare fact of him leaving care alone at 15 years old to the very real feeling that his story had never been told. I could only imagine and impose my own constructions as to how he would tell his story.

In my professional life, I have worked as a primary teacher and a designated teacher for looked after children. From there I moved to work as a specialist teacher for a local authority's looked after children education support team and I sensed that there was an injustice in their situation. I met many children behind the authority's statistics of low attainment and again felt that their voices, stories, successes and strengths were missed. Now, as a trainee educational psychologist I continue to meet looked after children whose lives and futures are influenced by the ways that professionals talk about and make decisions for them.

Article 12 of the UN Convention on the rights of the child (UNICEF 1989), sets out the right of the child to have their views sought and taken seriously in all matters regarding their welfare. As educational psychologists we need to consider how we can best accomplish this (Burden, 1997). Billington (2006) suggests that professionals need to develop working practices which enable us to engage with children and young people and allow their voices to be heard. He identifies narrative as an approach that provides them with space to find ways of thinking and feeling about their experiences. Narrative work can resist dominant modes of working, characterised by notions of adults being the experts, and alter the nature of the relationships that we develop with our clients. Through my educational psychology training I have sought to find more equal, respectful, and emancipatory ways of working with my clients and hope to move away from recapitulating more oppressive professional encounters that they may have experienced. As a framework to guide our work, Billington has set out five reflective questions:

How do we speak of children?

How do we speak with children?

How do we write of children?

How do we listen to children?

How do we listen to ourselves (when working with children)?

(Billington, 2006, p.8).

I hoped that by taking a narrative approach to co-constructing and exploring two young people's stories I would be able to reflect on an approach that would enable me to be ethically satisfied with my answers to these questions within my work as a psychologist. Through my research I have attempted to explore and elevate stories that two looked after young people constructed with me as we worked as co-researchers (May, 2005). I hope this thesis, which documents my journey, will both provide an insight into Zacharay's and Jimbo's stories and explore how this narrative technique may inform our work as educational psychologists.

Chapter 1: Literature Review

Introduction

Educational psychologists work with schools, communities, multi-agency teams, on individual casework and develop areas of specialist interest and research. Looked after children are over represented within the special needs system (Jackson & McParlin 2006; Martin & Jackson 2002) and more educational psychology services are employing psychologists within their service who develop a specialist interest in, or responsibility for, looked after children (Bradbury, 2006). This highlights that this group of children and young people are a priority for many educational psychology services. Through our work, it is likely that all educational psychologists, regardless of any specialism, will encounter and need to support looked after children or professional networks working with them. Therefore, research which helps to develop the profession's understanding of aspects of looked after children's educational experience is likely to be advantageous. In addition, this research may help to illuminate a process by which we can respectfully elicit and highlight the voice of the child whom we work with.

Within this literature review I will explore the terminology around children in care and the current reported demographics of these young people. I will consider the predominant narratives arising within the published literature such as those of poor attainment and life chances, resilience and children's voices before focussing on exclusion. Finally, I will discuss the contribution that I hope to make to this growing body of research and my research questions.

Terminology

The term 'looked-after' was introduced by the 1989 Children Act (Office of Public Sector Information, 2009) and refers to children who are subject to a care order (placed in the care of the local authority by order of court) and those who are accommodated by a voluntary agreement with their parents (under section 20 of the Children Act). There are a number of different ways through which a child or

young person may enter into the care of the local authority, these include: a young person (under the age of 16) requesting to be taken into local authority care, parents requesting that the local authority accommodate their child, a court decision to place a young person (perceived to be a significant risk in their home circumstances) in local authority care or a voluntary agreement between parents and the local authority without a care order (Haydon, 2003).

Within the published literature, children looked after by the local authority are referred to by a number of interchangeable terms such as children in care, looked after children and care experienced young people. Within this study I will refer to looked after children and young people (LACYP).

Demographics

The care population could be described as fluid and, for some, transient; children enter the care system at different ages and remain in care for differing periods of time. Almost 40% of children entering the care system will return home within eight weeks, more than half will do so within six months and 70% of children will return home within a year (Richardson & Lelliott, 2003).

The British Association of Adoption and Fostering (BAAF) (2010) reports that on the 31st March 2010 there were 64,400 children in the care of local authorities, of these, 56% were boys and 44% were girls. Children of all age groups were being looked after by local authorities, with the greatest percentage being those aged between 10 and 15 years old (39%). In terms of placements, BAAF (2010) reports that 73% of children looked after on the 31st March 2009 were living with foster carers, 10% were living in children's homes (including children's homes, secure units and hostels), 6% were living with their parents, 4% were placed for adoption and 4% were placed in residential schools or other residential settings. These published statistics represent the types of placements that children and young people in local authority care may experience.

Corporate Parenting Role

The Government developed the role of 'corporate parent' in 1996 to safeguard children cared for by the local authority and to ensure that these children receive the same standard of care as other children receive from good parents. It required local authorities to consider holistically the multiple aspects of a child's life, such as education, care, leisure, friendships and future planning. (Bradbury, 2006). Later guidance, 'The Education of young people in public care' (DfEE/DoH, 2000), describes expected aspects of this parenting. It falls to all of the individuals employed by the local authority to carry out the role and share the responsibility of parenting, and thus requires agents to work closely together and communicate well for the best outcomes for their children.

Predominant discourses

Research relating to the educational outcomes of LACYP has been increasing since the late 1980s. Government publications, policies and legislation relating to the educational achievement of LACYP have developed rapidly over the last decade and recently have become more integrated within policies relating to children and families. For example, the 'enjoy and achieve' outcome (one of the five outcomes for all children defined within the Children Act, DCSF 2004) incorporates improving the educational outcomes for LACYP (Brodie, 2010). Statutory guidance for local authorities relating to how they meet their duty to promote the educational achievements of LACYP was published in 2005 and reissued in 2010 (DCSF, 2010).

I have outlined below the narratives which I perceive to dominate the published research literature surrounding LACYP.

Poor attainment and life chances

...an unsatisfactory state of affairs for people.

Fletcher-Campbell, 1998, p.4.

A dominant narrative surrounding LACYP centres upon underachievement, disadvantage and social exclusion. Research and published statistics consistently

position LACYP as having limited life chances in comparison to their non-looked after peers. Peake (2006) has described LACYP as forming 'one of the most disadvantaged groups in society' (p.120). In comparison with children in the general population, statistical research suggests that LACYP are four times more likely to suffer from a mental health problem, are 13 times more likely to receive a statement of special educational need, and are more likely to be without a school place for extended periods of time (Martin & Jackson, 2002). They are ten times more likely to be excluded from school and up to 30% are out of mainstream school because of truancy or exclusion (DCSF 2009; Dearden, 2004).

In Francis' (2000) review of four decades of research in this area it was concluded that despite greater understanding and a number of government initiatives aimed at addressing the problem of attainment:

...children who are currently being looked after suffer the same disadvantages as their predecessors.

Francis, 2000, p.25.

Francis' assertion could still be construed as relevant today. The government Department for Children, Schools and Families (now the Department of Education) has identified, and annually publishes, statistics relating to a number of defined national indicators for looked after children. These indicate that in 2008 46% of LACYP achieved level four in English and 44% achieved level four in maths at Key Stage 2 compared to 81% and 79% of their non-looked after peers respectively. In year 11, 13.9% of LACYP obtained at least five GCSEs (or equivalent) at grades A*-C compared to 65.3% of the non-looked after population (DCSF, 2009). These such indications of difference and disadvantage continue into later life and care leavers are reported as more likely to be unemployed, to become homeless, and to be placed in treatment centres and custodial institutions. They are more likely to suffer from mental health problems, eating disorders and to engage in health-threatening behaviour such as smoking and misusing drugs or alcohol, and to do so at an earlier age and in greater quantities than their non-looked after peers (Golding et al 2006;

Jackson, 2002). Looked after young women have been found to be over represented amongst young mothers and one study found that 25% of looked after young women became pregnant under the age of sixteen in comparison with 3% of the general population and that a further 50% went on to become mothers by the age of eighteen, compared with 5% of their non-looked after peers (Biehal et al, 1992).

Such statistics provide snap-shot, end point measures, they do not tell us where that child began, what progress they have made over a period of time nor anything about the complexities of their experience. Taking a statistical approach could be seen to be a reductionist way of considering the situation, one which paints a problem-saturated picture of failure for LACYP and provides us with a thin description of their lives:

Thin description allows little space for the complexities and contradictions of life. It allows little space for people to articulate their own particular meanings of their actions and the context within which they occurred.

Morgan, 2000, p.12.

LACYP are not a homogenous group, each child will have a different experience within the care system and construct different meanings around their experiences. It is therefore essential that we do not gloss over the uniqueness and complexities of individual lives (Brodie, 2010; Stake, 2008).

Explanations constructed for the current situation

Explanations proposed within the research literature consider a range of interrelated factors as contributing to the current reported low achievement of LACYP. These include: pre-care experiences, societal, structural and professional factors.

Some authors have highlighted adverse pre-care experiences such as social deprivation, poverty, neglect and abuse and the value that birth parents have placed on education (Francis, 2000; Harker et al, 2003). However, others argue that it is the care system itself which is at fault:

...young people are being unnecessarily and unacceptably (on a number of criteria) disadvantaged by the welfare system itself, the welfare system having intervened in order to try and stem the flow of perceived disadvantage arising within the young person's domestic situation...

Fletcher-Campbell, 1998, p.4.

Structural factors within the care system which have been identified and proposed as having a negative impact upon LACYP have included: unstable care placements, frequent school moves, considerable time spent out of school, insufficient planning and a delay in making and implementing decisions (Fletcher-Campbell, 1998; Thomas & O'Kane, 1999). Difficulties related to interagency working such as poor communication, a lack of role and responsibility clarity and fragmentation of information about the child (Fletcher-Campbell, 1998; Harker et al, 2004) have been constructed as contributory factors. The number of professional adults sharing decisions within children's lives, some of whom described as 'relative strangers to the child', has also been raised (Thomas & O'Kane, 1999, p.221). This is an issue I can identify with, as when working as one of only two specialist teachers for LACYP within a large local authority, I was often invited to and attended reviews for children whom I barely knew. I would reflect on the potential unease that the child may feel with numerous unfamiliar professionals sitting around the table attempting to discuss their future with them.

Authors have also suggested that schools, carers and social workers do not receive adequate training and guidance to support their working relationships, and that school staff need a deeper understanding of the care system and children's experiences within it (Fletcher-Campbell, 1998). Indeed, conversations that I have had with educational psychologists within the service that I work in have often reflected the feeling that their role is often to facilitate and support these relationships.

Additional detrimental factors which have been raised include professionals' failure to pay attention to and prioritise education (Hayden, 2005), professionals' low expectations for the learning and behaviour of LACYP (Edwards & Sweeney, 2007),

insufficient educational resources in children's homes (Francis, 2000), inadequate social support and high levels of bullying in school (Buchanan, 1995; Dearden, 2004).

Attachment Theory

Attachment theory proposes that children are biologically predisposed to form attachment relationships that enable them to experience security and comfort (Bowlby, 1969, 1988). The infant develops a range of attachment behaviours in order to keep their carer close, to act as a secure base. Attachment behaviours are triggered by alarming conditions in the environment or threats of physical separation or rejection. When the child is feeling safe, attachment behaviours are replaced by explorative behaviours. Bowlby suggested that these early attachment relationship experiences lead to the development of cognitive models of these relationships which influence and are modified by future relationships. Secure attachments enable children to develop self-reliance in themselves and trust in others. When an attachment figure is insensitive, neglecting or rejecting an insecure attachment can develop and the child may maximise (ambivalent-resistant attachment) or minimise (avoidant attachment) attachment behaviour (Ainsworth et al. 1978). If care givers are frightening to the child, a disorganised attachment relationship can develop, where the child is unable to organise her behaviour at times of stress to elicit emotional support (Main & Soloman, 1986). Later on, the older child can become self-reliant and take control of relationships because they do not trust their carer. Highly organised but controlling ways of interacting that build upon early patterns of avoidant or ambivalent relating can develop.

Attachment theory emphasises the importance of continuity and sensitive responsiveness in the care giving relationships as key features of the child's early environment (Rutter & O'Connor, 1999). This has implications for LACYP who have experienced loss or separation from their biological parents; they may not have experienced sensitive responsive parenting early in their lives and may have had multiple care placements after separation from their family (Golding, 2006).

Resilience

The psychological concept of resilience refers to overcoming stress or adversity and is used to describe relative resistance to psychosocial risk experiences (Rutter, 1999). Research has identified three types of factors which influence the development of resilience: within-child factors, within-home factors and outside-home factors (Fonagy et al, 1994). These protective factors which operate at multiple levels within children's lives are seen to interact together, mediating how children cope with threatening or adverse circumstances. Resilience is conceptualised as a dynamic process that can change over time and situations within a child's life, suggesting that children and young people's ability to survive and develop within adversity can be positively enhanced.

Children often come into care after experiencing a number of difficult life experiences such as neglect or abuse which professionals working with LACYP have not been able to control or change. The psychological concept of resilience which looks at how protective factors can help individuals overcome adversity has been argued to be a useful framework to consider when working with LACYP (Gilligan 2001). Studies adopting a resilience-based approach have sought to identify protective factors which support LACYP to overcome negative experiences and to make a success of their lives. Such identified protective factors include: a parent or carer who values education, a supportive teacher, regular school attendance, a valuing school, stability and continuity, friends outside of the care system who did well at school, developing interests beyond school and the care system, and a mentoring relationship with a significant adult offering consistent support and encouragement (Dent & Cameron 2003; Gilligan 1999; Jackson & Martin, 1998).

These narratives within resiliency-led research could be construed as more positive and hopeful, resisting dominant pessimistic narratives.

Children's voices

A number of researchers have consulted LACYP about their experiences in care. Harker et al (2003) interviewed 80 children and young people, aged between 10 and 18 years old, who lived in foster and residential care placements about their educational experiences. These children reported high levels of exclusions and spoke about how their care placement changes had resulted in unwelcome school changes, separation from friends and had affected their ability to concentrate and to complete homework. Some young people spoke about feeling that no-one had taken an interest in their school work and that teachers lacked an understanding of the care system and viewed them negatively because of their care status. They were asked what they thought might support better educational progress of LACYP. Common responses included: having an individual in children's lives showing an interest in their education, quiet study spaces and educational resources at home, improving the quality and quantity of educational provision, improving teachers' and peers' understanding of the care system, and raising social workers' awareness of educational issues. The young people who were interviewed felt that all children within the care system should be treated as individuals and be consulted about their views and wishes.

As part of a service review in a local authority, Dearden (2004) interviewed 15 care-experienced young people about what they had found to be helpful or unhelpful at key moments in their lives. Dearden concluded that she felt that the young people she interviewed wanted and needed the following protective aspects in their lives: strong supportive friendships and, if necessary, help to make friends, professionals to listen and respond quickly to bullying or abuse at home and school, to be encouraged and supported to become involved in the social life of their school, stable placements, educational facilities at home and good communication between home and school.

Martin and Jackson (2002) interviewed 38 high achieving, care-experienced, young people about what had helped them succeed in school and about their opinions on

how best to improve educational experiences for LACYP. Emerging themes that Martin and Jackson identified included the importance of having a 'normal' experience at school without being singled out as different to their peers. The importance of foster carers, residential workers, social workers and teachers holding high expectations and providing support and encouragement for academic achievement was acknowledged and young people felt that some professionals held negative stereotypes which need to be overcome. The need for educational facilities at home such as books, a desk and quiet workspace were talked about as was the importance of attending the same supportive school regularly and active communication between different professionals involved in their lives. These young people also valued opportunities to develop interests and hobbies away from the care system, relationships with valued mentors and supportive social networks.

These studies exploring care-experienced children and young peoples' views and opinions help to provide thick descriptions (Geertz, 1973) of young peoples' experiences, thoughts and feelings. These in turn both deepen our understanding beyond reported statistics, and acknowledge that people's lives cannot be reduced to simplistic interpretations. Indeed, Brodie (2010) asserts that because individual young people's views differ it is essential that we talk and listen directly with each young person rather than making generalisations.

Holland (2009) reviewed the methodological and theoretical approaches adopted by researchers in 44 studies between 2003 and 2008 which were attempting to understand looked after children's perspectives. Holland suggested that:

...this field is developing a rich body of evidence derived from a broad range of methodological and theoretical frameworks

Holland, 2009, p.226.

These reviewed studies originated from ten nations, utilised a range of research methods, and were concerned both with children's general experiences of the care system and more specific aspects, such as advocacy, contact with relatives, mental health services and education. Methods included surveys, qualitative interviewing,

standard measures, focus groups, family sculpting, ethnography, observation and multi-modal qualitative design.

Holland (2009) identified and reported two common problematic issues arising in research; little discussion of ethical issues and not enabling young peoples' individual constructs of their experience to emerge. Brodie's (2010) review of research with LACYP highlighted both the need for research designs to encompass a wider range of methodologies and the experiences of some LACYP missing from the research literature. These include LACYP who have experienced high levels of mobility or have experienced problematic educational experiences such as school exclusion or long periods of time spent out of school.

School exclusion

...a lost right or a punishment? ...Surely these children need more education not less.

Parsons, 2000, p.7.

School exclusion refers to the process in which a head teacher (or teacher in charge) either suspends a pupil from school for a specified number of days or expels a pupil permanently. These are referred to as fixed-term and permanent exclusion respectively (DCSF, 2008).

Historically, research has documented that a higher percentage of LACYP do not attend or are excluded from school than are their non-looked after peers. For example in 1994, The Audit Commission reported that 40 percent of LACYP were not in school for reasons other than illness. A joint report by the Department of Health Social Services Inspectorate and OFSTED found that at least 25% of looked after 14 to 16-year-olds in their sample were out of school, 'many [of whom had] been excluded and have no regular educational placement' (SSI & OFSTED 1995, p.43). Current statistics for the levels of exclusion indicate that LACYP are ten times more likely to receive a permanent exclusion than are their non-looked after peers (DCSF, 2009). Barn et al (2005) report that for LACYP, exclusion rates are higher for

boys and for white, mixed parentage and Caribbean young people than those of any other ethnicity.

Studies of residential care have reflected the above statistical findings. One study reported that one in five young people resident in children's homes in Strathclyde were not registered at any school, employment or college and that nearly 40% of these young people were absent from school on the day of their survey (Borland et al, 1998). In a study of residential care in three local authorities, Berridge and Brodie (1998) described how only three of 21 adolescences of school age who were living in residential care were attending school regularly and suggested that in most of the homes that they studied exclusion appeared to be viewed as an inevitable way of life. They argued that exclusion and non-attendance in school was a complex issue and that many of the LACYP in their study had been experiencing school problems (including non-attendance and exclusion) prior to entry to the residential establishments. It was also suggested that staff often lacked information about schooling and exclusion and were therefore unable to effectively challenge the school exclusions experienced by the LACYP in their care.

When considering school exclusion rates, Vulliamy and Webb (2000) draw our attention to the need to view these as socially constructed. They suggest that official exclusion statistics provided by local authorities and schools underestimate the actual numbers of pupils excluded from school and argue that:

The practice of 'unofficial' exclusions and 'cooling-off days' has been widely documented ... viewing schools' permanent exclusion rates as a social construction alerts us also to the fact that the same behaviour in the form of the forced removal of a pupil from a school may or may not count towards the school's 'permanent exclusion rate'.

Vulliamy and Webb, 2000, p.123-124.

Illustrating this issue, one study of LACYP living in residential homes and not attending school regularly, found that only six percent of these children had been officially recorded as excluded (Stirling, 1992).

With regards to unofficial exclusion, DCSF (2008) guidance states that if a head teacher decides that a pupil needs to be removed from school because they have committed a disciplinary offence then formal exclusion is the only legal method of removal. Informal or unofficial exclusions are illegal regardless of whether they are done with the agreement of parents or carers, thus if pupils are sent home for any period of time this must be formally recorded as an exclusion. However, researchers continue to find that:

...accurate exclusion figures and information are notoriously difficult to obtain.

Social Exclusion Unit, 1998, p.36.

Firth and Horrocks (1996) question why LACYP experience such high exclusion levels when they have 'the weight and support of the local authority to secure their rights to equality and opportunity within the education system' (p.78) and argue that this absence of education will make a significant contribution to the 'distressing outcomes' (p.78) faced by LACYP. This view point is supported by Axford (2008) who argues that education is predictive of adult outcomes, including physical and mental health.

Through the 1988 Education Reform Act and the 1993 Education Act, Firth and Horrocks (1996) argue that schools have become competitive and consequently less motivated to support children who are having difficulties in school. They suggest that performance indicators have become a priority in schools and that trying to maximise both attendance and attainment figures conflicts with meeting the needs of 'challenging pupils who may be seen as threats to the school's performance and reputation' (Firth & Horrocks, 1996, p.81). With the result of vulnerable children becoming less likely to receive educational support and more likely to experience exclusion from school. Harris (2000) suggests that in addition to the effects of school league tables the pressures of the national curriculum have created an exclusion culture.

DCSF (2008) guidance on exclusion from schools and pupil referral units, explicitly states that LACYP are more likely to be at risk of school exclusion and outlines that:

Exclusion of looked-after children should be an absolute last resort.

DCSF, 2008, p.78.

This guidance outlines negative consequences of exclusion, in terms of strain on care placements and disruption in the child's life. It suggests that, with the support of the local authority, schools should work in partnership with other professionals to put in place strategies 'and try every practicable means to maintain them in school' (DCSF, 2008, p.78). In the case of a LACYP being excluded, this guidance suggests that schools and local authorities should arrange alternative educational provision from the first day of the exclusion and that the exclusion should not happen until suitable alternative provision has been found elsewhere.

With specific reference to the exclusion of LACYP, the Social Exclusion Unit (1998) comments that poor communication between professionals has exacerbated their situation. This is illustrated by citing studies that have reported that staff in social services are frequently unaware of the exclusion status of children in their care and of how to appeal to schools. They also write about the impact that school exclusion can have on care placements:

A new placement in a new area disrupts education through a change of school. Exclusion can add to this vicious cycle: many foster carers cannot cope with a child at a loose end all day so exclusion often triggers a breakdown in care placement.

Social Exclusion Unit, 1998, p.12.

This theme has been echoed by Christmas (1998) who reported that within her interviews, carers raised feelings of anxiety in relation to the possibility of school exclusion and the pressure that they felt it placed on placements. Carers also voiced their concerns that schools may be more likely to exclude the children in their care for parts of the day, such as lunchtimes than they would non-looked after children whose parents worked fulltime.

Brodie (2000) argued that although evidence suggests that LACYP are more likely to be excluded or not to attend school, there is a paucity of research which considers the processes through which these children become excluded and how it is managed by professionals. Brodie investigated the school exclusion of a group of 17 boys aged from 6 to 16 years old, within three local authorities, living in residential care and concluded that a more complex understanding of what constitutes exclusion needs to be developed. Eleven of these boys had experienced a previous exclusion from school and Brodie reported that boys in this study who were described as excluded by residential staff, frequently were not attending school for other reasons or had been excluded by informal processes. Brodie identified four processes through which the LACYP in their sample were excluded. These were:

- *Exclusion by non-admission:* for these young people exclusion related to not having a school place. They had arrived at their residential placements without a school place and residential staff had described difficulties persuading schools to admit them.
- *Exclusion on admission:* these young people had been officially or unofficially excluded within a few days or a few weeks of entry to a school.
- *Graduated exclusion:* for these young people exclusion had occurred by what was described as a lengthy process; professionals who were interviewed detailed attempts to prevent the exclusion. Brodie argued that this graduated exclusion process had involved young people becoming increasingly isolated from their peers and teachers.
- *Planned exclusion:* in these cases, as problems had escalated in school, professionals had made alternative plans in order to reduce the impact of the exclusion and to minimise the amount of time spent without educational provision.

Brodie argued that within their sample, there had been huge differences in professionals' understanding of the educational needs of these children and the

actions taken in different cases, suggesting that 'the educational prospects for the children concerned was therefore often a matter of chance' (Brodie, 2000, p.28). It was suggested that being a LACYP can have implications for the way in which the exclusion process unfolds and that future research within this area needs to take into account this specific context.

An example of a graduated exclusion process identified by Connelly and Chakrabarti (2008) is that of reduced timetables and curriculum subjects, they argue that:

The common assumption that looked-after children will cope better by being given a narrow and 'special' curriculum should be challenged, in favour of ensuring that learning opportunities are stimulating and rewarding

Connelly and Chakrabarti, 2008, p.356.

Certainly I can recall numerous LACYP who I have worked with, placed on part-time timetables with reduced curriculums, often focussing on English and Maths. Perhaps these young people would have found many more stimulating and rewarding learning opportunities in those parts of the wider curriculum that they were excluded from.

The United Nations Convention on the rights of the child (1989) emphasises that every child has the right to education and it has been suggested that going against this right by excluding young people from school is one of the most severe forms of exclusion. It may represent the first step of exclusion from wider society for young people who consequently spend more time away from formal institutions and receive less support and preparation for their transition to adulthood (McCrystal et al, 2007). Axford (2008) has argued that if LACYP who experience school exclusion are also experiencing exclusion or diminished activity in other spheres of activity such as in civic and community life they may become socially excluded in an even wider sense. Thus researchers and professionals must consider school-excluded children's well-being and participation in society more widely. Axford argues that taking a social exclusion perspective and considering exclusion from peer and family relations, access to social and leisure facilities, and community links alongside

exclusion from economic productive activity (school) may bring into 'sharp focus the lack of choice and control that looked after children often feel they have' (Axford, 2008, p.14) in many aspects of their lives. School exclusion may represent the tip of an exclusion iceberg experienced by many LACYP. Axford argues that if such social exclusion continues over time these children may develop a sense of having very little hope for the future.

Experiences of school exclusion

A number of studies have explored the perspectives of children and their families who have experienced exclusion from school (Cullingford, 1999; Hayden & Dunn, 2000; Kinder et al, 1997; Munn et al, 2000; Parsons et al, 1996; Pomeroy, 2000). Some of these have reported similar emerging themes, such as Hilton (2006) who sought to offer an alternative perspective on exclusion than that provided by statistics by interviewing 40 young people about their exclusion experiences. Hilton reported that a number of themes around pupil difficulties arose in her interviews:

These pupil difficulties could be summarised under three key themes: difficulties with the nature of school work; a perceived lack of adequate support with difficulties; and unhappy relationships within the school environment.

Hilton, 2006, p.302.

When writing about the exclusion of pupils identified as having social, emotional and behavioural difficulties, Hamill and Boyd (2002) assert that these pupils are rarely involved in the decision-making processes in their lives and that this is particularly the case when decisions are made to exclude them from school. The young people interviewed in their study said that they felt that their views were often disregarded by their school.

These studies offer an insight into how young people talk about their experiences of exclusion and also into school processes (Pomeroy, 2000) and 'how the social reality called education exists in the real world' (Garner, 1996, p.189).

Discourse positioning young people at risk of exclusion

Within any discourse language can be considered to be a form of social practice: the language we use creates a social reality.

Watson, 2005, p.55.

Other literature around school exclusion focuses upon how language can position children and young people as deviant or as unable to be included within educational systems. Watson (2005) studied an editorial in the Scottish Education Journal and argued that one outcome of educational discourse of inclusion has been a focus of attention on those who cannot be included, positioning these individuals as 'deviant'.

Turner and Waterhouse (2003) carried out a small-scale research project looking at the attempts of two Scottish secondary schools to reduce exclusions. They wrote about observing a more inclusive school culture within these schools and commented that this was in part created by the language used by teachers:

The inclusiveness of school cultures was noted in the teachers' discourse. They frequently used inclusive phrases, always in the present tense, such as 'keeping him in class' or 'helping him to keep out of trouble'

Turner and Waterhouse, 2003, p.27.

Turner and Waterhouse felt that teachers within these schools avoided negative labelling and making comparisons between children, and had therefore moved away from notions of deviance and normality.

Conclusion

Pomerantz (2007) asserts that the way that we talk about others sets up and influences possible ways of being and that it is through these 'expectations existing in the social system in which we live (that) we become who we are' (p.16). I have outlined the narratives which I perceive to dominate the literature surrounding LACYP and wonder how far these might influence the narratives that young people, categorised as LACYP, create with researchers.

The literature published about LACYP's attainment and life chances continues to be dominated by narratives of underachievement, social exclusion and disadvantage. Previous studies have sought to construct explanations for this and others have explored LACYP's views on their experiences and how they feel the situation can be improved for others. However, there is a need for research to allow young people to define what concepts mean to them (Holland, 2009) and to address the omission of the voices of LACYP who have experienced mobility or educational difficulties such as school exclusion (Brodie, 2000; Brodie, 2010). I hope to develop and contribute to this area of research by working with LACYP who have experienced exclusion from school in such a way as to enable their voices to be heard. I have felt that the published statistics and dominant narratives omit young people's individuality and their personal contexts:

...people are never only (not even a close approximation to) a particular set of isolated theoretical notions, categories or terms...They are people living storied lives in storied landscapes.

Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p.145.

It is my intention to address this through my research and to explore and elevate stories that LACYP who have experienced school exclusion co-construct with myself in order to explore the following research questions:

- What narratives are developed within stories co-constructed between the young people and myself?
- How are these young people positioned within the narratives?
- Do these stories challenge dominant constructions about LACYP?

Chapter 2: Methodology

Overview

Within this chapter I set out my epistemological position within this research, briefly review narrative and narrative research and discuss my choice in selecting a narrative methodological approach. Following this, I will outline my rationale for carrying out a small scale-study and detail my pilot study. Open interviews are considered as are ethical considerations, notions of power, possible therapeutic effects and critical reflexivity. Notions of evaluating narrative research are then discussed.

Epistemological position

Social constructionism

The theoretical perspective which has influenced my research and guided the choices that I have made throughout its conceptualisation and development is that of social constructionism. This posits that reality and knowledge are socially constructed within a context and both mediated by, and situated in, history, culture and language (Burr, 1995). Through these differing mediated interpretations, people actively construct multiple knowledges and realities of an experience rather than a single, universal truth which can be discovered (Willig, 2008). It therefore follows that research cannot be fully objective, and I am aware that the choices and interpretations that I have made throughout the process of my research have been influenced by my beliefs, understandings and personal history. I acknowledge that readers may construct different, alternative interpretations.

My research fits with this perspective of social constructionism, because it was my aim to move away from traditional empirical research which measures and categorises individuals (Emerson & Frosh, 2009) to providing insight and understanding into the narratives told within my work with two young people. By focussing upon our jointly-constructed narratives I remove the focus from the

individual as the object of study and acknowledge the social aspect of the construction of knowledge, meaning and power (Emerson & Frosh, 2009). This in turn, emphasises that I cannot generalise to other situations or make claims to have found any objective truths.

It was important for me to select a qualitative method that would be able to give voice. I was interested in the individual voices behind the broad and often statistical narratives published about LACYP. I wanted to explore the narratives constructed between young people and myself and whether they offered possibilities for alternative realities away from the dominant societal narratives (White & Epston, 1990) that are widely published about LACYP.

Narrative

Riessman (2008) argues that the narrative impulse is universal, present in every place, society and age. Bruner (1986) has proposed that narrative understanding is a basic mode of cognitive functioning, suggesting that narratives structure perception and experience and organise memory. Hiles and Cermak (2008) suggest that narrative is essential to the meaning-making process through which events and actions can be understood. Events themselves are not presented as stories, but the experience of an event becomes a story as it is shaped, ordered and given meaning. Narratives offer a way of understanding one's own and others' actions, organising events into a meaningful whole and of connecting events and consequences over time (Polkinghorne, 1988). Narratives can be multiple, and several narratives can give meaning to the same event. Individuals may use narratives to remember, argue, justify, persuade, engage, or entertain. Such storytelling can engage an audience in the experience of the narrator and in doing so narratives create experiences for their audience. Through this narrative process, speakers construct events into a story which is both socially situated and interactive (Chase, 2007). Stories are social, involving speakers as well as listeners and in this way narratives are shaped by the social world of the listener as the narrative is constructed through the interaction (Elliott, 2005). Squire (2009) suggests that even when

stories are told by and to yourself, you are speaking as a social being to an imagined other who understands your story. Individuals are part of many social worlds and in turn may re-author their stories depending on the context. It is therefore essential to consider narratives within their specific social, historical and cultural context. Elliott (2005) argues that narratives are also shaped through available cultural repertoires of stories, which frame and structure individuals' narratives. These narrative frameworks may be more or less restrictive, and in certain contexts narratives are expected to follow a typical pattern such as within the formal setting of a medical consultation. This links with the work of Foucault on the institutional settings that contribute to the shaping of the modern regulated self (Foucault, 1990). Elliot suggests that cultural narratives may provide guidelines, which influence stories, but they cannot determine the content of each individual's actively constructed narrative. Public narratives may be maintained and remain stable over time. However, they also have capacity to change; the interplay between these existing public cultural narratives and new individual narratives can create alternative possibilities. Riessman (2008) details how stories can create social change, such as through resistant feminist movements.

Much is written about the role of narrative in the construction, maintenance and renegotiation of self-identity through the stories that people tell both themselves and others about who they are (Elliott, 2005; Hiles & Cermak, 2008; Riessman, 2008). Riessman argues that individuals will revise and edit their memories of the past to fit with their identities in the present. Polkinghorne (1988) posits that identity includes both a self-narrative of an individual's past, and the construction of a projected, unfinished future story.

Narrative research

Although the 'narrative turn' in psychology is relatively recent, there is a long history of psychology's interest in story. Hiles and Cermak (2008) map the history of narrative research from the study of personality, biography, lifespan development and case study from Stern in 1910 and from Allport, Murray and Dollard in the

1930s. Narrative was seen as central by followers of the psychodynamic perspectives, from Freud, Adler and Jung to more recent psychoanalytic practice concerned with personal truths. Within this practice personal narratives are constructed which offer a way to construct meaning from the messiness of lived experience. Hiles and Cermak (2008) argue that the paradigmatic breakthrough of the 'narrative turn' in psychology took place in the 1980s, although Riessman (2008) dates this to the 1960s. Riessman suggests this paradigm shift was fuelled by critiques within social science of positivist modes of enquiry; an increase of memoir literature; identity movements of marginalised groups; and an increasing therapeutic culture. In addition, technological developments in recording technologies made detailed studies of speech possible.

This narrative turn had social constructionist foundations and offered a model of contextualism, recognising that stories do not occur in isolation (Gergen, 2001). It moved research away from investigator-controlled practices (Riessman, 2008). This shift was cross-disciplinary (Riessman, 2008) and the analytic study of narrative can be found within history, anthropology, psychology, social linguistics, sociology, medicine and law for example.

Within psychology, qualitative research methods have become more influential representing a major shift away from traditional empirical science (Emerson & Frosh, 2009). Researchers have moved away from a representational understanding of language towards a constructionist one which advocates that experience is produced in language. This has resulted in a focus within psychological research upon gathering and analysing discursive forms, such as narratives in talk and text. Through narrative analysis, one is able to remain open to social processes that are present in the construction of personal narratives. This methodological approach embraces contradictions and multiple possibilities within narratives and seeks rich description rather than coherence or reducing a story into a single category (White & Epston, 1990).

Elliott (2005) suggests that by embracing narrative research, researchers are able to develop a deeper understanding of their research subjects' perspectives and life-worlds. Through telling their experiences in a story form, individuals reflect on their experiences to select aspects they perceive to be important and order them into a coherent whole. Through this process of reflection, telling stories becomes 'a meaning making activity' (Elliott, 2005, p.24) and narratives therefore give meaning to experience. Although this methodology can give voice to some of the most marginalised people in society, Elliott cautions us that it can also be oppressive through telling stories that draw on culturally available narratives which express broad social structures of power and inequality. However, narratives may also open up other possibilities, such as counter-hegemonic narratives that challenge rather than maintain power differentials in society.

From my review of the literature, it has become clear to me that narrative methodology is diverse and wide ranging. Narrative has been applied in psychological studies of identity, health and illness, medical practice and therapy (Hiles & Cermak, 2008). Theoretical perspectives differ between those who assume that narratives are co-constructed through conversations and those assuming that narratives give external representation to internal representations of phenomena such as events, thoughts and feelings (Squire, 2009). Approaches to narrative analysis include: thematic analysis which focus on *what* is spoken; structural forms of analysis which examine *how* the narrative is told and performative analysis which considers how talk among speakers is *interactively* produced and performed as narrative (Riessman, 2008).

Authors differ in opinion regarding what constitutes a narrative. Elliott (2005) stresses three key features of narrative: that they are chronological, meaningful and social. Riessman (2008) reviews diverse definitions of what the term narrative means within research and concludes:

..the term narrative in the human sciences can refer to texts at several levels that overlap: stories told by research participants (which are themselves interpretive), interpretive accounts developed by an investigator based on

interviews and fieldwork observation (a story about stories), and even the narrative a reader constructs after engaging with the participant's and investigator's narratives.

Riessman, 2008, p.6.

Despite diversity within the field of narrative research, it is a method which enables researchers to give priority to personal narrative accounts (Emerson & Frosh, 2009) and to accumulate rich detail about an individual, rather than fragmenting accounts into categories such as in grounded theory. By honouring each individual's narrative within its own context and not splitting it and pooling with others to make a general statement, particularities and individual agency and intention is retained (Riessman, 2008).

Why a narrative methodology?

I was initially drawn to a narrative methodology because I felt that it offered me an approach that recognised the complexity of life, without trying to reduce it. This links research with practice to me; I feel that part of my role as a psychologist is to highlight the complexities, contradictions and messiness of lives and situations offering multiple possibilities rather than reducing lives down to a single issue. Similarly, I did not want to fragment lives by taking them apart and categorising them along with others. I felt that narrative analysis was an approach which respects participants' stories and could contribute to developing an understanding in their own words from their own points of view, whilst acknowledging my role in co-constructing these stories. The theoretical basis of narrative methodology acknowledges the social nature of narratives. In addition, I wanted to be able to give voice to the young people participating in this study and it has been suggested that narrative approaches provide children and young people with space to find ways of thinking and feeling about their experiences (Billington, 2006).

Although I could have selected other qualitative methodologies such as Discourse Analysis or Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) which can both incorporate narrative interviews as a way of generating data, I felt that neither

fitted with my epistemological position. I felt that the theoretical approach of IPA does not fully embrace the socially constructed nature of interactions taking place within the research interview and that through the process of analysis excerpts of what is said are separated and removed from their context within the interview. In addition, by pooling aspects of what was said by multiple participants, the potential for rich description of each individual and possibilities of agency are lost (Parker, 2008).

Within Discourse Analysis (DA) language is viewed as performative; functioning to order, request, persuade or accuse (Potter & Wetherell, 2007) and by doing so constructing positions which establish the power of one meaning position over another. This is conceptualised to be accomplished through drawing upon interpretive repertoires, which can be culturally embedded. Analysis of individuals' talk and text seeks to highlight the discourses which they draw upon, and how these construct identities. Although this may demonstrate the functioning of social discourses, it does not consider how individuals may assert agency within their lives (Emerson & Frosh, 2009; Willig, 2008). I therefore rejected following a DA methodical approach and drew upon Emerson and Frosh's (2009) version of Critical Narrative Analysis developed from Gee's (1991) linguistic approach to narrative. This attempts to retain the critical gains of DA through social understanding and construction and combines this with a focus upon individuals' processes of active construction within their narratives. Interpretation of meaning starts by examining closely how a narrative is spoken (Emerson and Frosh, 2009). This approach has been found to be useful by researchers analysing extended narratives of experience which may include asides, flash forwards and backwards and multiple episodes (Riessman, 2008). Riessman (2008) has found that this approach helped her to identify thematic issues within both her divorce study and her research with Indian women about infertility.

Small Scale Study

My aim was to make a detailed exploration of stories co-constructed within this research. As discussed above, I do not intend for my findings to be generalisable to a wider population and therefore did not need to consider a large, statistically significant sample size. Due to the in depth nature of narrative analysis and my focus on the stories told by individual young people, I chose to work with two participants. This choice fits with the ideology of narrative analysis, which assumes that the detailed investigation of very small numbers of research subjects' processes of making sense of their experience is seen as being of intrinsic interest. Critical narrative analysis holds the assumption that issues in people's lives are highly specific and by seeking to develop an understanding of possible multiple meanings within narratives we can ask different questions about our subjects, and generate different knowledges which may in turn problematise prevailing dominant professional views about LACYP (Emerson & Frosh, 2009).

Pilot

I utilised the pilot study to consult young people about my chosen topic of research and about practical elements of conducting the study to help inform the design of the research project. I was also able to practise and seek feedback upon my chosen method of electing narratives through loosely structured conversations.

I contacted a care-experienced young people's council within my employing local authority about my research and I was invited to attend a group meeting in which I could talk about my project. Following this, a focus group was carried out with five young people who were part of this council. Within this meeting we discussed my proposed research project and suggestions were made to help me with the practical elements of the design of the project. These suggestions related to: interview locations for interviews; the need to meet with young people before any interviews so that we would be able to get to know each other a little; and providing young people with a copy of what I write about them. When we discussed

my plan to return my transcripts and analysis for discussion and editing the group said that they thought that this was a good idea.

One member of the group volunteered to take part in a pilot interview and this enabled me to practise using an open narrative interview technique, to reflect upon and to seek feedback on this method and gave me the opportunity to transcribe and analyse part of this interview. When I listened back to the recording of this pilot interview I felt that I didn't leave enough time with silence before commenting or asking questions and tried to use these reflections to guide me within later interviews.

I had been nervous using this style of research interview as I had limited experience of following a very loose structure. However, I was pleased with how well the interview appeared to flow and with the stories which developed within our conversations. I felt that if I had asked more specific questions then we may not have discussed the topics which arose in our talk. I met with this volunteer again to discuss the interview and our conversation confirmed to me that taking a flexible, loosely structured approach was appropriate for this research. When I asked this young person about how he had felt after our meeting and whether it had raised any difficult memories or issues for him, he said that he was OK afterwards and didn't feel upset. He went on to say that he had been happy to talk to me, but that he chooses who he shares information with. I was pleased to note that he mentioned this issue about sharing information without a prompt from me and that he had felt in control of what he had chosen to speak to me about. His comments further confirmed to me that taking a narrative approach, which allows young people to select which stories they present to me, was appropriate for this research. If I had asked specific questions, due to the power differences inherent in a research relationship, he may have felt that he had to answer even if he didn't want to and subsequently our conversation may have been more dominated by my agenda.

Co-construction: generating narrative data

..the researcher does not *find* narratives but instead participates in their creation

Neander and Skott, 2006, p.297.

I hoped to generate conversations with the participants in ways that would privilege their perspectives and processes of meaning-making in relation to their educational experiences. With this aim, I took a narrative approach to interviewing in which the interviewee is conceived as a story-teller and it is the interviewer's responsibility to be a good listener (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000). Within this approach the interview agenda remains open to change depending on the narrators' experiences and stories that they tell. I felt that this approach best suited my research because I was interested in the stories that young people constructed about their experiences of school and a loosely structured, open interview agenda allowing for 'flexible and rich talk' (Emerson & Frosh, 2009, p.32) enabled the participants to make choices about the preferred narratives which they presented to me (Billington, 2009). I rejected using the traditional question and answer interview because it is argued that such approaches can restrict interviewee's answers and suppress their stories (Mishler, 1986). Had I taken this traditional approach to our interviews and asked specific predetermined questions, I feel that I would have constrained the participants' answers by imposing my own agenda into our research conversations and making presumptions about the topic of the stories they would present. The story topics which arose in our interviews would have come from me and made my research less credible because one cannot know in advance, a story which is particular to that interviewee (Chase, 2007). I will undeniably have been part of the joint construction of the stories which were shaped within our conversations through my very presence and by the questions and responses that I gave. I hope however, that this open interview approach will have helped to enable the participants to take an active part in this process and that we were able to develop conversations which moved away from a traditional

question and answer format towards a mutual exchange from which jointly produced discourses were constructed. (Mishler, 1986).

School-History Grids

I adapted the use of life history grids (Elliott, 2005; Holstein & Gubruim, 1995; Riessman, 2008) to produce school history grids within my initial interviews with the participants. Elliott (2005) suggests that it can be very difficult for people to produce an account of broad life experiences which span many years, such as education. Structuring experiences into such a grid can create a guide which in turn aids people to recount their stories and to talk about specific times and situations within their life. In addition, Riessman (2008) reminds us that some participants may not want to develop lengthy accounts of their lives with a stranger and that producing life history grids may relieve some of the pressure participants may feel under from the researcher to produce an extended 'story'.

I introduced these school history grids by asking each participant to consider their time at school as a book and to break down their school history into chapters, the chapters were given titles and recorded as a school history grid.

Narrative Interviews

Following our construction of the school history grid I then asked each participant to tell me more about each of the chapters that they had identified within the grid. The structure was kept very loose and I simply asked them to tell me about any significant memory or episode from that time, to attempt to enable the participants to lead our construction of narratives in ways which were meaningful to them. I was guided by Hollway and Jefferson (2000) who argue that the best questions for narrative interviews invite the participant to speak about specific times and situations, rather than asking about their life over a long period of time. Referring to the chapters constructed within the school history grid enabled me to do this. I took heed of Emerson and Frosh (2009) who emphasise the importance of inviting participants to say as little or as much as they might want to within our

conversations. I tried to emphasise that participants could choose how much, and in which ways to talk. I am aware that by introducing this chapter structure, I may have influenced how the stories were told and perhaps they may have included chapters that they might rather have left out. In addition, I tried to keep to an informal conversation style, to use everyday language, to follow the lead of the participants and to pay attention to emotions being expressed and to focus on engaging within our conversations rather than being preoccupied with gathering obvious stories (Chase, 2007; Elliott, 2005; Riessman, 2008; Squire, 2009). I hoped that this would help to create a relaxed environment and help to build positive relationships in which natural conversations could develop.

I acknowledge that there are limitations to this data gathering method that I adopted. Despite my attempts to create a relaxed and informal atmosphere and participant-lead conversations I felt that the very circumstances of the research situation, my questions and the necessity of recording the interviews impacted upon this.

It is an inevitable part of any social interaction that individuals will bring their histories and expectations to their encounter which will also be mediated by cultural and temporal contexts. I am aware that just as I bring my self, thoughts, past experiences and expectations into the research with me, so do the participants. Phoenix (2009) discusses processes by which research participants may bring their histories of previous positioning and their expectations of the interview and interviewer into the research context. Phoenix argues that interviewees may make assumptions about the cultural identity of their interviewer and in turn may modify what they say and how they say it according to these assumptions. I felt strongly that one of the participants held expectations about what a research interview would involve and when we met prior to our first interview he kept asking me exactly what I wanted to know about and which aspects of his school life I wanted him to talk about. This made it more difficult to move away from a more formal interview. In contrast, when working with the other

participant, I felt that my expectations about narrative interviews were strongly influencing my reactions. I had felt very uncomfortable about how the meetings between myself and this participant had been and upon reflection I felt that this was because they differed from my personal expectations for what a narrative interview would look and sound like. I now feel that this is how the narrative methodology should work. This participant was able to speak and meet with me the amount that he chose to, rather than having to follow an interview length and number of meetings devised entirely by myself. The differing experiences of the interviews reflect both the social and contextual differences of talking with different people on different days and also the individual processes of the co-constructions of our research journeys.

Within the interviews, I was nervous about whether or not I was eliciting stories and additional questioning was needed to different extents in each interview to elicit narratives. Although I was initially worried about how much I was talking, I have reflected up on Squire's (2009) assertion that co-construction can feel very much like engaging in a conversation and this was how my interviews felt. Squire suggests that the narrative is the whole interview and that the researcher should not be concerned with gathering obvious stories as trying to do this may skew the research (Squire, 2009). As I listened back to our recorded interviews I could hear our jointly-produced narratives developing and I noticed that there were occasions within the interview where stories flowed with less questioning or commenting from me. At other times the interview sounded confused and I was reminded of Riessman's (2008) assertion that it can be difficult to put ambiguous or jumbled thoughts into words, particularly for people who have suffered dramatic loss.

Like Hollway and Jefferson (2000) I planned two interviews with each participant so that I was able to take a preliminary reading of the first research conversation and then meet a second time to follow up and further explore themes, to check out meanings and to give individual young people a chance to talk about anything that they had been thinking about or reflecting on in between our meetings in a second

interview. This is established practice in qualitative research and is used regularly in the methodological approaches of grounded theory and action research for example. I attempted to stay close to their ordering of the narratives, their phrasing and to the meanings that they gave to their experiences (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000). In addition, I hoped that meeting on several occasions would help to build up rapport and a trusting research relationship in which the interviewees felt that I valued their stories.

Taking the narratives back

The transcripts from our first interviews were given to each young person to either look at with me or to take away and read. We met to discuss the transcripts and I was able to check out if they felt it reflected our conversations and to offer each participant the opportunity to remove, change or add to the material within these transcripts before my further analysis. Similarly, following further analysis I offered to share my drafts with each participant so that I was able to ask for their views and amend my work in the light of their comments, facilitating a process of on-going informed consent. Only one participant chose to meet with me to do this. I was aware that each young person's story was largely my constructed narrative and interpretations and that each young person may not agree with how I presented their talk or my analytical approach (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000). Emerson and Frosh (2009) argue that these follow-up conversations enable us to negotiate narrative and ethical closure within our research relationships.

The meetings and interviews differed between each participant and myself. Zacharay often took the lead in setting our next meeting and asked to take the transcripts and interpretations away with him. In contrast, Jimbo appeared reluctant to want to talk with me in great depth following our first interview. At first I was concerned that I was failing to develop the 'right' relationship with Jimbo to enable the interview to progress as I had envisioned and perhaps as I had experienced with my pilot study and with Zacharay. However, I feel that the differences between my perceived experiences with these two participants reflects

both the narrative methodology which allowed them to make these choices and the ethical issue of consent, each participant consented by selecting how much to talk and what to share.

Ethical considerations

Ethical guidelines from the British Psychological Society (BPS, 2004) and the University of Sheffield were followed in this study. Ethical approval was obtained from both the University of Sheffield and from my employing Local Authority (in which I was conducting this study) prior to commencing the research.

The open narrative interview was designed to be as participant-lead as possible, enabling participants to choose which stories they told within the interview. It was therefore impossible to predict which experiences or topics would be discussed in advance of our interviews. It was essential to consider both the implications of this for participants' informed consent, and any potential distress that may arise due to the topics discussed within our interviews.

I chose to conceptualise informed consent as an on-going process, rather than as a single event that took place prior to starting the research (Parker, 2008). Participants were introduced to this project by initial information letters and then an informal discussion with me and a further information sheet. They were given the opportunity to ask questions about the project in every meeting with myself. Consent forms were then discussed and signed before the interviews took place. Furthermore, participants were able to choose, and thereby consent to, the stories which they chose to tell within our interviews. I hoped that participants discussed only the stories that they felt comfortable to share with me. I emphasised that participants were free to choose which experiences to talk about, that they could decline to answer any questions and that they could terminate the interviews at any time. Following our interviews informed consent was further negotiated by taking back the transcripts, and for one participant my interpretations, to enable them to comment, change or ask for any sections to be removed. I was aware that our interviews felt like informal conversations and therefore may have created a

false sense of intimacy in which participants may have shared stories with me which they would not like to be published within this thesis (Elliott, 2005). This practice therefore gave us the opportunity to address this and give further consent to me using their words within this thesis.

My intention was to create a safe (Winnicott, 2002) physical and metaphorical space for the interviews to take place in, within which guarding against harm was of highest importance. I attempted this through explaining the boundaries of confidentiality, attempting to maintain a warm, non-judgemental and empathetic approach (Rogers, 1980) and providing light refreshments. I also tried to remain aware of the psychodynamic concepts of projection and counter-transference and monitored my own emotional responses within and following the interviews through reflective writings in my research journal and through regular supervision.

Consideration needed to be given to the fact that potentially sensitive, difficult or challenging issues may arise within our interviews and that talking about these experiences may bring back feelings of distress or upset. I ensured that there was a member of staff, with whom each participant had a good relationship with, available after the interviews if they wanted to talk further about anything raised within our interview. In the event of either participant becoming upset I planned to offer to break or terminate the interview and I checked with them before and after each interview how they were and if any difficult issues had been raised for them. In addition, I remained aware that returning the transcripts and interpretations to participants may have emotional effects for participants when they read back their words or my interpretations. I tried to present these sensitively and explain that mine was only one of many possible interpretations. Both of the participants were offered the option to look through this material with myself or alone at one of our meetings or to take them away to read. Again, they were also given the option of keeping copies of this material.

A further ethical issue for consideration was that of confidentiality and anonymity. Parker (2008) argues that research can never be confidential because the intention

of research is to make discoveries which are then presented to others. I explained to the participants how this research would be disseminated and the limitations of confidentiality; when many details of a person's life are included within the story it may be possible that someone who knows the participant well may be able to identify them. I anonymised places such as cities, towns and schools within my transcripts and analyses, and had intended to use pseudo-names chosen by the participants. However, although one participant (Jimbo) was happy with this and selected his pseudo-name, the other participant (Zacharay) was adamant that nothing should be changed about his story and requested that both his name and the names of the places and schools remain within this thesis. I had numerous discussions about this, both with Zacharay and with my supervisor in university tutorials. I also considered Parker's (2008) argument that although anonymity is possible within research it is not always the most ethical option and that concealing the identity of participants can construct them as 'fragile beings needing to be protected by others' (p.17). I negotiated with Zacharay to use his first name within this thesis but to change all other identifying details. I reflected upon this process of our co-construction and felt that although Zacharay was able to exert some power, this was an example of the ultimate power of the researcher in making the final decision about how his narrative must be edited.

Power

I have remained very aware of my powerful position as a researcher throughout this research process. Although it has been argued that power is inherent within all social relationships (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000), unavoidable structural disparities existed between myself and the participants. Not only did we have differences of age and education, Hyden (2009) argues that when dealing with sensitive topics (such as school exclusion) there is always a danger of interviewees positioning the researcher as superior to them. Hyden suggests that this could be due to participants talking about issues which they are ashamed of, issues that may be rated as culturally low, or events which have left them vulnerable. To try and reduce the power differences between myself and the participants, I attempted to

create an open and reflective relationship, in which the research process was as transparent as possible. I explained what I would be doing to transcribe and analyse the narratives and offered to share what I produced. I tried to empower the participants by providing choices within the research process, such as where and when to meet, and whether to use a pseudo-name. In addition, by inviting participants to select stories to talk about and to say as little or as much as they wanted to within our interviews I hoped that they would have further control of the narratives constructed through our talk. Riessman (2008) argues that if researchers are able to follow participants down their own narrative paths, power can become more equal within interviews. In this way, the participants are empowered to select what they perceive to be the most important information about their lives and experiences (Elliott, 2005).

Hollway and Jefferson (2000) have argued that power differences within research relationships can have both positive and negative effects. For example, if such differences result in participants positioning the researcher as more knowledgeable than themselves they may be unwilling to challenge interpretations and assumptions. However, if the researcher sympathises with or recognises their dilemmas it can have powerful emotional effects and be almost therapeutic.

Therapeutic Possibilities through Narrative

Although Parker (2008) argues that research should not set out with the aim to be therapeutic, through the narrative interview process, participants are able to reflect on and talk about their lives. This is not a neutral activity (White & Epston, 1990) and can be beneficial (Elliott, 2005). Therefore narrative studies can have components of both research and therapy; people may be moved to possibilities of action following an understanding that they develop through this process of constructing their narrative. Chase (2007) also suggests that acts of narrating significant life events can facilitate positive change. Through telling their story narrators can hear alternative versions of their own life and in turn may make changes within it. My aim was not to facilitate change, but to carry out good

narrative research. It was essential that I remained aware of the possibility of positive and negative change for the participants and, as detailed in my ethical considerations section, I tried to plan for the occurrence of any negative reactions. Although I was not actively seeking to work therapeutically, I hope that the participants found the process of this research to be a positive experience.

Critical reflexivity

Clandinin and Connelley (2000) write about being in the midst of stories. Both researchers and participants come in to research settings whilst living their own stories. They suggest that the narrative researcher has a dual experience; one of an inquirer experiencing the experience and also being part of the experience. There is a need to be fully involved within the research relationship, yet also to stand back and reflect.

Being reflective of my position as a researcher allowed me to become aware of how my beliefs and ideas might have influenced the narratives, analyses and interpretations within this study. I have attempted to reflect upon my role in the co-construction of the narratives, from the choices I made as I conceptualised and designed this study, through the way that I introduced the research to participants and in my interactions with them. I am aware that my responses and interpretations have been influenced by my prior experiences, beliefs and attitudes which do not remain static (Andrews, 2009). Indeed, I feel that these influences have evolved as I have developed and changed throughout this study.

To help the reader gain some insight into my position I have included information about myself in an earlier section of this thesis and have attempted to write reflectively about this research process. In addition, I have written regularly within my research diary to help me to critically examine and analytically reflect upon the nature of this research and my role within it. I am cautioned by Squire (2009) who suggests that however much we strive, we cannot be fully reflexive as there is always material that lies beyond the realm of our interpretations. Through this reflexive process I have tried to set out my research account as a narrative written

from my own specific perspective, rather than a simple transparent representation of the research process (Elliott, 2005).

Evaluation

Validity

Riessman (2008) argues that, within narrative research, two levels of validity must be attended to:

...the story told by a research participant and the validity of the analysis, or the story told by the researcher.

(Riessman, 2008, p.184).

Elliott (2005) posits that the use of narrative within research can increase the internal validity (the story told by the participant) of a study. Through this methodological approach participants are able to talk about what they feel is most important and provide specific details about their lives using their own vocabulary and conceptual frameworks to describe their experiences.

I take a social constructionist perspective and consider the narratives constructed within this study as more than factual reports of events. These narratives were told from a particular point of view within this research context. Within a different social context or at a different time, these narratives would have differed. I am interested in the meanings created between us and the ways in which the narratives were constructed rather than whether their every detail is factually correct.

In terms of the validity of my analysis, I have attempted to demonstrate the genuineness and plausibility of my data and interpretations by providing descriptive evidence of the exact words which were spoken by participants set within their contexts of production (Riessman, 2008). Following Emerson and Frosh's (2009) suggestion I have included my transcriptions to enable readers to critically examine and accept or reject my interpretations and to make their own, additional interpretations of the narratives. I remain aware that narrative research remains open ended and subject to others' differing interpretations (Polkinghorne, 1988). Taking transcriptions and interpretations back to the participants enabled them to comment on and request changes to these.

I have kept a research diary of my decisions, thoughts and reflections throughout the process of this study. This has helped me to take a reflexive approach to my research and has enabled me to be more transparent in my work by carefully documenting how I made methodological decisions, the processes I used to collect and interpret data, and the interpretations which I considered (Riessman, 2008). In addition, I have attempted to recognise and acknowledge the limitations of methods I have used (Wellington, 2000).

Confirmability

... the same words do not carry with them the same significance as our understanding of our own lives and the world around us changes. And if the meaning of the words changes, are they really the same words? If the meaning of the data changes, are they the same data? Meaning is variable. Not only because it is always in the eyes of the beholder, but, equally, the beholder never occupies a static position.

Andrews 2009, p.94.

I am aware that there are multiple possible interpretations of the transcripts (Emerson & Frosh, 2009) and therefore my interpretations must be considered as tentative (Clandinin & Connelley, 2000). To help acknowledge and overcome this problem, I have endeavoured to be both reflexive and transparent within my research. As I alluded to above, I hope my approach has helped to make my decisions clear to the reader and that readers will interrogate my decisions and analyses.

In relation to the dependability of the participants' individual narratives, it is essential to remember that these narratives were composed for a particular audience, within a specific context at moments in history (Riessman, 2008) and therefore must be considered within this context. It is likely that in a different context, within a discussion held with someone else, these narratives would differ.

Generalisability

Narrative research is a form of case-centred enquiry (Reissman, 2008) and case-study research is frequently criticised for its low populational validity. However,

Stake (1995) argues that within case-based research our priority is to understand the case being studied, not to be able to generalise to other cases. Flyvberg (2009) argues that formal generalisation is only one way by which people accumulate knowledge and that knowledge that cannot be formally generalised can still enter into the collective process of knowledge accumulation within a given field. The aim of my research, has been to develop an in-depth study of the stories co-constructed with the particular young people within this research, rather than to reduce and generalise these stories to LACYP more generally. However, I hope that this research may still challenge assumptions, offer new insights and critical perspectives into the existing body of research (Crossley & Vulliamy, 1984).

Chapter 3: Specific Procedures

This chapter details the specific procedures and processes of this study, including approaching and selecting participants, our research interviews, taking the narratives back and the processes of analysis.

Approaching and Selecting Potential Participants

When selecting participants to take part in this study I deliberately set out a wide selection criteria. I was interested in stories told by young people who were looked after by the local authority and had experienced some sort of formal or informal exclusion from school and so it was essential that potential participants met this criteria. I did not want to specify the gender of the participants because the population of LACYP is often described as 'hard to reach' (Richards, 2009) and I wanted to remain as open as possible to working with any young people who were happy to participate in this research project. For the same reasons I did not want to be overly prescriptive about the exact age of the participants, however, because I was interested in their experiences of school and school exclusion I felt that it was necessary for potential participants to have had experience of both primary and secondary school to reflect upon and talk about. Therefore, the broad age range I hoped to work with was young people in Years 10 and 11 of secondary school, at college or young people who had recently left school.

Before I could approach any young people about my research I came across a number of challenges. I firstly needed to contact social services to obtain permission to carry out this project. Permission for me to work with LACYP within the local authority was granted, however, due to confidentiality reasons, I was unable to have access to a list of LACYP within the age range that I hoped to work with. Instead I was directed to speak with a manager within the local authority who made the decision to approach foster carers of LACYP who were recorded by the authority as having experienced exclusion from school. This initially restricted the potential participants to LACYP in foster care. I had prepared letters about this

project for foster carers, but they were approached by telephone. All of the foster carers, who were approached, said that they did not want the young person to take part in this research. Heptinstall (2000) suggests that LACYP are often viewed as vulnerable and in need of protection from adverse effects that could result from participation in research. I reflected upon this possibility and also wonder whether the process of approach affected foster carers' decisions and whether their views may have been differed had I been granted permission to contact them myself by letter. This perhaps would have offered a different story about the research.

I then spoke with managers of the authority's leaving care and residential care teams. After our discussions it was agreed that my information letters (see Appendix I) for young people would be taken to a LACYP's participation group by a participation worker in the local authority and that she would speak with these young people to see if any of them were interested in taking part in the project. This participation worker explained the content of the letters and also the context, aims and process of the research verbally to the group to ensure that young people were not excluded from participation due to any difficulties accessing the language within my letter. My absence from this introductory meeting was planned so that potential subjects would not be pressured into taking part by my direct involvement. Social workers from the authorities leaving care team were also made aware of the project and were given copies of the information letters to raise the project with young people.

Three young people expressed an interest in taking part within the research and I arranged to meet with each of them individually to further discuss the project, to give them an additional information sheet and to answer any questions that they might have. We planned an additional meeting for the following week to answer any arising questions and to complete consent forms (see Appendix I) if they still wanted to take part. This gave the young people further time to consider their participation in the project. One of these young people was also a pupil within a secondary school allocated to me in my role as a trainee educational psychologist

and had also been referred to me in this capacity. I felt that this raised an ethical dilemma in relation to my dual role as researcher and practitioner and after reflecting upon this I met with this pupil and explained why I felt that I could only work with her in my capacity of psychologist within her school. I felt that I may potentially have found it difficult to separate what she may say to me as an anonymous participant in research and as a pupil speaking to the school psychologist, it would have been difficult to keep our boundaries clear and separate.

Reflecting upon the process of approaching and selecting participants, I considered again how LACYP are often described as 'hard to reach'. I certainly felt that young people were protected from meeting with me by a number of different gatekeepers with the authority. This process of recruiting became frustrating, and at times, made me feel that the research was no longer 'mine' but belonged to the local authority. I am also aware that through these recruitment processes only some of the LACYP within the authority were approached about the study; only those who attend the participation group or who were approached by their social worker.

However, ultimately being able to approach a group of young people directly through my letters of invitation, meant that these young people were able to make decisions for themselves about whether or not they wanted to be involved in the research, and they were able to decide whether or not they had experienced any type of exclusion from school (which may or may not have been recorded by the local authority). I wonder whether through attempts to protect young people who we perceive to be vulnerable from experiences such as research, we deny their decision-making competence and repress their opportunities for making choices? Had the young people volunteering to participate in my study not been able to make decisions about whether or not they felt that they fitted my selection criteria and if they wanted to take part the power differences between us may have been wider and my influence in our co-construction greater.

The Participants

Zacharay and Jimbo chose to participate in this study; they were both male and 17 years old at the time that they became involved in the study and 18 when it was completed in January 2011. Both were looked after by the local authority and had experienced various forms of exclusion from their schools.

Zacharay is a young man who is interested in computers and games and expressed an interest in participating in this research project when it was introduced to him in a participation group meeting. At the time of our meetings, Zacharay was attending college and also was part of a care experienced participation group which met together once a week. At the time of this project, Zacharay was living in residential care and had been looked after by the local authority for about ten years.

Jimbo expressed an interest in taking part in this research project when it was introduced to him by his social worker. He had been looked after by the local authority since he was two years old and at the time of this project he was living in supported independent accommodation. At the time of our meetings Jimbo was a recipient of an Intensive Supervision Order and described his interests as smoking weed and getting high.

Meetings

All our meetings and interviews took place within a local authority building in the centre of the city. This building was familiar to the participants as they meet with their social workers or attend group activities there regularly. A choice of location for our meetings and interviews was offered, such as social care services buildings, their home or my office buildings. It was felt that the central building was the most convenient place to meet and participants were able to choose the day and time of our meetings. The interviews were held in a quiet room in which we could not be disturbed.

I outlined the format that our interviews followed in the earlier section of this chapter. Rather than using structured questions, I had a number of areas which I

hoped to discuss within the interview and I took a prompt card with me into our initial interview to remind myself of these (see Appendix II). The starting point for each of my initial interviews was the school history grid which was then referred to throughout the interview to facilitate our conversations. Our conversations were recorded upon a digital voice recorder and I made notes on my initial thoughts and on how I was feeling following our conversations.

The questions that I devised for our second interviews arose from listening to the recordings and reading the transcripts from the initial interview with each participant. These related to discussions which I hoped to learn more about or clarify meanings.

I met with Zacharay on seven occasions, for an initial introduction, to sign the consent form, for our first and second interviews, to give Zacharay copies of the transcriptions, to discuss the transcripts and finally to discuss my interpretations. Jimbo and I met on three occasions, the first was to introduce the study then to sign the consent form and for our initial interview and then again for a second interview and to discuss the transcripts from our first interview. The regularity and number of times that we met was guided by the wishes of each participant. I hoped that they would become as involved as possible in the process of co-constructing the narratives and reviewing the transcripts and analyses that I wrote. The participants differed in the number of meetings that they wanted to have with me and in how much they wanted to talk within each of these meetings.

Analysis

My analysis was based upon Emerson and Frosh's (2009) approach to Critical Narrative Analysis which developed Gee's linguistic approach to narrative, utilising micro and macro analytic tools to privilege the participant's meanings within a thematic analysis. I also drew upon the work of Mishler (1997) and Riessman (2008) who have adapted Gee's structural approach to inform their thematic analyses.

Transcriptions

transcription as interpretation - an act of meaning-making

(Emerson & Frosh, 2008, p.38).

My approach to transcription was informed by a social constructionist position, which advocates that research is always situated within a context. The narratives that developed within the interviews were constructed through our joint dialogue and interactions. Therefore, my transcriptions needed to reflect the co-constructed nature of the narratives and include this interactional context. Riessman (2008) suggests that a detailed transcription should bring the interviewer into the analysis of personal narrative. Through doing so, it can help to examine power relations within the research interaction and demonstrate how meaning is co-constructed. In addition, including the interviewer within the transcription and analysis of personal narratives ensures greater transparency of the researcher's contribution to the conversation (Emerson & Frosh, 2009). I felt it was essential to include this context and hoped that by doing so it would help me to:

...lower the barrier between researcher and researched, and allow both sides to be seen and understood for who they are.

Etherington, 2007, p.600.

In order to transform my recordings of our interview conversations into text I adapted some of the transcription conventions outlined by Riessman (2008) and Emerson and Frosh (2009) based upon Gee's (1991) use of poetic line breaks and included both myself and the participants within the transcriptions.

Gee's (1991) model of a linguistic approach to narrative requires that you listen and attempt to demonstrate how the narrative is actually spoken by including pauses, emphasis and changes in pitch in order to make interpretations. This discursive approach enabled me to carry out a detailed bottom-up analysis which helped to privilege the narrators' meanings from within their speech, resisting ascriptivism (Emerson & Frosh, 2009; Riessman, 2008).

Gee (1991) conceptualises speech into micro and macro structures of 'idea units' separated by paying close attention to 'pitch glide' (raising and falling intonations) as signifying the focus of the sentences and information which speakers wish hearers to take as new information. Gee further structures speech into lines ('something like what would show up as a sentence in writing', Gee 1991, p.22), organised around a central idea, and then larger narrative units of stanzas (groups of lines with similar content), strophes (stanzas which are often paired and thematically related) and parts (thematically related strophes that make up episodes of the story) (Emerson & Frosh, 2009; Gee, 1991; Mishler, 1997; Riessman, 2008). Each stanza, strophe and part is labelled through a circular process of analysis which involves a close listening and reading of the narrative in conjunction with a consideration of previous interpretive responses. This helps to outline the text and to show patterns of meaning developing throughout the narrative. Although this process of analysis is 'anchored in the invitations and constraints of the text, as said' (Emerson & Frosh, 2009, p.72) it is highly interpretive and so reflexive awareness of my choices was essential to try and identify any assumptions I was applying to the data.

Elliott (2005) argues that the major disadvantage of this style of transcription is the amount of time it takes to listen to a tape to identify the beginning and end of lines and stanzas. She argues that it is unlikely that this would ever be used by researchers to transcribe the whole of an interview and that it is more appropriate for use with short sections that the researcher has already identified as being of particular interest (Elliott, 2005). Although I considered this critique, and certainly found this stage of analysis to be very time consuming, I felt that I wanted to be able to trace themes as they developed across the whole of our interviews, interactively. By selecting aspects of the transcript to analyse I may have missed something from our conversations and would not be fully honouring the context of the developing narratives.

Micro-analysis

To create the transcripts, the recorded interviews were down-loaded onto my laptop and erased from the digital recorder. To enable me to reflect upon the narratives, I listened to our conversations several times before starting to create the anonymised raw transcriptions. I acknowledge that the act of transcriptions is interpretative and how I heard the recordings may differ from how others may do so. To ensure that I was happy with my transcriptions I listened to the recordings many times while writing and editing the text, until I felt that the text reflected as closely as possible what I heard in the recordings. I then returned to the transcripts to identify and mark idea units and line breaks. Through this process I kept a reflective log of my thoughts arising from my repeated listening, typing and editing.

The following notations were used within the transcriptions (adapted from Riessman, 2008; Emerson & Frosh, 2009; Gee, 1991):

(.)	Pause less than 1 second
(1)	Number in () indicates approximate length of pause in seconds
[Speakers overlap
[coughs]	Word in [] indicates non-verbal action or event.
???	I could not decipher the words spoken
<i>Italics</i>	word emphasised by the speaker
/	change of tone, signifies new idea unit

Line breaks indicate pacing of phrases around pauses or slight hesitations

Macro analysis

Following the transcriptions I returned to the tape and read through the transcripts to further structure and separate the narrative into stanza's, strophes and parts. These were given interpretative titles based upon my consideration of where we placed emphasis upon our spoken words. I then created summaries of the macro-analyses (see Appendix IV) which traced the overall shape of my interpretations of

our narratives (Gee, 1991). I wrote comments on these and used these comments and titles to map (on a large sheet of paper) themes which I interpreted to be reoccurring within the narratives. This was a circular process, as I moved between the macro-analysis summaries and the full transcripts. I considered both the repetition and variation within my interpretations across the stanzas and the psychological subjects within the stanzas. An example of my 'raw' working can be seen in Appendix VI which includes an annotated page from a macro-analysis summary and my map of my interpreted themes within Zacharay's narrative.

Like the interview experiences of Emerson and Frosh (2009) with Lance, an adolescent boy, I also found that neither Jimbo nor Zacharay narrated in 'chunks' longer than a few lines. Emerson and Frosh suggest that an absence of extended monologue is not unusual when working and talking with adolescence boys, but the challenge is raised of how to identify personal narrative within such conversational contexts and in turn how to select and reduce personal narrative from the raw transcription for analysis. Although numerous researchers treat narratives as discreet units which can be separated from the surrounding discourse (Riessman, 2008), I felt that by doing so aspects of the context of the narrative would be omitted. I therefore chose to consider my transcriptions to contain:

...embedded narrative segments within an overarching narrative that includes non-narrative parts

Emerson & Frosh, 2009,p.43.

I chose to analyse the entirety of my first initial transcripts, so that the embedded narrative segments were kept within their context of our conversations within which they developed. Emerson and Frosh (2009) are not alone in this conceptualisation of a narrative which is composed of the entirety of the research conversations; Squire (2009) suggests that:

A personal narrative may also, from the experience-centred perspective, be the entire 'narrative' told to and with a researcher...

Squire, 2009, p.42.

Chapter 4: Interpretation and discussion

Within this chapter, I offer my construction of Zacharay's and Jimbo's stories through discussing my interpretations of the themes that I identified in my analysis of the narratives. These themes were interlinked, overlapping and interactive and therefore only separated for the purpose of this discussion. The stories should be read with this in mind. The school history grids and full analysed transcripts can be found within Appendix III and Appendix IV and readers may wish to turn to these to situate the themes and quotations within their fuller contexts.

Zacharay's Story

'...oh god (.) I forgot the name of that as well...'

Zacharay started his story when he went into care at 7 years old. As we attempted to create an overview of Zacharay's time in school, Zacharay initially divided his time into 8 different chapters based on different locations he had moved between. His story was constructed as difficult to remember, confusing and hazy as if the number and frequency of moves had disrupted Zacharay's memories:

Zacharay: the the chapter 2 I was only in there for a *few weeks* /cos I moved from (3)

/oh god (.) I forgot the name of that as well

*/err there was a primary school in *Metropolis* as well*

Kate: *ok*

Zacharay: I forgot what it was /that was *in between* the *Urbantown*/ no (.) that was in between *Bigtown* and *Urbanville* (4)

(transcript 1, lines 141-144).

At times the narrative constructed Zacharay as slightly unsure about the details of each place as he checked out details with himself:

Zacharay: (4) mm (.) chapter 6 (11)/ it was high school wasn't it?

*yeah high school in *Farshire**

(transcript 1, lines 37-38).

I found that as we tried to create an overview of Zacharay's story through the ordered grid it was difficult to keep track of the story and make sense of the details.

'... and then cos the placement broke down they moved me'

Zacharay's movement between locations within his story was constructed as resulting from care placements breaking down:

Zacharay: *but* because that placement broke down
I *had* to move back to Urbantown

(transcript 1, lines 407-408).

The emphasis upon '*had*' constructed a sense that placement breakdown was irreversible; the only possible option was for Zacharay to move. One of these moves was to another part of the country and when I asked him about his involvement in the decision to move there, Zacharay emphasised that it was the *only* place available for him to go to:

Zacharay: *no* it was just like the *only* place that my social worker could get

Kate: yeah

Zacharay: so I *had* to move to there

(transcript 1, lines 392-393).

I felt that the narrative constructed Zacharay's options for a place to live as so limited that he was unable to have an opinion about where he would like to live. I noticed a contradiction within this story between the general rule that Zacharay constructed about knowing how long a placement would last and his constructed experience:

Zacharay: because when you go to a *placement* it's either temporary or *long-term*

Kate: Oh OK

Zacharay: it depends what is

Kate: and would you *know* when you went *there*?

Zacharay: which *one*?

Kate: yeah

Zacharay: yeah

Kate: so would you *know* when you went somewhere how *long* you would be staying *there*?

Zacharay: roughly (.) yeah

(transcript 2, lines 57-60).

Our use of 'you' as the psychological subject in this extract, created for me a narrative of the way placements work within the care system, a general rule for young people within it. However, an episode from our first interview contradicted this rule and constructed a narrative of a move with almost instant notice. This episode related to the notice that Zacharay was given for his move from Farshire to Urbantown:

Zacharay: Err they *only* give me like *twenty* minutes *notice* that I was leaving yeah

[laughs] it was well *bad*

Zacharay: all all they said was '*grab a bag you're leaving*'

(transcript 1, lines 428-450).

As the episode continued, the reason for the quick move was constructed as a consequence of Zacharay breaking a window in an old caravan around the back of the residential home. The details of the move were then developed through the narrative:

Zacharay: they phoned social services and like three *massive* white guys came

like about *20* stone each and like in this *tiny* car

so *I* got my black *bin bag* like *this* [gestures holding bag over his shoulder] '*where*'re we *going*?

cos I *didn't* actually *know* where I was *going*

Kate: *No /so when did they tell you?*
Zacharay: *About twenty minutes before they came*
 and they take me to Urbantown

(transcript 1, lines 457-462).

Although there was humour within this episode in the image of three massive guys squeezed into a tiny car, for me this extract constructed a huge imbalance of power. This was developed through Zacharay's emphasis on the size difference between them, by being outnumbered and by the differences in their knowledge. The image created within this narrative episode of Zacharay standing with his bin bag of worldly goods over his shoulder and asking where he was being taken to felt very sad to me. Zacharay emphasised his lack of knowledge about what was planned for him by emphasis and repetition. He used ventriloquism of himself asking where they were going and repeated again that he didn't know the destination. To me this move between placements felt forced and almost sinister.

'I just like started going and then they just moved me'

I felt that this story constructed a fragmented experience of education. Alongside moves of care placements, this story was constructed with many changes in Zacharay's educational arrangements, including different schools, home tutoring, educational placements and time spent out of school. Dominating the narrative around these changes of schools was that they were the result of placement moves:

Zacharay: *and then err that placement broke down*
 and so I had to move to eerm Farshire

(transcript 1, lines 349-350).

Zacharay: *but because that placement broke down*
 I had to move back to Urbantown

(transcript 1, lines 407-408).

I felt that Zacharay's use of emphasis in the extracts above had the effect of constructing the placement breakdown as being the disruptive factor, interrupting his education. These placement breakdowns are constructed as external to Zacharay and perhaps that he was powerless in these moves.

There were exceptions to this dominant narrative of a change of care placement leading to a change of school:

- Kate: *okay/* and did that *always* involve a *change of school* as well?
- Zacharay: not necessarily
- Kate: mm
- Zacharay: because *when* when I moved *from* (1) /like around *Urbantown* I stayed in the school that I was in in Urbantown
- Kate: yeah/ oh OK so *yeah/* your school would *stay* but you might be moving different *places*

(transcript 2, lines 61-64).

'...so like my shortest ever'

The frequent moves within this story created a sense of interruption; as Zacharay started to settle into a new school he would be moved again. Within this story there were many examples of school placements that lasted a few weeks:

- Zacharay: and I was *probably* there about what a *month* (1) I *think* (2) and then I moved to (1) Urbanville

(transcript 1, line 237).

The emphasis upon *probably* and *think* above positioned Zacharay as finding it difficult to remember the details, adding to the fragmented narrative of educational experience. There were other examples of school placements lasting two weeks (transcript 1, line 410) and the shortest school placement within this narrative was a part-time placement which lasted a week:

Zacharay: a *week*

Kate: a *week*

Zacharay: *nine mornings*
Kate: *gosh*
Zacharay: *so like my shortest ever*

(transcript 1, lines 289-291).

An episode within the narrative related to the short time that Zacharay spent in his school in Urbantown before moving care placements. This constructed the disruptive effect of moving so quickly:

Kate: *so this school/ you said you were only in for*
Zacharay: *only for like a a few weeks cos I moved from (.) Urbantown to (.) Metropolis [clears throat]*
so I didn't really do anything there
/I just like started going/ and then they just moved me

(transcript 1, lines 145-148).

The placement was so short that Zacharay did not expand on any memories from this school, he did not have chance to do anything there. As we continued to talk about the move from this school, the narrative created a sense of sadness for me:

Kate: *Yeah (.)/ what was that like for you /moving (.) between the schools?*
Zacharay: *Well (.) the two weeks*
/I'd got like settled into that school /in a routine/met some friends (.) and stuff
Kate: *mm*
Zacharay: *and then just (.) moved me out*
Kate: *yeah*
Zacharay: *so (.) I was annoyed with it /because because/ I wanted more out of that school*

(transcript 1, lines 149-153).

The way that Zacharay spoke about being settled and having met friends in the school, followed by the contrasting short sentence with the emphasis on '*just*' and

'out' felt sudden and with disregard for Zacharay. This was further constructed through Zacharay's emotional response of annoyance to this move. We returned to this episode in our second interview and again, the notion of having been settled in that school was emphasised and that remaining there would have been a positive thing.

'...so like I missed school out then...'

Adding to this construction of Zacharay's fragmented school experience, this story contained many references to and instances of time spent out of school, such as through exclusions, part time tables and periods of home tutoring.

Within this story, starting in a new school was constructed as often being part-time:

Zacharay: yeah/ they *tried* to move me into err (.) primary school/ *like* on a staggered timetable

(transcript 1, line 250).

However, Zacharay positioned himself as preferring to enter a new school placement on a fulltime timetable:

Zacharay: well they first they asked me what *I wanted* to do/ either a *full* timetable or (.) *staggered*

Kate: mmm

Zacharay: I said *full* timetable, I said *put me in* for full

(transcript 1, lines 336-337).

This reoccurs within the story, with Zacharay constructing starting a new school full-time as more successful for him, enabling him to be like everybody else in school. The first school that we talked about in our interview was Zacharay's primary school in Urbantown and his experience there was constructed as being disrupted by time spent out of school:

Zacharay: And then (1) I (1) a *well* in primary school I was (.) was *naughty*

and then I like got expelled a few times excluded whatever it is called

Kate: Mmh hmm

Zacharay: Like (.) and *then* (1) and then /they reduced my timetable *then* as well

Kate: Oh yeah

Zacharay: *Yeah*

Kate: *Yeah*

Zacharay: and *then* /so like I missed school out *then*/ and then (.) I just didn't bother going

(transcript 1, lines 105-108).

I feel that the way that Zacharay placed emphasis upon the words '*naughty*' and '*then*' constructed this school's actions to be a consequence of Zacharay's behaviour. This positioned Zacharay as responsible for the exclusions and reduced timetable which caused him to miss school. Zacharay's memories of this school were constructed as dominated by conflict:

Zacharay: Err (5) no /I (.) I can't remember much else in that school (.) except for kickin off now and again

I can't remember actually doing any *work*

(transcript 1, lines 118-119).

Similarly, within our dialogue about Zacharay's primary school in Urbanville, Zacharay's dominant memory of the school was constructed as one of conflict leading to school exclusion:

Kate: have you got *any* kinda or *can* you remember kinda *any* memories (.) or *one* point (.) or *an episode* in that school? (4)

Zacharay: errr (.) duno (.)

well (.) there was *one* where I was like

because I had *kicked* off and went into the *cloakroom*

and was like *throwing* everything *everywhere*

so the staff (.) *teachers* (.) *caretaker*/ like just like *five people* (.) had *jumped* on me to try and *restrain* me/ so I would not like *kick off* anymore

and that's when they *threw* me out of *that* one (2)

(transcript 1, lines 269-275).

Within this dramatic narrative, Zacharay again positioned himself as the psychological subject and placed emphasis upon words relating to his behaviour, creating for me a sense that Zacharay and his behaviour were so powerful that it took five people to control it. Continuing this narrative of a battle of power, the actions of these five people were constructed as dramatic and fight-like through the emphasis upon the words '*jumped*', '*restrain*' and '*threw*'. Although in some ways this narrative served to construct both Zacharay and 'they' (the school staff) as equally powerful, ultimately the staff asserted greater power through throwing Zacharay out of school. An additional example of Zacharay positioning himself through his behaviour as the reason for him leaving schools came from the construction of the end of his time in High school in Urbanville:

Zacharay: but before I *moved* to Farshire I was like (.)

my *behaviour* deteriorated and I was just like getting *kicked* out of *that* school *anyway*

So they basically said *if you don't leave* the *school* we will have to *expel* you

(transcript 1, lines 364-366).

I found it interesting to reflect on how, within these episodes, the narratives were saturated with strong language. I wondered if Zacharay was creating a counter-narrative to that of powerful staff, by externalising and constructing his behaviour in equally powerful terms.

Adding to the narrative of time spent out of school, this story included two episodes of time where Zacharay was home tutored. Our narrative constructed these as times of reduced time spent in educational activity:

Zacharay: it was *less* hours (.) like only did from *nine* until *half* past twelve

(transcript 1, line 262).

However, these times of home tutoring were also constructed positively as educationally productive time:

Zacharay: and (1) we got *more work done*
well (.) like a lot more *interaction* with teachers

(transcript 1, lines 263-264).

I felt that this narrative had the effect of constructing Zacharay as studious and concerned about his education.

'...and did you have any support?'

The narrative of support was initially brought into the story by my questions to Zacharay about what support he had in school. Perhaps by doing so I constructed Zacharay as having difficulties within school and therefore needing support for these, rather than constructing the system as in some way deficit and in need of change. This narrative of Zacharay needing support was constructed initially in terms of specialist support in the form of an educational psychologist:

Kate: and did you have any *support*
do you remember anyone giving you any support at that time?

Zacharay: yeah there was (2) one of *the* (3) I don't know ermm (1)
educational *psychologists*

they like came to see me and stuff like that

Kate: yeah

Zacharay: so we kinda like talked about (1)

we were talking about stuff (.) and then (.) /like about
behaviour *behaviour*

and that's when we decided to cut down my timetable (.)

and then like only do like mornings (.) and *stuff* like that

(transcript 1, lines 126-133).

I noticed how Zacharay resisted a narrative of himself as being in need of support by externalising the behaviour that was being talked about and not positioning it as his. This decision to reduce his timetable was constructed as a negotiation between Zacharay and the psychologist. Later within our discussion we returned to this theme, and again I placed Zacharay as in need of support:

Kate: and umm *did* you feel that you had much *support* from that *school* [

Zacharay: no

Kate:] in *terms* of kinda (.) *helping* you?

Zacharay: *no* (.) I don't think so

(transcript 1, lines 276-279).

Within the narratives of support in school, Zacharay positioned himself as in receipt of positive support through rewards for doing well:

Zacharay: but (.) we *had* like (.) well I had like a (.) like a *reward chart* or whatever

if I did *good* I'd get like a reward *rewarded* at the *end* of the week

(transcript 1, lines 233-234).

Here, Zacharay initially positioned himself along with others in the school, having a reward chart, but quickly switched the focus to himself as having a chart and subsequent rewards for doing '*good*' in school. Zacharay's High School in Urbanville was constructed as supportive in a positive way:

Zacharay: the *best* supporting *school* was probably the *high* school in *Urbanville*

(transcript 1, line 280).

This positive support was positioned within a context of Zacharay having a statement of educational need:

Zacharay: errr (2) ummm (2) and *it's* like (3) I *had* like(.) cos I had a *statement* an *educational* statement

so I got 10 hours *support* a week

(transcript 1, lines 343-344).

Zacharay's school was constructed positively in terms of the choice they gave to Zacharay over how this support was used and with regards to the range of supportive options available within the school:

Kate: so *this* school/ it sounds like *you had* quite a lot of kind of *opportunity* to *talk* about what was gunna *work* for *you* and [

Zacharay: Yep

Kate:]*choosing* your *support* and things

Zacharay: *Yeah/* they asked me *loads* of things like what *lessons* I wanted *support* in

and like they had a *Cool-off* room where *you could* go

so *you could* just *walk* out /cos they like they *gave* you a *pass* or whatever

so I could just like walk out of the *room* and have half an hour

(transcript 1, lines 351-355).

Here, Zacharay switched between positing himself as the psychological subject, relating how the support worked for him and using the more general psychological subject of 'you'. This to me, had the effect of constructing Zacharay as the same as others in the school, utilising the same system of the cool-off room.

'...it let let people know that I was different (.) from the other people'

In contrast to the narrative around support systems in school that were the same for Zacharay and other pupils, there were narratives within the story in Urbanville and Farshire, where Zacharay was made to feel very different:

Zacharay: and they (.) they said that like *one* of their *staff* had to sit in *class* with me in school as well

Kate: from *the* residential care?
Zacharay: *yeah* (.) from the home
Kate: *yeah*
Zacharay: to monitor my *behaviour* and stuff
Kate: so (.) how was *that* for *you* having them come in with you every day?
Zacharay: *well* errr (3) I dunno /but like it *let* let people know that /was *different* (.) from *the* other people

(transcript 1, lines 251-255).

Zacharay described the residential care staff as being in school to monitor his behaviour; this constructs this arrangement in school as one of regulation rather than one of support. The emphasis upon *let* constructed how it was the result of this action which set Zacharay out as different to others in school. We returned to this narrative again later in the story when talking about Fartown:

Zacharay: Well it does feel *strange* cos you've got some member of staff sitting next to you

and everyone is *asking* like *who's* he *who's* he /and stuff like that
Kate: Mmm
Zacharay: So you like explain the *situation* whatever
and you *might not* necessarily *want* to

(transcript 1, lines 418-421).

This extract further constructed how the presence of a member of staff from the residential home being with Zacharay in school emphasised Zacharay's difference from others. People asked who this member of staff was which forced an explanation and took away Zacharay's choice to disclose that he was in care. It is interesting to consider how the psychological subject of 'you' moved the emphasis away from Zacharay. As we continued talking, I positioned Zacharay as the psychological subject, asking how he positions himself in relation to what had just been said:

Kate: No (2) no (.) did you want people to *know* kinda?

Zacharay: Not *that* bothered me

Kate: You *weren't* that bothered

Zacharay: No

(transcript 1, lines 422- 423).

Reflecting on this dialogue, I wondered if I doubted Zacharay's reply by almost repeating my question. There was a contradiction within the narrative between being forced to tell people you are in care even if you might not want to and Zacharay not being bothered about whether he tells people this. Perhaps this serves to reinforce that even though Zacharay does not mind telling people that he is in care, it should be his decision rather than being forced upon him by the support arrangements in school.

'...that was a good one...'

Within this story positive narratives of school were constructed, for example when Zacharay described his school in Bigtown he placed emphasis on the word '*good*':

Zacharay: Yeah (.) that was a *good one*

I was in there for like 1 to 2 years

(transcript 1, lines 164-165).

We further explored together what worked to construct this school positively and it seemed to me that this came from how things were going well for Zacharay there; the school was local to where he was living, he had friends at the school and the staff, his behaviour and grades were '*all right*' (Zacharay, transcript 1, line 168). When I then asked Zacharay to talk about any particular memory or episode from that school he spoke about times that he had been involved in activities with friends, such as a performance and watching a world cup football match. While talking about these times, Zacharay positioned himself along with his friends taking part in these activities:

Zacharay: (3) ermm (.) it was like (.) I had like a *gang of friends* and we *did* like a performance (1) /cos we did like an X-factor thing
(transcript 1, line 180).

The language and emphasis that Zacharay used here constructed a narrative in which he felt very much part of a community of friends within this school, so much so that he described them as a '*gang*'. Zacharay was positioned as proud of their performance:

Zacharay: yeah, like a talent show/and we like did a *song* or whatever/*dance* routine sort of like that (3)/about five of us/in front of like (.) the *whole* school

Kate: oh fantastic
(transcript 1, line 183).

'...I was like predicted like Bs and As and Cs mostly'

Within this story, Zacharay is constructed as a successful learner. When we discussed school assessments, Zacharay's attainment, performance and predicted results were constructed positively:

Zacharay: did *my* sats /can't remember what the results *were* but they were *all right* (.)
(transcript 1, line 338).

Zacharay: b but I was *in* that school *until* (1) cos I'd done *most* of my English coursework *there*

Kate: Mm

Zacharay: And/ *god knows* where it is though
it was *good* though I *liked* it
and I was like predicted like *Bs* and *As* and *Cs* mostly

Kate: *fantastic*

Zacharay: It was a (1) *C* in *English* (.) *A* what *A* in science (.) *A* in *maths* and *B* in *ICT* and a few other subjects /but I can't remember what they were

Kate: That's really good
(transcript 1, lines 468-473).

I noticed the way that Zacharay positioned himself as proud of his work within this extract, qualifying that his English course work was *good* and that he *liked* it. I felt that this extract further constructed Zacharay as scholarly and as being interested in his own learning. We further constructed his learning as successful by the grades that he was predicted and by my affirmation that those predicted grades were 'really good'.

'...but because I couldn't sit them I couldn't get them...'

However, the disruptive effect of school moves constructed Zacharay as unable to fulfil his potential. Zacharay moved schools in the year of his GCSE exams and so was unable to sit his examinations:

Zacharay: but because I couldn't *sit* them I couldn't *get* them so I *left well* I got to college with like *no* GCSEs

Kate: because you were *moving* /so was that your GCSE *year*

Zacharay: yeah
(transcript 1, lines 482-484).

In another example from the story, Zacharay's moves between schools were further constructed as restricting his potential, preventing him from completing core requirements of his GCSEs:

Zacharay: I did my *coursework* my English *coursework* /that was it English
cos maths doesn't have coursework anymore

Kate: and did you *take* that (.) could you take that with *you* to Farshire and use that for your GCSE's?

Zacharay: I *could* of but I *couldn't* get hold of the school
(transcript 1, lines 491-494).

This quotation was set within a narrative about Zacharay trying unsuccessfully to contact his teacher to retrieve his coursework. I felt that this positioned Zacharay as

having responsibility to sort difficulties caused by decisions made within the care system.

'...I wasn't learning anything that I didn't already know...'

Zacharay's educational experience when he moved back to Urbantown was constructed as inadequate. It felt to me that this was a narrative about Zacharay being put into an educational placement that was available, rather than into the one that was most suitable for him. The extract below is taken from our discussion about the ASDAN course that Zacharay was following:

- Kate: so *how* did they *go* for you?
- Zacharay: err well there *wasn't* really *structured* work it was mostly like (1)
well (.)cos there was like an *engineering* one /they *basically* gave you an *engine* [
- Kate: right yeah[
- Zacharay: to take *apart* and put back *together*/which was *easy* enough /
- Zacharay: but I *wasn't* actually *doing* anything constructive I don't think cause I *wasn't* learning *anything* that I didn't *already know*

(transcript 1, lines 566-570).

This construction of the educational experience being inappropriate for Zacharay continued:

- Zacharay: it's like with college *now* (1) like when you do *maths* and *English* and stuff
you don't actually *do* maths and English *lessons* /you *only* do like *practice* tests
- Kate: oh okay
- Zacharay: which is *isn't* actually *learning* any like *new* maths or English that I *didn't* already *know*

(transcript 1, lines 571-573).

This constructed an ironic image of an educational placement where you don't learn anything. The presence of these narratives within the story further positioned Zacharay as being motivated by education and concerned about having a good education. This was reinforced when he spoke about finding tuition out of college which again, constructed Zacharay as having been let down by the system and so having to seek tuition:

Zacharay: so (.) I th I'm *looking* to like maths *tuition* and *stuff* now

Kate: to have *outside* of college? [

Zacharay: yeah

(transcript 1, lines 574-575).

Similarly, this construction of the system letting Zacharay down was developed when we spoke about how the Maths and English courses that Zacharay had been doing were not challenging him and he wanted something different in college:

Kate: yeah (1) /and can *they* offer *you* anything *different*?

well they've got *GCSE* maths where you *do* learn like *GCSE maths*

Kate: mm

Zacharay: but they don't *offer* it like only they *don't* offer it unless you've *got* *GCSE* maths *already* /like a *low* level

Kate: oh *right*

Zacharay: *well* cos my *predicted* were B and A but I *couldn't* get that in my old school

Kate: yeah

Zacharay: so they had to *start* me at the *bottom* of level I

Kate: oh that's *frustrating*

(transcript 1, lines 587-592).

Although Zacharay would like to study for his GCSE Maths and the college that he is attending offers this course, he cannot enrol on it because he hasn't already got a Maths GCSE that he needs to re-sit. He had been unable to take his GCSE exams because of the timing of his placement moves. This made me feel very sad;

Zacharay is a bright and motivated young man who wants the opportunity to learn and obtain his qualifications, but the effects of his previous care placement moves are preventing this. I wondered if these narratives represented a clash between the social care system and the educational system; the educational system was too rigid to cope with and accommodate the effects of the care system.

'...cos I'm a kid in care they have to offer me a place'

Within Zacharay's story the care system is constructed as having rules and powers. For example, when Zacharay returned to live in Urbantown, he was placed on roll at a school where there was no place for him:

- Zacharay: there was *no* place in City View because it was already all *full* up
- Kate: right
- Zacharay: but I got registered with City View for like *funding* from social services

(transcript 1, lines 502-503).

It felt to me that throughout Zacharay's story the two institutional systems of care and education were constructed as clashing with each other, detracting from meeting Zacharay's rights. This was the case when the care system moved Zacharay but the educational system was not able to cope with these moves. In this example, although the power of the care system ensured that Zacharay was placed on roll at City View School, he was still not actually given a place there:

- Zacharay: Yeah they (.) *Well* they *tried* to get me a *place* at City View
- Kate: Yeah
- Zacharay: but there was *no* places *left*
- Kate: ah right
- Zacharay: cos I'm a kid in *care* they *have* to offer me a *place*
- Kate: yeah

Zacharay: but they *had* absolutely cos like *classes* were like 30 38 in a class now anyway

Kate: mmm

Zacharay: so there was like *nowhere* to go

Kate: so they they *put* you on *role* because you are in *care*

Zacharay: yeah

Kate: but they couldn't *actually*

Zacharay: *take* me yeah

Kate: *take* you

(transcript 1, lines 518-524).

This narrative constructed for me, a sense of things not being as they seem. On the surface Zacharay appeared to have a school place, but the reality was different. This situation lead to Zacharay being given educational placements which he constructed as being '*rubbish*' (Zacharay, line 506), giving me the impression that Zacharay felt that he had been dumped into these placements. When we continued to talk about this move, I got a sense of him having no other option:

Kate: so did *you* have the *opportunity* to choose a *different* school that *did* have a space *or*

Zacharay: mm they *tried* a few schools but there weren't *any* like River View School are and green *what's* that Green *called?*

Kate: *umm* Town

Zacharay: yeah *Town* Green

Kate: yeah

Zacharay: and *no* no one had any *places* round *Urbantown*

(transcript 1, lines 525-529).

City View School was selected because it was available rather than because it was most suited to his needs or interests:

Zacharay: well that were like the *only* school that was there

Kate: ah that could *take* you yeah that could take *you*

(transcript 1, line 538).

Another example of the care system being constructed as having rules and regulations developed when Zacharay was talking about his desire to go to university. Here Zacharay stressed that the care system has set a limit upon the age of university students that it will fund:

Zacharay: so I've *got* like *two* years to get a university place so like I *need* to get a university place before I'm 21

Kate: oh right *okay/why* is *that*?

Zacharay: cause I'm sure these */social* services will *only* fund *you* if you *get* on a university course before the age of *21*

(transcript 1, lines 626-627).

This segment of the narrative was set within a context of Zacharay constructing a plan of the timescales of when he had to complete his college courses in order to achieve his goal of going to university, within the limits and confines of the care system regulations.

'...so I reckon being in that like stable family environment probably helped with the school aspect'

Foster care and residential placements were constructed as having very different effects upon Zacharay's school experiences. When we spoke about Zacharay's school in Bigtown, the narrative was very positive and Zacharay constructed being in foster care as the reason that he was not expelled from this school:

Zacharay: *and* (.) I think that was about the *only* school /that I didn't get expelled from

Kate: oh was it (1)/ *what* do you think it was that was going *well* for you there or (.) *why* do you think? (3)

Zacharay: err (3) because that placement was a *foster* placement (.) and most of my others were residential care homes

Kate: Aahh (.) right

Zacharay: so I reckon being in that like stable family environment
/probably *helped* (.) with the school aspect

(transcript 1, lines 203-207).

This construction of foster care being a stable family environment which also stabilised school placements was developed further through our narrative:

Zacharay: yeah cause in the foster carers'/ they'd like treat you like normal family

you'd go to (.) school (.) from like nine to three or whatever

(transcript 1, lines 210 – 211).

Zacharay's comment about being treated like a normal family links with a theme that reoccurs within the narrative, about being different from or the same as other people at school. This was added to when Zacharay contrasted what it is like to start a new school when living in residential care with living in foster care:

Zacharay: and in residential care home (.) they'd try to *ease you in gradually* into it (.)

like starting in the *mornings* and then do an *afternoon* and stuff like that/

which I think just *messes it up*

(transcript 1, lines 212-214).

Starting school while living in residential care seemed to me to be constructed as something difficult to do; Zacharay had to be gradually eased into school positioning him as fragile and not able to start school full time like other pupils. This contrast was further constructed in our second interview:

Zacharay: because *in* /whilst you are in *foster care* /the foster carers obviously want to make a more *stable home*

so they like put you in to school *full-time* straight away

whilst at /like children's home and stuff they like tried to (.) build up to *it*

so like put you on *part* timetables and stuff like *that*
 so it worked *better* because I went straight into it
 Kate: *why* do you think that worked better for *you*
 Zacharay: because *then* I was just *like* every other kid in *there*
 just went to school nine till *three* or whatever

(transcript 2, lines 28-35).

I interpreted this segment as constructing a narrative of foster carers creating a more stable home and Zacharay being treated the same as other pupils with the same expectations, leading to a more positive start and time in school for Zacharay. Zacharay moved from a more general psychological subject of 'you' to positioning himself as the subject above. This created a more general narrative about how things work in foster care, which was then applied as working well for him. The narrative of a 'more stable home' and 'normal' family was further explored below:

Kate: and I just wondered if you /if you *know* or what you *think*
 was more *stable* about the environment and how it felt more
 like a *normal* family /being with foster *carers* a[
 Zacharay:]because being with foster *carers* /you can probably make
 more of a *relationship* /cos there's only *two* err (.) well (.)
 normally only *two* of them /just *all* the *time*
 Kate: Yeah
 Zacharay: Whist in residential care *homes* /they change staff every *day*
 Kate: Ahh so those relationships are harder to (1) b build up
 Zacharay: Probably

(transcript 2, lines 42-45).

Here relationships were constructed as contributing to a stable environment and feeling like a normal family. Zacharay constructed relationships as being easier to develop in the foster care environment where there are two carers rather than a changing number of staff. I noted how the use of the word 'staff' in relation to people caring for him in residential care, makes it very hard to think of them as family.

'...my brother lived in Urbanville...'

Zacharay's family are constructed as being part of the beginning, middle and projected future of this story. Zacharay had been living with his mother when he attended the first school which he talked about. His first move into residential care was when he moved to Urbanville to the same placement as one of his brothers:

Zacharay: well [coughs] my *brother* lived in *Urbanville*
so they just *moved* me into the same care home that he was
in

(transcript 1, lines 244-245).

Contrasting with this narrative of keeping his family together is one of separation; these two boys were not able to attend the same school. This resulted in Zacharay having a lengthy taxi journey each day:

Zacharay: but *they* they didn't *want* him un me going to the *same*
school

Kate: okay

Zacharay: so I went to one like *four* miles *away*

(transcript 1, lines 542-543)

In contrast to these constructions of separations from family members, the projected future for Zacharay within this story is one of being joined with his brothers, working together in an IT business:

Zacharay: well I've *got* employees *already* me brothers

Kate: ahhh

Zacharay: like one *brother* is a really good at is like *networking* and
problem solving and stuff like that /*one* is like a *salesman* he
can sell *anything*

(transcript 1, lines 638-639).

'so like I need to get a university place before I'm 21'

This story constructs Zacharay as having positive aspirations for his future, with detailed plans of what he wants to do and how he will achieve this. At the time of our interviews, Zacharay had been offered interviews for two different college courses and he positioned himself as being able to make the choice about which of these to pursue:

Zacharay: I've *applied* for two courses and they've both given me *interviews*

so I'll have to see which one I *want*

(transcript 1, lines 612-613).

Within this story, Zacharay's plan for his future career is to go to university to do '*something* computery' (Zacharay, line 631) and to open his own IT shop. Within this narrative, Zacharay set out detailed steps of what he will need to do to achieve this projected future:

Zacharay:]*College* level two this year

Kate: yeah

Zacharay: get a *merit* /so I'll do like /cos I *didn't* get a merit this year /so I *need* to get a merit /

well I *didn't* get a well *this* year yeah so I *need* to get a merit *this* year *next* year /so I can go for a level *three* 2011 2012

Kate: yeah

Zacharay: so then I'm going to *go* for level *three* (1) go for

how *old* will be *then* how *old* am I *now* 17 (.) 18 (.) 18 /I'll be like 19

Kate: mm

Zacharay: so I've *got* like two years to get a university place so like I *need* to get a university place before I'm 21

(transcript 1, lines 621-626).

The only limiting factor to his preferred future in this narrative is the age limit imposed by the social care system; Zacharay must get a University place before the age of 21 to qualify for funding.

Similarly, when constructing his future of opening an IT shop, Zacharay outlined detailed plans of when and how he would do this, working with his brothers so that they all utilised their particular skills and strengths:

- Zacharay: get some money and then /*when* I'm 18 I'm gunna get a loan from the *bank* (1)
- that and *then* like *rent accommodation* and *equipment* stuff like (.)/hire *employees* /well I've *got* employees *already* me brothers
- Kate ahhh
- Zacharay: like one *brother* is a really good at is like *networking* and problem solving and stuff like that /*one* is like a *salesman* he can sell *anything*
- Kate: uhh huh
- Zacharay: and *I'm* more of like the *manager* that's *why* I'm going for like a *business* course
- Kate: yeah
- Zacharay: so I can *structure* the business and everything like that

(transcript 1, lines 635-641).

Zacharay has positioned himself as the manager of this business, and this construction of him as the future manager was reinforced by how Zacharay had positioned himself as the psychological subject sorting out all the details of setting up their business.

Jimbo's Story

'I've been everywhere'

It felt to me that this story was constructed with movement weaving throughout it, creating for me a sense of confusion. Within this story Jimbo moved between schools, care placements and different parts of the country. These multiple moves fragmented his experience through school and created a temporally fragmented narrative of events. At the start of the narrative when I asked Jimbo to partition his time in school into chapters, he replied: 'I can only remember two' (transcript 3, line 8) as if there were many other schools that he has been to. This confusion was further constructed when we attempted to detail the number of schools that Jimbo had attended:

Kate: have you been to lots of different schools?

Jimbo: yeah yeah

Kate: can you remember how *many* you've been to?

Jimbo: lo loads

Kate: loads

Jimbo: don't know

Kate: could you *guess* how many schools you've *been* to?

Jimbo: probably (.) /*six*

(transcript 3, lines 185-213).

Similarly, when I asked Jimbo which was the last school that he attended before returning to Urbantown, the word 'probably' in his reply, helped to construct a story in which details are hazy and unclear:

Kate: which was the *last* school that you were at before /before
Urbantown?

Jimbo: probably *Park View*

(transcript 3, lines 273-274).

The two schools that Jimbo chose to talk about within this narrative were Meadow View in Ruralshire and Park View in Urbanville, which he described as ‘*me main ones*’ (Jimbo, transcript 2, line 14). Through our dialogue I tried to establish the temporal order that Jimbo attended these schools:

Kate: and umm before going *there*/is that what

when you were at Meadow View was that the school *before* Park View?

Jimbo: *well* before

(transcript 3, lines 151-153).

Jimbo’s reply indicated to me that the time in between these schools was missing from this story. When I asked Jimbo how long he had spent in Meadow View his reply indicated to me that three years was a relatively long time to be in one school:

Kate: *and* (.) did you stay /*how long* did you stay do you remember how long you stayed like in the *main* school?

Jimbo: errm for a good three year

Kate: mm hmm

Jimbo: that were that were a *long* one that

Kate: yeah *compared* to others?

Jimbo: yeah

(transcript 3, lines 181-184).

If three years is constructed to be a long placement, it makes me wonder how long Jimbo spent in his other schools that are not included within this story.

Not only was this story one of movement between schools, but also between care placements and regions of the country:

Kate: and I *noticed* that Meadow View was in Ruralshireshire and then *that* one was in Urbanville and now you are in Urbantown

have you moved to lots of *different* [

Jimbo: Yeah

Kate:]like cities and towns?

Jimbo: yeah /been Urbridge (.) Ruralshire (.) Bigtown (.) Townville
(.)Seatown

I've been *everywhere*

(transcript 3, lines 214-217).

Six different locations were talked about above and Jimbo's emphasis on the word 'everywhere' helped to construct a story dominated by change and movement. This movement was constructed as sudden and without warning, with '*instant*' (Jimbo, line 322) notice being given to Jimbo of a placement move.

Moving between placements led to an inevitable move of school and the narrative of a fragmented educational experience was further constructed by the time taken after a move of placement to be moved into a school:

Jimbo: ...I'd get in a *placement*

and it would take a good few *months* before they would move me
into a *school*

(transcript 3, lines 226-227).

'I've been in care since I were two so..'

Within this story, being in care is constructed as something which created many moves for Jimbo. In lines 226-227 above, a move into a new school was constructed to be a consequence of moving care placements. In the narrative segment below, the definiteness of the words 'of *course*' (transcript 3, line 192), and the emphasis placed upon them, helped to construct a narrative in which being in care makes moving to many schools inevitable:

Jimbo: I've been in *care* since I were two so

Kate: have *you*?

Jimbo: yeah

Kate: and does that *mean* /do you *think* that you have moved round more
schools than you might have done?

Jimbo: yeah (1) of *course* (2)

because if you are not /if you are not in *care* and you've got your own *parents* then (.) they'll move you to one *school*

and you stay in one *area* and till they move their actual *house*

(transcript 3, lines 190-194).

By contrasting the situation of living with parents, Jimbo further reinforced the construction of this inevitability of being in care leading to multiple moves between schools:

Stanza 3: When you are in care they chuck you into a school and think that you'll be al-reet.

Jimbo: whereas when you are in *care*

they they will move you to a *school*

just *chuck* you in/ oh we'll *chuck* him in *here* (.)

we'll put him in *here* he'll be *al-reet* (1)

Kate: mmm

Stanza 4: When that care home gets up you are moved on to another school

Jimbo: and when that care home gets *up*

they'll move you *on* and chuck you in another *school*

that's how they work *now*

Kate: oh does it (2) /so where ever you are *living* (1)/

Strophe 3: You get used to being forced to move

Stanza 5: You get used to it

Kate: that could be quite tough [quietly]

Jimbo: you get *used* to it after a while

Kate: did you *feel* that they were thinking about *you* when they[

Jimbo: no

Kate:]moved *schools*?

Jimbo: well they /no

(transcript 3, lines 195-206).

Within this narrative segment Jimbo moved from positioning himself as the psychological subject to the more general subject of 'you'. This had the effect of constructing a more general rule about how the care system works, one that might be applied to anyone within it.

The use of language here, such as 'chuck' in stanza 3, constructed an uncaring and impersonal care system. The use of ventriloquism in this stanza further reinforces this image of an uncaring social care system, personalising it to a practitioner who fits with this constructed rule about how the care system works. In stanza 5 I moved the psychological subject back to Jimbo, asking him how this was for him. It felt very sad to me when he replied: 'you get used to it after a while'. I noted that Jimbo didn't position himself as the psychological subject and I could perhaps infer from this that although Jimbo was telling me that 'you get used to it', he hadn't.

This story constructed an uncaring, impersonal care system where young people get used to being moved around with very little thought. I got a sense of Jimbo waiting for things to happen to him; being moved on from a care placement, waiting months to get chucked into a school only for this cycle to start again. This sense of powerlessness and inevitability was further emphasised when I asked Jimbo if he thought things may have been different if he hadn't been moving around:

Kate: so do you *think* that things might have been *different* umm (1)
if you hadn't been being moved *round* so much?

Jimbo: probably *yeah*/ but I can't say *that* can I

/that's not one of them things you can say

(transcript 3, lines 238-241).

I was struck by Jimbo's response; is the care system so powerful that as an individual who has been subject to it, he cannot resist and consider different

possibilities? Has Jimbo never had any choices in his life and so there is no point in thinking about it now? Or is it too painful to think about how things might have been different? I asked Jimbo why you 'can't say' those things and he spoke about how life could have been different if he was living with his mother:

Kate: Why not?

Jimbo: then if I were /if I were with me *mum* then I'd probably be in I mean one school *only*

Kate: mmm

Jimbo: instead of moving from *Urbantown* to *Ruralshire* to *Urbridge*

(transcript 3, lines 242-244).

Within this narrative the way that the care system works has been constructed as so powerful and rigid that other possible alternatives, such as being in care but not moving schools, cannot be considered. In Jimbo's story the only way that he would have been moving around less would have been if he had been living with his mother, out of the care system.

'I didn't have a choice'

Jimbo's lack of control over the choices in his life permeated this story; a constructed consequence of being in care was that decisions were taken for him and life happened to him. Within this story, decisions are often taken by an impersonal other referred to as 'they'. For example, when Jimbo spoke about getting excluded for selling cannabis in school, it was 'they' who made the decisions:

Jimbo: and then they kicked me *out* because they said I was selling weed in it

Jimbo: and they they tried they excluded *me* for it for two *weeks* or so

(transcript 3, lines 25 & 30).

Similarly, 'they' made decisions about the subjects that he studied in Park View school:

Kate: and did you choose *those*?

Jimbo: no that's what they gave *us*

Kate: that's what you had to *do* when you went *there*

Jimbo: Yeah

(transcript 3, lines 139-142).

Through our dialogue, we co-constructed a narrative where Jimbo was not able to choose the subjects that he took. It is interesting to note that my questions and responses related directly to Jimbo, positioning him as the psychological subject of this stanza. Jimbo resisted this and positioned himself along with others at the school, all being given particular courses to follow. The power held by those making decisions within Jimbo's life was reinforced by the strong, almost violent language used:

Kate: *when* you moved *placements* did you have did you *choose* to move placements?

Jimbo: no/ I were *forced* to move.

(transcript 3, lines 209-210).

Jimbo's story made an explicit link between having little control over decisions and being in care when we spoke about Jimbo attending Park View School:

Kate: when did *you* /like did you *choose* to go *there* /or did *someone*

Jimbo: no I'd been in *care* since I were two year *old*

so I got *moved* there /by my (1) social worker

(transcript 3, lines 42-44).

Jimbo's reply constructed for me a sense of inevitability, as if things could not have been any different. Similarly, this came through when we spoke about Jimbo leaving Park View:

Kate: did you want to leave the *school*?

Jimbo: I didn't have a *choice*

Kate: If you *had* a choi

Jimbo: I ran *away* /and come to *Urbantown*

(transcript 3, lines 87-91).

Jimbo resisted my invitation to talk about whether he wanted to leave, stating that he had no choice. When I returned to the question he interrupted my speech. Although we constructed a narrative of no choice, I feel that Jimbo resisted this in the story by asserting his agency and running away.

Within this story, a tension arose between Jimbo wanting to assert his agency and resist control and not being able to do so because attendance on his current course was part of his legal order. The narrative of control was constructed very powerfully here, as being bound in law:

Jimbo: that's one thing I don't *like*

I'm going to *start* walking *out* me

it's it's not like I *can* walk out though

do you know what I mean?

it's an *actual* course that I've *got* to take part in cos of me *order*

(transcript 3, lines 112-116).

Traceable through Jimbo's story are examples of counter-narratives, resisting the dominant narrative of lack of control and choice. For example, when we spoke about Park View School Jimbo said:

Jimbo: I just saw it as a place to go to chill out

cause you didn't do much work there

you just did a few pieces of work and then you just get to chill out

Kate: ahh

Jimbo: and if you *didn't* get to chill out and you had to do more *work*

you just kick *off* and they'd end up letting you chill *out*

(transcript 3, lines 65-69).

Within this stanza, Jimbo exerted his agency, resisting the 'work' imposed on him by his teachers. By using the psychological subject of 'you' within this dialogue, it had the effect of positioning him alongside others in this school who also adhered to this rule of how to take control in Park View. This counter-narrative of taking control from authority is further constructed in an episode in which the pupils of Park View take over the school:

Jimbo: one of the times I took oer all *school* an locked all teachers *out* (.)
and got all kids to come into school
and we took it *ooer*

Kate: mmm

Jimbo: and then they called coppers and rushed *ooer*

Kate: what happened after that?

Jimbo: well they got all kids *out* /and tha all staff got let back *in*

Kate: mm hmm (3)

Jimbo but we/ we jumped all in *windas* in office *windas* pushed and got the

set the fire alarms off so all *staff* went outside

(transcript 3, lines 256 to 263).

Jimbo initially positioned himself as the hero and psychological subject of this episode then changed and positioned himself along with others in this story as 'we'. I felt that this episode was one of an uprising, of excitement and danger, involving the police and chaos. Young people took collective control of the school domain, one that usually both belongs to and represents authority.

In part nine of this story, we discussed moving between placements and Jimbo spoke about an incident of leaving a foster carer's care. This was full of contradictions, and constructed both a narrative of a lack of control and a counter-narrative resisting this:

Jimbo: got kicked *out*/ cos like one /one of my carers /my foster carers came *back* from *work* /and he were in a *mood* (2)

so I /we had an *argument* and I kicked *off* and I whacked him round the *leg* with an air rifle

Kate: mm

Jimbo: and I stormed out/ ran *off*

Kate: and then *you* went

Jimbo: yeah

Kate: what happened did you go back after *that*

Jimbo: no I ran *off* to one of me /like a respite carers house where I knew where it *were*

Kate: yeah

Jimbo: I got like *train* and I went to their *house* and I went /right I want to *move* (2)

and they *rang* social workers and told em *situation* and then I got put in a different *place*

Kate: and what about your *things*/ did you go *back* and pack

Jimbo: no (2) left them [quiet] (5)

(transcript 3, lines 325-333).

Initially, Jimbo said that he 'got kicked out', supporting the narrative of having no control. However, the plot moved on and Jimbo asserted his agency, running off and instigating a move away from this foster carer's home. Although this segment of narrative offers some resistance to the dominant narrative of lack of control, the last two lines left me feeling very sad. Taking control was not without cost and Jimbo lost his belongings in the process. The way that Jimbo spoke these lines so quietly, suggested to me that at this moment we were both sharing these feelings of sadness and loss.

'...that were a proper secondary school that'

I found it interesting to consider the way that schools were constructed within this narrative. Park View was the first school which arose in the story and was also the

last school which Jimbo had attended. Park View was constructed as a place that fell short of being a proper school:

Jimbo: that was just a *behavioural* school *that*
everyone were just running round *riot*
and they didn't do no *work* /they didn't do *nothing*

(transcript 3, lines 38-40).

I felt that the use of the word 'just' dismissed Park View's status as a school as it was first introduced. This construction of a story in which Jimbo attended a school that was not a proper school was more explicitly developed in the following lines:

Jimbo: it *weren't* a *school* /it weren't a school

Kate: what was it *like* /can you tell me a bit *about*

Jimbo: well it was *sposed* to be a *school*

but *I* didn't see it as a school

Jimbo: I just saw it as a place to go to chill out

(transcript 3, lines 61-65).

It is interesting how this story constructs contrasts between how things are meant to be and how they really are. Such as a school which does not provide education and an uncaring social care system.

In contrast to the construction of Park View School, Meadow View School, which Jimbo attended in Ruralshire, was constructed positively and as a proper school:

Jimbo: that were *al-reet*

that were a proper secondary school *that*.

(transcript 3, lines 161-162).

When I asked Jimbo more about what a school should be like, Jimbo added that you sit and work in a proper school:

Kate: yeah (2) and what do you *think* like school *should* be *like*?

Jimbo: proper *school* where you *sit* down and do *work* (.)

(transcript 3, lines 281-282).

I sensed a feeling of Jimbo having been let down within this story. Although Park View was relaxed and '*alright* /for what it was' (Jimbo, line 150), it was not a 'proper' school where Jimbo was able to sit down and work towards his qualifications which he later said he wished he had got.

'...all they were bothered about was getting money for their job'

The way in which paid professionals were constructed through the narrative, created a story in which Jimbo had been let down by these people who were often referred at as 'they', anonymous others. Jimbo spoke about how young people are chucked into schools and care homes and we co-constructed social care professionals as not thinking about Jimbo when they moved him:

Kate: did you *feel* that they were thinking about *you* when they[

Jimbo: no

Kate:]moved *schools*?

Jimbo: well they /*no*

(transcript 3, lines 205-206).

The teachers encountered within this story were constructed in a similar way, as more concerned with their wages than with individual pupils such as Jimbo:

Jimbo: ...all *they* were *bothered* about was getting
money for their *job*

(transcript 3, lines 54-55).

In contrast to this, at one point within our interview we started to construct a tentative counter-narrative, resisting this dominant narrative of lack of care and concern:

Kate: did anyone like sit down and *ask* you like what you *wanted* to do?

Jimbo: plenty of people have asked me *what* what I'm doing

but it's just being bothered to do it /and actually quitting weed and

Kate: mm hmm

Jimbo: just moving *on/* that's the *hard* part

when I *like* just being *chilled* out

(transcript 3, lines 122-126).

Within this story, some professionals in Jimbo's life had asked him what he would like to do, but Jimbo has found it difficult to quit cannabis. This could be constructed as professionals offering the wrong sort of help, addressing what subjects he wants to study instead of his cannabis smoking. The narrative constructed professionals who have not got to know Jimbo and therefore overlooked his wishes and needs, pushing him into an educational system which did not flex to meet his concerns.

Further support for this counter-narrative, where some professionals have shown care and concern, comes from an episode in part nine of the story. Here, Jimbo has had an argument with his foster carer who was constructed as an uncaring professional who had kicked Jimbo out:

Jimbo: no I ran *off* to one of me /like a respite carers house where I knew where it *were*

Kate: yeah

Jimbo: I got like *train* and I went to their *house* and I went /right I want to *move* (2)

and they *rang* social workers and told em *situation* and then I got put in a different *place*

(transcript 3, lines 329-331).

I interpreted this stanza as constructing this respite carer as someone who could be trusted and who helped Jimbo to move to a different placement.

Although I had not asked Jimbo specifically about his friends, I felt sad that the people who dominated this narrative were those paid to be in Jimbo's life, predominantly constructed as uncaring. When talking about his experiences within

school, Jimbo often positioned himself with his peers. This served to construct a narrative of things being the same for everyone in school. Jimbo made explicit references to his friends on two occasions, when he spoke about daily life in Meadow View School:

Jimbo: have a spliff with me *mates* /in school int car *park* before going *school*

(transcript 3, line 74).

And again when talking about Meadow View school:

Jimbo: well to Meadow View/ Meadow View was al-*reet*

because I was with all me *mates*

but then er er you make mates anywhere where you go don't you so

Kate: some people do yeah (.) yeah.

(transcript 3, lines 177-180).

I felt that these references to friends, constructed them as important in Jimbo's life. However, I felt sadness in Jimbo's words that 'you make mates anywhere you go' (transcript 3, line 179). It constructed to me, a story of transience, where friends continually have to be re-made. I am aware that my emotional interpretation of sadness and aloneness in these lines is influenced by my own personal constructions of friendship being about lasting and enduring relationships; Jimbo or other readers may not feel my sadness at this part of the story.

'I get high... I'm a drug sort of person'

Within Jimbo's story, he positioned himself within a repertoire of cannabis smoking. After our brief introduction, Jimbo opened his story with an incident of being excluded from school for selling weed:

Jimbo: I used to sell *weed* in me secondary in me sec /at that *Park View*

Kate: mm hmm

Jimbo: and then they kicked me *out* because they said I was selling weed in it

(transcript 3, lines 24-25).

Jimbo's school days in Park View were constructed as being dominated by smoking cannabis:

Jimbo: I'd wake up int *morning*

Kate: mm

Jimbo: make me *spliffs* go get in a *taxi/* go to *school/*

have a spliff with me *mates/* in school int car *park* before going *school/*

go in *class/* go in (.) do my work and break *time/* have a *spliff*

then go back in/ work again and it were *lunchtime/* went out for *more* spliffs then ke/

that's *all* I used to *do*

(transcript 3, lines 72-77).

Within this story, Jimbo positioned himself both as being the same as others in this school and as separate from them:

Jimbo:]and when I didn't bring it *in* then *other* kids used to bring it *in*

Kate: so that was something that was (.) kind of really *big* any way

it *felt* like *everybody* was doing the same thing

Jimbo: yeah/ but I got *blamed* for it *all* (2)

everyone else everyone else were bringing it *in*

but I got blamed for *it/* for *selling* it

Kate: why do you think it was *you* that?

Jimbo: I don't know because I was the *biggest* one out of them

(transcript 3, lines 78-85).

Jimbo positioned himself with others, smoking together and all bringing cannabis into school, normalising smoking weed at school. However Jimbo's separateness

from others was emphasised by being blamed and excluded for this practice and by his description of himself as the heaviest smoker.

Within this story, there is narrative tension between Jimbo's like of the feelings he achieves through smoking cannabis and the need to give up smoking it:

Jimbo: *but it's just* being bothered to do it/ and actually *quitting* weed and

Kate: mm hmm

Jimbo: just moving *on*/ that's the *hard* part

when I *like* just being *chilled* out

(transcript 3, lines 124-126).

Reading this narrative I feel that the chaotic nature of this story would make it difficult for Jimbo, the principal character, to feel calm and perhaps the cannabis smoking is an antecedent to this chaos. Continuing this narrative of the dominance of cannabis within Jimbo's life, when I asked Jimbo how I might describe him, he spoke about drugs and offered no further descriptions of himself:

Kate: what would I write about *you*?

Jimbo: smoke weed *every* day/(3) I get high/(2) I'm a drug sort of person

Kate: mmm/ is there anything else you'd like me to put about *you*?

Jimbo: no

(transcript 3, lines 34-37).

These comments, taken within the context of the rest of the narrative, could be constructed Jimbo as having nothing else that was truly 'his' or that he has chosen in his life.

'...me behaviour were getting bad'

Within this story, Jimbo's behaviour was constructed in contrasting ways. His behaviour was constructed as very powerful, making him move schools and requiring one-to-one adult support. In contrast, his behaviour was also constructed as harmless, as the class clown reaching out to others and as a symptom of not

being able to cope in lessons. Jimbo's behaviour was constructed as powerful and dangerous through the adult responses to his behaviour in his story:

Jimbo: they ended up moving me into *this* (.) like *supported accomo/ supported* building outside

Kate: as part of Meadow View?

Jimbo: yeah on the side of Meadow View

so they could like teach me in *there* because I weren't behaving well
int classes

(transcript 3, lines 166-169).

This construct of powerful and dangerous behaviour was further reinforced by the school's response to it:

Kate: Umm did um/ did umm/ did you receive much *support* in your schools to kind of *help* you with your behaviour or to help you with

Jimbo: well they put me on a *one-to-one/* in *most* schools

Kate: did they

Jimbo: cause of/ me behaviour were getting *bad*

(transcript 3, lines 246-248).

I have reflected upon how, through the language of my question above, I positioned this behaviour as within-Jimbo by suggesting that he may have received support to help him with it, perhaps to bring it under his control.

In contrast to the constructed narrative of powerful and dangerous behaviour, when Jimbo spoke more personally about his behaviour it was constructed in a harmless way, as a way of dealing with school life:

Jimbo: I ended up because of my *behaviour*

and I couldn't cope in *lessons*

and I just wanted to be the class clown

(transcript 3, lines 163-165).

By positioning himself as not being able to cope in lessons, Jimbo constructs himself as the 'problem', not being able to fit into the school, rather than taking the perspective that it was the school that could not cope with him. I felt sad as I returned to these lines, that Jimbo was constructed as to blame because he needed something which the care and educational systems were not giving him.

Jimbo's behaviour is constructed playfully, as a way of reaching out to others with humour:

Jimbo: I were chucking rulers
firing pieces of tissue at teachers

Kate: Yeah [quietly]

Jimbo: Basic class clown shit (3)
just to get (.) everyone to laugh

(transcript 3, lines 170-173).

This construction positioned Jimbo in an acceptable role within school narratives; that of the pupil who plays the fool, not as a dangerous member of the class. These different constructions of Jimbo's behaviour within this story created a sharp contrast between Jimbo's perspective and that of professional others'.

'I wish I had got more qualifications'

Within this story a narrative around qualifications arose several times. The 'Prove it' course, which Jimbo was attending, was constructed as a method of obtaining qualifications:

Jimbo: and that's *just* to get qualifications *back*

Kate: I haven't *heard of prove it/ what's that?*

Jimbo: some *course* (.) that you get your *qualifications* out of/ or something

(transcript 3, lines 101-103).

This dialogue was set within a narrative context of Jimbo not wanting to be part of this course because he was not being paid the Educational Maintenance Allowance which he had been promised would be given to him for his attendance. This could be interpreted as a construction of Jimbo being motivated by money for attending the course rather than the end result of any qualifications. This construction is not supported by a later part of Jimbo's story, when we were talking about a time in Jimbo's life when he did not have a school placement:

Jimbo: at the time it were *good*/ but now I *don't*

I I wish I had got more *qualifications* (.)

do you know what I mean?

Kate: mmm

Jimbo: now I *know* (1)/ what I *need* them qualifications for/ but back then I *didn't*

Kate: no

Jimbo: I thought what the *fuck* qualifications/ I don't give a shit what the fuck they are

(transcript 3, lines 232-236).

I felt a real sense of regret here, Jimbo constructed a younger version of himself who didn't care about qualifications which contrasted with the older Jimbo who did. I tried to resist slipping into the role of educational psychologist within this conversation, talking about how he can construct this preferred qualified future, perhaps obtaining these through his 'Prove It' course.

'Hopefully get a job...if I don't get sent down'

Jimbo's story constructed a future which seems tentative to me. When I asked Jimbo what he wants to do when he finishes his course, he emphasised the word '*hopefully*' and then interrupted my reply to indicate that he may get sent down and therefore would not be able to make such a choice:

Kate: and umm (.) / what do you want to *do* when you *finish*?

Jimbo: *hopefully* get a *job*

Kate: do you *know* (.) kind of

Jimbo: if I don't *get* sent *down*

Kate: do you think that might happen?

Jimbo: yeah

Kate: mmm (3) umm (3)

Kate: well have you have you *thought* kind of/ what kind of *job* you might be interested in?

Jimbo: working in a *shop* (.) warehouse (1) ought with physical *lifting* really

Kate: yeah kind of *physical* stuff

(transcript 3, lines 297-304).

At the time I felt that this story did not construct Jimbo as optimistic that he would have this future decision to make. This is consistent with dominant narratives which have constructed a story of lack of choice and control, where Jimbo's wishes have not been part of the unfolding plot. I felt that I moved between the roles of researcher and psychologist, asking Jimbo for details about the future job he might like and moving away from the possibility of prison. Through this dialogue we started to construct an alternative future narrative in which Jimbo could take control and make decisions about his life:

Kate: *and* you said you *didn't* really *choose* like what courses you were going to *do*

Jimbo: no

Kate: but I I guess you can have some choice when you finish about what you want to do next

Jimbo: yeah

(transcript 3, lines 313-316).

Chapter 5: Further discussion and conclusions

Within this chapter I return to consider the aims of my study and discuss the cautions and future possibilities of this research. I then consider the implications for my practice and for the educational psychology profession.

Overview

I set out on my research journey to explore narratives co-constructed between myself and Zacharay and Jimbo, who were looked after in local authority care and who had experienced school exclusion. I was interested how they were positioned within these and whether their stories challenged the dominant narratives that I interpreted to be constructed within the research literature surrounding LACYP.

Beyond Categorisation

I was motivated to explore voices behind the published statistics relating to LACYP. Both Zacharay and Jimbo are a similar age and both fit into the categories of being looked after, male and part of the 1% of LACYP who experience school exclusion (DCSF, 2009). They have both been part of the 10% of LACYP living in residential care (BAAF, 2010) and of the 34.4% of LACYP who did not obtain at least one grade A-G GCSE when they left year 11 (DCSF, 2009). However, this tells us very little about Zacharay's and Jimbo's actual experiences and what they would select as being pertinent to their lives. This narrative study has demonstrated the limitations to statistical categorisation. Through our constructed narratives, the uniqueness of each young person has been illustrated. These complex and rich descriptions of each young person cannot be contained within a homogenous category, such as 'looked after' or a further reduced statistical categorisation with this. Parker argues that:

...it is more helpful to focus upon the moments when members of a community or identity category challenge and refuse the attempt by others to make them fit into it. It is at those moments that we are able to see how the category functions to hold together a certain view of the world

Parker, 2008, p.19.

By exploring these individual narratives we are able to reflect upon the inability of the looked after category to contain the complexities of Zacharay's and Jimbo's stories. They both offered counter-narratives which challenged those dominating the literature surrounding LACYP.

Narrative Resonances

My experience of working with Jimbo and Zacharay differed through the feel of our relationships, our processes of co-construction, and our narratives. The length and content of our meetings and discussions varied, as did the number of times that Jimbo and Zacharay chose to meet with me. When engaged in the process of transcribing our meetings, I identified with Hollway and Jefferson's (2000) assertion that their '..transcript (did) not remotely resemble the ideal of a narrative interview..' (p.28). Like them, I also felt responsible for keeping our conversations going within the interviews and I noticed that I asked more questions in one of my interviews as I adapted my style to that young person. However, despite this, I felt that narratives were co-constructed between us. Jimbo's and Zacharay's stories were individual and very different, but I felt that I interpreted themes within each story which both resonated with those occurring within the other young person's story and also with dominant narratives within published research literature. I was also able to trace resistance to these dominant narratives, highlighting contradictions and counter-narratives and felt that the methodological approach of narrative enabled the complexities of these stories to emerge.

Both stories contained narratives of movement and created for me a sense of fragmentation and confusion. Perhaps my feelings of confusion also reflected the inherent difficulty of trying to understand how another person has made sense of and talks about their experiences and would be part of any co-construction process where we try to negotiate a coherent story together. Both stories constructed moving between schools as an inevitable result of living within the care system, although exceptions were illustrated. Care placements were constructed as transient, often breaking down and leading to both boys moving around the

country and having to change schools. At times, these placement moves were sudden, with instant notice and were constructed almost brutally. Such as when Zacharay was moved by three large men or when Jimbo ran away from a foster carer. Published research literature also contains dominant narratives of frequent movement between placements and schools, which disadvantage LACYP through structural factors of the social care system (Fletcher-Campbell, 1998). Within Jimbo's and Zacharay's stories we heard this dominant societal narrative; however their stories went beyond this and constructed the specific meaning of this within their own lives. Considering these narratives of frequent movement from the perspective of attachment theory which emphasises the importance of sensitivity and continuity in a child's care giver (Rutter & O'Connor 1999), we have constructed stories in which Zacharay and Jimbo were at risk of not being able to form secure attachments. Indeed, it could be construed that not only do the frequent moves and inconsistency of carers place these young people at risk of attachment difficulties, but that any attachment difficulties further put future placements under stress and at risk of breakdown (Bomber, 2007). An implication of this for professionals is to consider how we can provide consistency and sensitivity in care giving relationships for the LACYP whom we corporately parent.

Both stories constructed a disrupted education. A placement move within Jimbo's story preceded a wait of several months for a school placement and within Zacharay's story, it prevented him taking his GCSE exams or completing coursework requirements. Dominant narratives within government publications and research literature construct LACYP with poor educational outcomes such as fewer and lower grade GCSEs than their peers (DCSF, 2009; Dearden, 2004; Martin & Jackson, 2002). This positions many LACYP as unsuccessful learners, whereas Zacharay's and Jimbo's stories challenge this. Zacharay was presented as a successful learner concerned about achieving his qualifications but it was the enforced moves between schools that thwarted his attempts to achieve these. Jimbo was also positioned as regretful that he had no formal qualifications. I feel that by studying these narratives and giving voice to individuals behind statistics, we start to create

more real, human and complex pictures of young people within this system, deepening our understanding of how these lower educational outcomes develop and affect young people.

Zacharay's and Jimbo's individual stories constructed narratives of power imbalances between young people and professionals from the care and educational systems. For example, Jimbo's story painted a picture of Jimbo having no choices in his life and when asked how things might have been different, he replied that that was not something that he could say. The powerful care system was constructed as too rigid to ever be any different and had left him no possibility of voice within it. This narrative highlights the need for advocacy for LACYP, to ensure that their views and wishes are taken into account when decisions are being made. Power differences developed in Zacharay's story when he was held down by five members of staff to control his behaviour and when he was moved between care placements. However, their stories contained narratives of resistance to those of powerlessness. These were constructed when Jimbo ran away from a care placement, taking control of a situation he had had no choice in and when he worked with his peers to take over a school, normally the professional adult's domain of power. Narrative methodology enables us to construct such alternative realities away from dominating narratives that allow little room for agency.

Jimbo's and Zacharay's behaviour was at times constructed violently within these narratives, with examples of breaking windows, fighting with others and 'kicking off'. We constructed this behaviour in such a way that it had to be controlled by being held down by professionals within the narratives. Within the stories such behaviour resulted in a change of placement or school, creating a sense that what the behaviour may have been trying to communicate was not understood. By interpreting these narratives in light of attachment theory we may consider that Zacharay's and Jimbo's behaviour may have resulted from attachment difficulties and subsequent poor self-regulation. By viewing behaviour in this way, the implication for professionals is trying to understand what LACYP are communicating

by their behaviour and how as corporate parents we can support them in their school and care placements. This may be through network meetings as a group of professionals to ensure consistence of approach, through developing safe and calm spaces in their school and through working alongside LACYP to notice, interpret and translate strong feelings and to provide calming activities in order to support them to begin to self-regulate.

I felt that the narratives constructed within both stories contained several conflicts and contradictions, which would have been lost had I tried to reduce the stories further to summarise them. There were elements of illusion within both stories, of things being not as they seem. Jimbo's story constructed an uncaring care system and schools which were not real schools. Within Zacharay's story this was emphasised through educational experiences where he wasn't learning and being enrolled by a school which did not give him a place. I feel that this reminds us of the importance of our duty as corporate parents to look deeper and ask young people how life is for them, and act on this if things are not how they appear or need to be.

Both stories constructed narratives about the functioning of the care and educational systems. These included how schools have to offer LACYP a place, how funding for university is available if LACYP enrol up to the age of 21 and a rigid care system in which young people are chucked in to residential homes. Professionals were constructed as uncaring within Jimbo's story which could reflect difficult early attachment relationship experiences creating a cognitive model of relationships with adults characterised by mistrust, lack of concern and perhaps harm. This narrative prompts us to consider how we might facilitate trusting attachment relationships for the LACYP whom we parent and how we can include LACYP in decision making processes. Supporting LACYP from an attachment perspective suggests that any changes to school or care placement must be made by trying to minimise further feelings of rejection and by carefully supporting LACYP through each transition.

A narrative within Zacharay's story developed around the advantages of being in foster care rather than residential care, the stabilising affect that it had upon school placements and how it served to normalise his experiences. This narrative of normality, of the importance of not being seen as different to non-looked after peers has also arisen in previous research (Martin & Jackson, 2002). Zacharay spoke about the benefit of developing a relationship with two foster carers in comparison with the difficulty of trying to form relationships with many members of staff in residential care. This can be interpreted in light of attachment theory that suggests that consistent relationships are of key importance and that adults can start to work and challenge LACYP with attachment difficulties to do things differently in the context of genuine relationships (Bomber, 2007). Within this story, Zachary constructs genuine relationships as being able to be formed with two consistent carers rather than many, inconsistent members of staff. The implication for professional networks and schools working with LACYP is to identify fewer key workers to work directly with LACYP to build up genuine relationships. The professional can be supported through supervision and consultation with the wider corporate parent network.

Utilising a narrative methodology enabled me to critique systems from the perspective of how they operated for Zacharay and Jimbo within them. I felt that a conflict between the powerful education and social care systems developed in these stories. These systems were constructed as acting independently from each other and not being able to fit together. Zacharay's story created an educational system not able to cope with the care system through the narratives of Zacharay having to chase his English coursework when he moved and of being moved at times of educational importance. The powerful care system ensured that a school placed him on role, however the educational system did not give him a physical place within that school. Tensions between different facets of the local authority were being played out in Zacharay's story. Perhaps considering such tensions between these systems may help to unpick the question raised by Firth and Horrocks (1996) as to why LACYP experience such high exclusion levels when they

have the support of the local authority to secure their rights to education. This constructed narrative has political implications for the way that services work with or against each other and comments on the reality of how the government agenda of creating children's services and joined-up-practice is working. The need for multi-agency professionals to receive adequate training and guidance to support their working relationships and for school staff to develop deeper understandings of the care system and childrens' experiences has been identified previously (Fletcher-Campbell, 1998). Case examples such as Jimbo's and Zacharay's illustrate why this is so necessary, but also raise questions about how professionals' can affect change through their individual practice. Perhaps through increasing their knowledge of individual cases such as these, individuals can bring more understanding into their work and corporate parenting role with young people and effect change from a bottom-up level alongside top-down approaches of training and system design.

In many ways I set the scene for stories relating to the care system to be developed in our interviews, through my initial request to work with LACYP who had experienced school exclusion. However, the narratives also resisted this genre and their stories were not exclusively concerned with being in care or being excluded. Both Jimbo and Zacharay chose to develop narratives of normality and were positioned within their stories along with their peers. Zacharay's story contained narratives of reward charts for all pupils and of a performance with others. Jimbo was positioned with his peers within a repertoire of smoking weed in school. I felt that within these narratives, Jimbo and Zacharay were not choosing to define themselves as 'looked after' or 'excluded' and perhaps resisted my attempts to do so through my request to work with excluded LACYP. Resiliency theory posits that friendship networks, positive school experiences and participation in a range of extra-curricular activities can be protective factors which help young people to overcome stress and adversity (Jindal-Snape & Miller, 2008; Newman & Blackburn, 2004). When life was constructed more positively in the narratives, I felt that a number of these resiliency factors were described as being present. When working as a network, the corporate parents could view resiliency as a framework to

consider how we can enhance and develop protective factors present in the lives of LACYP. This should involve consultation with individual LACYP and may include supporting them to develop interests, take part in extracurricular activities (and facilitating these through sorting out obstacles such as transport arrangements) and providing support to make and keep friends. At the school level it will be important to remain aware that children with attachment difficulties may not know how to develop and maintain friendships and may need specific interventions to facilitate these skills and processes (Bomber, 2007). Including LACYP in a wide variety of community groups requires a response from the local community corporate parenting network, including neighbours, police, shopkeepers, and cultural and religious groups, to provide supportive encounters that will promote LACYP resilience (Cairns, 2002).

In contrast to the choices made by Jimbo and Zacharay to position themselves with their peers, these stories positioned professional adults as resisting these narratives of normality and constructing Jimbo and Zacharay as 'different'. Zacharay's story included episodes where residential care staff had to stay with him in school to monitor his behaviour which demonstrated his difference to his peers and forced his disclosure of being in care. Zacharay was positioned in his story as wanting to start new school placements as a fulltime member of the school. However, when he was in residential care, staff would put him into school on a part-time timetable, contradicting his wishes. Connelly and Chakrabarti (2008) argue that we should be challenging the commonly made assumption that LACYP will cope better by being given a narrow curriculum and Zacharay's story adds weight to this argument, with reference to his experience. Jimbo's story suggested that professionals 'chuck' LACYP into new placements presuming that they will cope and that this would not happen to young people who live with their family. These stories constructed professionals as lacking specific understandings of what Zacharay and Jimbo wanted and needed. I feel that this demonstrates that professionals working with LACYP need to find ways to ask and to listen to young people so that they act in an advocacy role to ensure that decisions and services can be personalised to them.

I wonder how far I might have followed a narrative-practice approach (White & Epston, 1990) with Jimbo and Zacharay to further resist narratives of care and exclusion and develop richer alternative stories. This is something to reflect on when adapting this approach as an intervention within my work as a psychologist.

Both Jimbo's and Zacharay's narratives concluded with unfinished futures which offered positive potential for alternative narratives in which they could take control and construct desirable future lives. Zacharay constructed a rich and detailed projected future, which was full of optimism and possibility. I felt that Jimbo was more resistant to the possibility that things may be different for him, countering our construction of how he might like his future to be, with the possibility that he might get sent to prison and would therefore not have this choice. From the perspective of attachment theory, it is argued that young people might express the effects of insecure attachment through developing an impoverished view of their future (Bomber, 2007). Axford (2008) has postulated that if LACYP have continuously felt that they have a lack of choice and control over their lives, then they may also develop a sense of having very little hope for their future. This resonates with me when I consider the very dominant theme of a lack of choice and control within Jimbo's story and his constructed future narrative. Within my professional role as a psychologist, I feel that this would be something to expand upon, further helping to co-construct alternative preferred futures with the young people who I work with.

In addition to the construction of a projected future of custody and few choices, when Jimbo was asked how he might be described within this thesis, he placed an emphasis upon drug taking and getting high. This was a theme that had previously arisen within the narratives; research indicates that LACYP misuse drugs or alcohol in greater quantities and at an earlier age than the general population. It has been suggested that this can be a way of coping with traumatic early experiences and that both trauma and insecure attachments can diminish neurological and emotional capacity to manage stress. Therefore interventions aiming to sustain

secure attachments to caregivers and providing structure and support in all areas of life are suggested to be most effective (Dent & Brown, 2006). I would suggest that helping young people to develop other coping strategies for managing stress, alongside trying to reduce the stressful factors within their life would also be helpful.

The stories that I have co-constructed with Jimbo and Zacharay and have further explored through my analysis, offer an insight into the complexity of their experiences in the specific circumstances of their lives. Some of the constructed narratives resonated with aspects of previously published research literature and government publications. Through Jimbo's and Zacharay's stories we developed narratives previously heard in prior research but also created narratives that resisted these and offered alternative possibilities for these young people away from these dominant, limiting narratives. Foucault (1980) writes about disqualified knowledges that are denied the space in which to be performed such as those which conflict with knowledges held by those with authority (i.e. researchers or professionals). These may include Jimbo's and Zacharay's narratives of being a successful learner, or of exerting control which contradict dominant published research narratives. Foucault suggests that through searching for and highlighting details of these knowledges, we can offer and provide a place for their performance and can develop a criticism of dominant knowledges:

I also believe that it is through the re-emergence of these low-ranking knowledges, these unqualified, even directly disqualified knowledges ...and which involve what I would call a popular knowledge though it is far from being a general commonsense knowledge, but is on the contrary a particular, local, regional knowledge, a differential knowledge incapable of unanimity and which owes its force only to the harshness with which it is opposed by everything surrounding it - that it is the re-appearance of this knowledge, of these popular knowledges, these disqualified knowledges, that criticism performs its work

Foucault, 1980, p.82.

Through co-constructing and writing about Jimbo's and Zacharay's stories I hope that I have been able to contribute to this critique of dominant limiting narratives of knowledge published and repeated about LACYP.

Cautions

It is important to remain aware that the narratives co-created and analysed within this thesis were situated at a particular point in time and within the context of research interviews. These stories have offered an insight into how Zacharay's and Jimbo's experiences were constructed between themselves and me. If we repeated our conversations, or if the same process was undertaken with a different researcher the narratives would differ. My questions and responses within our interviews, the stories that I helped to construct and my interpretive writings have been determined by my own understanding of the world (White & Epston, 1990). The narratives which I have heard and selected will have been influenced by the university, psychology and professional culture that I am currently part of, and have previously been immersed in. I have however, attempted to ground my interpretations as far as possible within our actual spoken discourse through the Critical Narrative Analysis (Emerson & Frosh, 2009) methodology that I adopted. I have accepted my own subjective interpretations of our co-created narratives, but I have acknowledged that narrative analysis is always partial and incomplete (Polkinghorne, 1988; Reissman, 2008) and readers may make further, alternative interpretations. To support these further interpretations, I have attempted to make my work transparent, through detailing my methodological choices, ethical considerations and inclusion of my transcriptions (see Appendix IV). These transcripts include my interpretative headlines (titles of parts, strophes and stanzas) for others to inspect and trace how my analysis developed. I offered the opportunity for both participants to review and comment upon my analyses, although only Zacharay wished to do so. Ethically I respected Jimbo's choice, but it may have enhanced my analysis had they both done so.

I wonder how Zacharay, Jimbo and I will view these interpretations in the future, as our lives and perspectives change. Andrews (2009) argues that as narrators of our own lives and of the lives of others, we continuously re-script the past to make sense of our present. These interpretations are therefore offered as provisional, existing in the particular context of this thesis and are forever able to be interpreted differently. Andrews posits that this is a strength of narrative research, that more layers of meaning are able to emerge over time and through different readings.

The negotiated process of participant selection with the local authority restricted the number of participants who had the opportunity to take part within this study. Zacharay's and Jimbo's stories are as important as any other young person's but others may have liked the opportunity to take part in this study and were denied it by the processes at work regulating how potential subjects could be approached. I am aware that the small-scale nature of this study has implications for the applicability of these individual stories to the lives of other LACYP. However, it was not my intention to make generalisations beyond Zacharay and Jimbo; I hoped to develop an insight into our co-constructed stories and into working in this way. Perhaps if I had worked with more young people I may have been able to identify additional themes in which individual's accounts may have converged and been able to identify some coexistent realities between stories and themes where they diverged (Reissman, 2008). However, these individual stories have produced context-specific insights and I have been able to focus on small details and contradictions which contribute to the accumulating knowledge in this area (Flyvberg, 2009).

I found it difficult to reduce the stories to the descriptions within my analysis. I attempted to highlight contradictions rather than search only for coherence, but I am aware that there are multiple other possibilities I could explore further. I have attempted to include the context of our narratives through including both my and the young people's voices within my transcriptions and analysis, but I could have

further problematised my interpretation of our language, by considering the concepts of linguistic 'signifiers' and 'signified' (Lacan, 1977). Perhaps through this omission I may have obscured some particularities of meaning within the interview contexts.

I had intended to write a pen-portrait (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000) of each story, and although such contextual summaries may have been helpful for the reader, I felt that reducing the stories further did not fit with my epistemological position and my motivations for taking a narrative approach. Emerson and Frosh (2009) caution us about the danger of reducing stories to a coherent summary which removes the complexities of details.

A final caution that must be considered is the issue of giving voice through narrative research and practice. Although my hope was to facilitate voice and utilise a respectful methodology that can reduce the power differentials between researcher and participants, Elliott (2005) reminds us that through our work as researchers, creating stories can be oppressive and can further marginalise research participants:

We are as likely to be shackled by the stories we tell (or that are culturally available for telling) as we are by the form of oppression they might seek to reveal. In short, structure, content, and the performance of stories as they are defined and regulated within social settings often articulate and reproduce existing ideologies and hegemonic relations of power and inequality.

Elliott, 2005, p.146.

Future possibilities

It would be an interesting extension to this research to further explore canonical narratives around LACYP, perhaps through an analysis of written texts and through interviews with professionals employed within the local authority. This would enable me to consider the narratives being told around LACYP and in turn it would be interesting to consider how individual young people's stories interact with and resist these narratives (Elliott, 2005).

To add another dimension to my analysis and to further explore the process of co-construction which occurred between the participants and myself, it would be interesting to conduct a Performance Analysis (Riessman, 2008), looking more deeply at how talk between us was interactively produced and performed as narrative.

For Jimbo and Zacharay, this work could be the starting point of an intervention. I could work with the young people to further develop their rich and complex narratives offering them multiple possibilities and by sharing these alternative narratives with the adults and professionals in their lives. Sharing these narratives more widely within the Local Authority, such as with teachers, social workers, service managers, foster carers, residential staff, and other young people will help to challenge thin narratives constructed about LACYP.

Implications for my practice

Utilising a narrative methodology has offered me the opportunity to develop, and reflect upon, a different way of practising as a psychologist which allows me to embrace the messiness of real lives. I have become more aware of how my expectations, understanding and language inevitably co-construct the realities of the lives and experiences of the young people whom I work with. Through this process we position others and can limit or expand possibilities for their lives. This has demonstrated to me the importance of searching for alternative narratives in stories, seeking out complexities and developing rich pictures of individuals while refusing to accept thin, problem saturated stories of children and young people. This way of practising requires that we are mindful of our influence within the narratives that we develop and remain 'aware of our own presence in our work' (Billington, 2006, p.112). The reflexive approach which I adopted within this research process has positively influenced my practice, encouraging me to question the interpretations that I make and the stories that I write and tell about the children and young people whom I work with. I have noticed that I also reflect more carefully about the stories created for me about young people in referral forms or

in reports from other professionals. I try and remain aware that these represent one of many possible stories and endeavour to remain open to seeking, hearing and co-creating other alternative possibilities.

The cyclical process of co-construction within this research, of returning my transcriptions and my interpretations to the participants represents good practice for my work. I feel that if I am presenting young people's stories to people in their lives, such as their families, teachers, social workers or other professionals, it is essential that I have checked out their views of my interpretations and offered them the opportunity to edit or comment upon my words. In addition, through this research process I have reflected upon the need to communicate the contextual nature of my stories. How the interpretations that I make within my practice are situated within a particular time and place and are open to other possible interpretations.

Through my review of the literature I had an awareness that structural and systemic factors can disadvantage LACYP. However, Zacharay's and Jimbo's individual narratives critique the specific effects of these systems in their own lives. This critique has been very powerful for me and has helped me reflect to upon the tensions of my role. As a psychologist working for a local authority, I am part of these systems and representative of them, yet I am commenting on their negative effects. As I complete my training as an educational psychologist I am constructing my role as a psychologist and considering what is important and ethical within this. I feel that it is important that I continue to critique my work and to remain aware of difficulties, tensions and fractures within the system that I work in and the impact that these may have on children and young people. As an individual practitioner working with individuals within this system, I feel that it is important that I begin with the views, needs and rights of the children and young people that I encounter, not with the constraints of the system. I want to develop my practice so that I can ethically answer Billington's (2006) five reflective questions of how I speak with and of children, how I write of children and how I listen to children and to myself while

working with them. I feel that narrative offers me a respectful framework for practice which enables me to be satisfied with my answers.

Implications for the profession

Narrative offers possibilities for research, assessment and intervention. The 1989 UN convention sets out the right of the child to express their views and to have a voice in relation to decisions being made about them. Narrative offers a way that psychologists might do this within their practice. It offers a way of listening and of enabling children and young people to bring their pertinent issues to a discussion which the psychologist can follow. By facilitating narrative, we can avoid constraining children's voices only to the topics seen as pertinent to ourselves and in turn discover other possibilities and realities. I hope that this thesis will help the profession consider how it works with children and young people and how the way that our talk can construct realities. Bruner (1986) suggests that we become the stories that people tell about us, this has especially important implications when the stories told are limiting or pessimistic. As psychologists, it is important that we are reflexive and critique how our work and talk may be limiting children and young peoples' stories and possibilities. White and Epston (1990) assert that life experience is richer than discourse and although narrative structures organise and give meaning to experience, there are always feelings and lived experience not fully encompassed by the dominant story. When structuring our narratives we are more likely to select aspects of our experiences which fit with the stories that we and others hold about us. The challenge for our profession is to remain open to hearing alternative stories, to facilitating young people's selection of contradictory material and to constructing alternative possibilities. I hope that this research will raise professionals' awareness and highlight the need to consider each child or young person as an individual, especially when negative dominant narratives abound around them. White and Epston (1990) have suggested that it is difficult for people to believe their own stories when others around them have alternative, authoritative knowledge. Therefore, as a profession we need to develop and share

rich alterative narratives with young people, and the family and professionals in their lives as well as more widely with managers and policy makers.

By highlighting contradictions, alternatives and the complexity of the stories I have co-created with Zacharay and Jimbo, I hope that this thesis will raise awareness of, and contribute to, a critique of dominant narratives within the literature around LACYP. I hope that these stories will help us consider how we can design our services and adapt our practice to offer personalisation and consistency to young people who may experience movement between placements and schools. I feel that the narratives within these stories identified a need to align and personalise systems operating in young people's lives. Jimbo was constructed in his narrative as unable to conceive that life could have been any different for him; as professionals working within these systems we need to consider how we identify and meet the needs, concerns and rights of the young people who we work with. I hope that this will urge us to consider how we can work together across agencies and design care and educational systems to flex with each other and the children and young people that they are designed to support.

As Educational Psychologists, we work with LACYP directly and indirectly through the schools, communities and professional networks that we support. As part of local authorities we share a corporate parenting responsibility for the children it looks after and must consider how we can fulfil this obligation and make a unique contribution to this role using our professional strengths. With our knowledge and understanding of child development, psychological theories, consultancy and creative problem solving and training skills educational psychologists are well placed to offer multi-agency training and to support schools and professional corporate parenting networks working with LACYP. For LACYP who have experienced loss of previous caregivers and possible trauma we can try to support the development and maintenance of constant, sensitive care-giving relationships (in care placements and in schools) and promote factors of resilience. This may be through a combination of training, helping others to interpret and understand a

LACYP's behaviour and experiences, and helping to develop consistent and sensitive approaches to support. We may help to manage professional networks to share information and develop shared aims and goals and help to share successes which develop positive narratives about the LACYP who we work with. Psychologists could act as advocates for LACYP and emphasise the responsibility that all corporate parents share to ask for, listen to and act upon the views of LACYP. In addition, through our individual case work we may work with LACYP to offer therapeutic support in relation to previous experiences, building resilience and help them to interpret and understand their behaviour and experiences.

The amount of movement in Jimbo's and Zacharay's stories created a sense of confusion and fragmented memories for me. This led me to reflect upon how professionals can help children and young people to keep track and make sense of their lives. I feel that narrative offers us a tool to help young people to construct their stories and to direct professionals to the important aspects of these. If, in order to make sense of lived experiences they must be storied (White & Epston, 1990), narrative offers this opportunity:

...in work with children narrative practice is designed primarily to address the needs of the young person in that they develop a knowledge of themselves which only they can possess. While such work might involve a range of emotions, including sadness or happiness, it might also deal with the tragic or profound (or even mundane) but always the space created will be an opportunity for the young people to access some form of truth about themselves.

(Billington, 2006, p.134)

References

- Ainsworth, M., Blehar, M., Waters, E. And Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: a psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Andrews, M. (2009). Never the last word: revisiting data. In: M. Andrews, C. Squire, and M. Tamboukou (eds) (2009). *Doing narrative research*. London: Sage.
- Audit Commission (1994). *Seen but not heard: co-ordinating community child health and social services for children in need*. London: HMSO.
- Axford, N. (2008). Are looked after children socially excluded? *Adoption and Fostering*, 32, 4, 5-18.
- Barn, R., Andrew, L. and Mantovani, N. (2005). *Life After care: the experiences of young people from different ethnic groups*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Berridge, D. and Brodie, I. (1998). *Children's homes revisited*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishing.
- Biehal, N., Clayden, J., Stein, M. and wade, J. (1992) *Prepared for living? A survey of Young People Leaving care of Local Authorities*. London: National Children's Bureau.
- Billington, T. (2000). *Separating, Loosing and Excluding Children: Narratives of Difference*. London: Routledge.
- Billington, T. (2006). *Working with Children*. London: Sage.
- Billington, T. (2009), *Narrative research*. Sheffield University Seminar. 23.6.09
- Bomber, L. (2007). *Inside I'm hurting. Practical strategies for supporting children with attachment difficulties in schools*. London: Worth
- Borland, M., Pearson, C., Hill, M., Tisdall, K. and Bloomfield, I. (1998). *Education and care away from home*. Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss, Vol I attachment*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base. Clinical applications of attachment theory*. London:Routledge.

Bradbury, S. (2006). Corporate parenting: a discussion of the educational psychologist's role. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 22, 2, 141-158.

British Association for Adoption and Fostering. (2010). *Statistics*.
<http://www.baaf.org.uk/res/statengland>, accessed 6.1.11.

The British Psychological Society. (2004). *Guidelines for minimum standards of ethical approval in psychological research*. Leicester: BPS

Brodie, I. (2000). Children's homes and school exclusion: Redefining the problem. *Support for Learning*, 15, 1, 25-29.

Brodie, I. (2010). *Vulnerable children knowledge review 1: Improving educational outcomes for looked after children and young people*. London: Centre for Excellence and Outcomes in Young People's Services.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. London: Harvard University Press.

Buchanan, A. (1995) Young people's views on being looked after in out-of-home-care under The Children Act 1989. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 17, 5, 681-696.

Burden, R. (1997). Translating values into rights: respecting the voice of the child. In: G. Lindsay and D. Thompson (eds) (1997). *Values into practice in special education*. London: David Fulton.

Burr, V. (1995). *An introduction to social constructionism*. London: Routledge.

Cains, K. (2002). *Attachment, trauma and resilience. Therapeutic caring for children*. London: BAAF

Chase, S. (2007). Narrative inquiry: multiple lenses, approaches, voices. In: C. Willig, and W. Stainton-Rogers (eds) (2007) *Sage book of qualitative research*. London: Sage.

- Christmas, L. (1998) Looking after learning: making a difference for young people in care. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 15, 4, 79-90.
- Clandinin, D., J. And Connelley, F., M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (eds) (2008). *Research methods in education*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Connelly, G. And Chakrabarti, M. (2008) Improving the educational experience of children and young people in public care: a Scottish perspective. *International Journal of inclusive education*, 12, 4, 347-361.
- Crossley, M. and Vulliamy, G. (1984). Case-study research methods and comparative education. *Comparative Education*, 20, 2 , 193-207.
- Cullingford, C. (1999). *The causes of exclusion: home, school and the development of young criminals*, London: Kogan Page.
- Dearden, J. (2004). Resilience: a study of risk and protective factors from the perspective of young people with experience of local authority care. *Support for Learning*, 19, 4 , 187-193.
- Dent, H. R. and Brown, S. (2006). The zoo of human consciousness: Adversity, brain development and health. In: K. Golding, H. Dent, R. Nissim and L. Stott (eds) (2006). *Thinking Psychologically About Children Who are Looked After and Adopted*. Chicester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dent, R. and Cameron, S. (2003). Developing resilience in children who are in public care: the educational psychology perspective. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 19, 1, 3-19.
- Department for children, schools and families (2004). *Every Child Matters: Change for children*. <http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/> accessed 28.10.09.

Department for children, schools and families (2008). *Improving behaviour and attendance: guidance on exclusion from schools and pupil referral units 2008*. London: DCFS.

Department for children, schools and families (2009). *Statistical first release: outcome indicators for children looked after: twelve months to 30 September 2008, England*. London: DCSF.

Department for children, schools and families. (2010). *Promoting the educational achievement of looked after children. Statutory guidance for local authorities*. London: DCSF.

Department for Education and Employment and Department of Health (2000) *Education of young people in public care (Guidance)*. London: DfEE/DoH.

Edwards, O. and Sweeney, A. (2007). Theory-based interventions for school children cared for by their grandparents. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 23, 2 , 117-190.

Elliott, J. (2005). *Using narrative in social research: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. London: Sage.

Emerson, P. and Frosh, S. (2009). *Critical narrative analysis in Psychology: A guide to practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Etherington, K. (2007). Ethical research in reflexive relationships. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13, 5, 599-616.

Firth, H. and Horrocks, C. (1996). No home, no school, no future. In E. B. Miller (ed) (1996) *Exclusion from school: inter-professional issues for policy and practice*. London: Routledge.

Fletcher-Campbell, F. (1998). Progress or procrastination? The education of Young People who are looked after. *Children and Society*, 12 , 3-11.

Flyvberg, B. (2009) Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12,2 p219-245.

Fonaghy, P., Steele, M., Steele, H., Higgett, A. and target, M. (1994). The Emanuel Miller memorial lecture 1992: the theory and practice of resilience. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 35, 2, 231-257.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/ Knowledge: selected interviews and other writings*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality, vol 1, an introduction*. London: Penguin.

Francis, J. (2000). Investing in children's futures: enhancing the educational arrangements of 'looked after' children and young people. *Child and Family Social Work* 5 , 23-33.

Garner, P. (1996). A la recherché du temps perdu: case-study evidence from off-site and pupil referral units. *Children and Society*, 10, 3, 187-196.

Gee, J.P. (1991). A linguistic approach to narrative. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 1, 1, 15-39.

Geertz, C. (1973) Thick description: towards an interpretive theory of culture. In: C. Geertz (ed) *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Gergen, K. (2001). Knowledge as socially constructed. In: Gergen, M. And Gergen, J. (2001). *Social construction: a reader*. London: Sage

Gilligan, R. (1999). Enhancing the resilience of children and young people in public care by mentoring their talents and interests. *Child and Family Social Work*, 4, 187-196.

Gilligan R. (2001) *Promoting resilience A resource guide on working with children in the care system*. London: BAAF.

Golding, K.(2006). 'Forgotton miseries': can attachment theory help to guide interventions? In: K. Golding, H. Dent, R. Nissim and L. Stott (eds) (2006). *Thinking Psychologically About Children Who are Looked After and Adopted*. Chicester: John Wiley & Sons.

Golding, K., Dent, H., Nissim, R. and Stott, L. (2006). Being heard: listening to the voices of young people, and their families. In: K. Golding, H. Dent, R. Nissim and L. Stott (eds) (2006). *Thinking Psychologically About Children Who are Looked After and Adopted*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Hamill, P. and Boyd, B. (2002). Equality, fairness and rights - the young person's voice. *British Journal of Special Education*, 29, 3, 111-117.

Harker, R., Dobel-Ober, D., Berridge, D. and Sinclair, R. (2004). More than the sum of it's parts? inter-professional working in the education of looked after children. *Children and Society*, 18, 179-193.

Harker, R., Dobel-Ober, D., Lawrence, J., Berridge, D. and Sinclair, R. (2003). Who takes care of education? Looked after children's perceptions of support for educational progress. *Child and Family Social Work*, 8, 89-100.

Harris, N. (2000). Education and law: excluding the child. *Education and the law*, 12, 1, 31-46.

Hayden, C. (2005) More than a piece of paper? : Personal education plans and 'looked after' children in England. *Child and Family Social Work*, 10, 343-352.

Hayden, D. (2003). *Teenage pregnancy and looked after children and care leavers- Resource for teenage pregnancy co-ordinators*. London: TPU.

Hayden, C. and Dunne, S. (2000). *Outside, looking in: children and families' experiences of exclusion from school*. London: The Children's Society.

Heptinstall, E. (2000). Gaining access to Looked After Children for research purposes: Lessons learned. *British Journal of Social Work* 30, 876-872.

Hiles, D. and Cermak, I. (2008). Narrative psychology. In: C. Willig and W. Stainton-Rogers (eds) (2008). *The Sage Handbook of qualitative research in psychology*. London: Sage.

Hilton, Z. (2006). Disaffection and school exclusion: why are inclusion policies still not working in Scotland? *Research papers in education*, 21, 3, 295-314.

Holland, S. (2009). Listening to children in care: a review of methodological and theoretical approaches to understanding looked after children's perspectives. *Children and Society*, 23, 226-235.

Hollway, W. and Jefferson, T. (2000). *Doing qualitative research differently: free association, narrative and the interview method*. London: Sage.

Holstein, J. and Gubrium, J. (1995). *The active interview: Qualitative research methods series volume 37*. London: Sage.

Hyden, M. (2009). Narrating sensitive topics. In: M. Andrews, C. Squire and M. Tamboukou (eds) (2009). *Doing narrative research*. London: Sage.

Jackson, S. (2002) Reducing Risk and Promoting Resilience in Vulnerable Children. *IUC Journal of Social Work, Theory and Practice* 4.
http://www.bemidjistate.edu/academics/publications/social_work_journal/issue04/articles/jackson.html accessed 29.12.08

Jackson, S. and Martin, P., Y. (1998). Surviving the care system: education and resilience. *Journal of Adolescence* 21, 569-583.

Jackson, S. and McParlin, P. (2006). The Education of Children in care. *The Psychologist*, 19, 1, 90-93.

Jinal-Snape, D. and Miller, D. J. (2008). A challenge of living? Understanding the psycho-social processes of the child during primary-secondary transition through resiliency and self-esteem theories. *Educational Psychology Review* 20, 217-236.

Kinder, K., Wilkin, A. and Wakefield, A. (1997). *Exclusion: who needs it?* Slough: NFER.

Lacan, J. (1977). *Ecrits*. London:Routledge.

Lown, J. (2007). What works in reintegration following exclusion. In: K. Pomerantz, M. Hughes, and D. Thompson (eds) (2007). *How to reach 'hard to reach' children*. Chichester: Wiley.

- Main, M. And Solomon, J. (1986). Discovery of a new, insecure disorganized/disorientated attachment pattern. In: T. B. Brazelton and M. Yogman (eds). *Affective development in infancy*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Martin, P. and Jackson, S. (2002). Educational Success for children in public care: advice from a group of high achievers. *Child and Family Social Work* , 7, 121-117.
- May, H. (2005). Whose participation is it anyway? Examining the context of pupil participation in the UK. *British Journal of Special Education* , 32, 1, 29-34.
- McCrystal, P., Percy, A. and Higgins, K. (2007). Exclusion and marginalisation in adolescence: the experience of school exclusion on drug use and antisocial behaviour. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 10, 1, 35-54.
- Mishler, E. (1986). *Research interviewing: context and narrative*. London: Harvard
- Mishler, E. (1997) The interactional construction of narratives in medical and life-history interviews. In: B. Gunnarsson, P. Linell, and B. Nordberg (eds) (1997) *The construction of Professional Discourse*. London: Longman
- Morgan, A. (2000). *What is narrative therapy? An easy-to-read introduction*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publishing
- Munn, P., Lloyd, G. and Cullen, M. (2000). *Alternatives to Exclusion from School*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Neander, K. and Skott, C. (2006). Important meetings with important persons: narratives from families facing adversity and their key figures. *Qualitative Social Work: Research and Practice*, 5, 295-311.
- Newman, T. and Blackburn, S. (2004). *Transition in the lives of young people: resilience factors. Report for the Scottish Executive Education and Young People Research Unit, 78*. The Scottish Executive: Edinburgh.
- Office of Public Sector Information (2009). *The Children Act (1989)*, UK Parliament Public Acts, www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts/1989 accessed 2.11.09.

Parker, I. (2008). *Qualitative Psychology: Introducing radical research*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Parsons, C. (1999). *Education, exclusion and citizenship*. London: Routledge

Parsons, C., Castle, F., Howlett, K. and Worrall, J. (1996.) *Exclusion from school: the public cost*. London: Commission for Racial Equality.

Peake A. (2006). Like highly polished mirrors: Educational Psychology and support for the education of looked after and adopted children. In: K. Golding, H. Dent, R. Nissim and L. Stott (eds) (2006). *Thinking Psychologically About Children Who are Looked After and Adopted* (pp. 98-127). Chicester: John Wiley & Sons.

Phoenix, A. (2009). Analysing narrative contexts. In: M. Andrews, C. Squire and M. Tamboukou (eds) (2009). *Doing narrative research*. London: Sage.

Polkinghorne, D. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany: State University of New York Press

Pomerantz, K. (2007). *Including excluded adolescent boys: discursive constructions of identity*. University of Sheffield: Thesis.

Pomeroy, E. (2000). *Experiencing Exclusion*. Stoke-On-Trent: Trentham Books.

Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (2007). *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage

Reissman, C. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. London: Sage.

Richards, V. (2009). Division of Educational and Child Psychology Debate, 130, p31-32.

Richardson, J. and Lelliott, P. (2003). Mental health of looked after children. *Advances in psychiatric treatment*, 9, 249-251.

Rogers, C. (1980). *A way of being*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Rutter, M. (1999). Resilience Concepts and Findings: Implications for Family Therapy. *Journal of Family Therapy* 21, 2 , 119-144.
- Rutter, M. And O'Connor, T. (1999). Implications of attachment theory for child care policies. In: J. Cassidy and P. Shaver (eds) (1999). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical applications*. New York: The Guilford Press
- Scheper-Hughes, N. (1992). *Death without weeping. The violence of everyday life in Brazil*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Shope, J. (2006). "You can't cross a river without getting wet" A feminist standpoint on the dilemmas of cross-cultural research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12, 1, 163-184.
- Social Exclusion Unit (1998). *Truancy and School Exclusion*. London: The Stationary Office.
- Social Services Inspectorate and OFSTED (1995). *The education of children looked after by local authorities*. London: OFSTED.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. London: Sage.
- Stake, R. (2008). Qualitative case studies. In N. D. Lincoln (2008) (ed) , *Strategies of qualitative enquiry* (pp. 119-149). London: Sage.
- Stirling, M. (1992). How many pupils are being excluded? *British Journal of Special Education*, 19, 4 128-130.
- Squire, C. (2009). Experience-centred and culturally-orientated approaches to narrative. In: M. Andrews, C. Squire and M. Tamboukou (eds) (2009). *Doing narrative research*. London: Sage.
- Thomas, N. and O'Kane, C. (1999). Children's participation in reviews and planning meetings when they are 'looked after' in middle childhood. *Child and Family Social Work*, 4 , 221-230.

Turner, E. and Waterhouse, S. (2003). Towards inclusive schools. Sustaining normal in-school careers: an alternative to pupil exclusions. *Emotional and behavioural difficulties*, 8, 1, 19-31

United Nations Convention on the right of the child (1989).

<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/crc.htm> accessed 14.11.09.

Vulliamy, G. and Webb, R. (2000). Stemming the tide of rising school exclusions: problems and possibilities. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 48, 2, 119-133.

Watson, C. (2005). Discourses of 'indiscipline': a Foucauldian response. *Emotional and behavioural difficulties*, 10, 1, 55-65.

Wellington, J. (2000). *Educational Research: Contemporary issues and practical approaches*. London: Continuum.

White, M. and Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. London: W.W. Norton & Company

Willig, C. (2008). *Introducing qualitative research in Psychology*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill

Winicott, D., W. (2002). *Playing and Reality*. London: Routledge.

Appendix I: Information letters and consent forms for participants

Initial Participant Information Letter

(Insert contact details)

(insert date)

Hello,

My name is Kate Warham. I am a trainee educational psychologist working in *(insert local authority)*. As part of my studies at Sheffield University I am involved in a research project and am currently looking for co-researchers. I would like to talk with young people who are looked after and who have also experienced some sort of exclusion in school. This might be through formal exclusion or by other ways such as having a reduced timetable, having 'cooling off' days or by not being offered a school place. This is an area of great interest to me and my aim is to help to develop greater understanding of the experiences of looked after young people.

In order to make this research possible I have to rely on your help. If you decide to take part I would like to interview you about your experiences. We would meet twice for about an hour, at a convenient time and place for you (between May and August 2010).

There will be no particular questions for you to answer in these meetings. I am interested in your story. I will record our conversations, but these recordings will be deleted once the research is finished. After the interviews I will analyse what we have said and you will have the chance to comment on and change what I write. All the information that you provide will be confidential, this means that your real full name will not be used. I will not share anything you say with your social worker or anyone else, unless you tell me something that makes me think that you or someone else is in danger. I then have a legal duty to tell your social worker about this.

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. At any time during the research you can change your mind and no longer take part. You do not have to give a reason. I am very happy to answer any questions that you might have about the research. If you think that you might be interested in taking part then we can arrange to meet to talk about the project. I can be contacted on the details at the head of this letter.

Best Wishes,

Kate Warham.

Further information sheet for interested participants

(used as part of our initial meeting)

(Insert address and telephone number)

(Insert date)

Dear.....,

I am a trainee educational psychologist working for *(insert local authority)* Educational Psychology Service. As part of my doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology at Sheffield University, I am involved in a research project. I am hoping to explore the experiences of young people who have experienced school exclusion, through their stories. Young people may experience school exclusion through a formal exclusion or by other processes such as reduced timetables, cooling off days or non-admission.

The title of the project is:

Engaging with young people who are looked after in local authority care and have experienced exclusion from school: co-constructing narratives.

You are being invited to take part in this research as a co-researcher. Before you decide whether or not you would like to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask me if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Please take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part.

Purpose of the project

Research indicates that looked after children and young people are ten times more likely to be excluded than are their peers. The aim of this project is to find out more about the experiences of these young people by exploring their stories told within interviews with myself. While there are no immediate benefits for people taking part in the project, it is an opportunity for talk about your experiences. It is planned that the project will be finished by August 2011.

Why have I been chosen?

You have been chosen because you are currently looked after by the local authority and have experienced some form of school exclusion. It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and will be asked to sign a consent form.

You can withdraw your consent at any time and you do not have to give a reason.

What does the project involve?

If you do decide to take part, I would like to meet twice with you to talk with you about your experiences of school. These meetings will take about an hour and will be at a time of your choosing. There will be no particular questions to answer; I am interested in giving you the opportunity to talk about your experiences. You can decide what you would like to talk about. I will then type up our conversations before analysing them and would like to meet with you again to share and discuss these and ask you if there is anything that you would not like me to include in my thesis. After that, I would then like to meet with you a final time to discuss the analysis and give you an opportunity to comment on this.

I would like to record our conversations using a digital voice recorder and type up what both of us have said. The audio recordings will only be used for analysis and no one outside of the project will be allowed access to the original recordings. Once my research is complete the recordings will be destroyed.

Confidentiality

All the information that I collect during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential.

I will not share anything that you have said with your social worker or anybody else. If you tell me something which makes me think that you or someone else is at risk of harm, then I have a duty to disclose this information. If this circumstance arose, I would talk to you about this first before passing this information on.

You will not be able to be identified in any reports of publications. Once the research is finished, it will be submitted to the University of Sheffield. There is a possibility that the research may be written up and submitted for publication in a professional journal. The full names of individuals, local authorities and schools will be removed.

You may have a copy of the thesis, which should be available by August 2011, and the main findings can be reported to you either in a short paper, or a short presentation.

If for any reason the research is stopped earlier than expected, I will let you know and explain why this is the case.

If you would wish to make a complaint at any time, please speak first to Kate Warham, on (*insert number*), and then if it is not resolved to your satisfaction, please contact my supervisor, Tom Billington on (*number inserted*) or (*insert email address*). If the matter is still not resolved to your satisfaction, you can contact the University of Sheffield's Registrar and Secretary.

I also need to inform you that I have a funded place at Sheffield University, and am also an employee of the (*insert local authority*) Educational Psychology Service.

This project has been ethically approved via the School of Education's ethics review procedure. The University's research ethics committee monitors the application and delivery of the University's ethics review procedure across the University. This project has also been ethically approved by *(insert local authority)* Council's ethics review procedure.

If you have any questions at any time, please contact me on *(insert number)*, asking for Kate Warham or email me on *(insert email address)*.

If you are still happy to take part I will ask you to sign a consent form and you will have a copy of this information sheet and your signed consent form to keep.

Thank you very much!

Kate Warham

Participant Consent Form

Title of Project: Engaging with Young People who are looked after in local authority care and who have experienced exclusion from school: co-constructing narratives.

Name of Researcher: Kate Warham

Please initial box

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet dated *(insert date)* for the above research project and have had the opportunity to ask questions about the project.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reasons. I understand that if I not want to answer any particular question or questions, I am free to decline. Kate Warham can be contacted on *(insert number)*

3. I understand that my interviews/conversations with Kate Warham will be digitally recorded and that these will be anonymised and stored securely until they are destroyed when the research project is complete. I give permission for these interviews/conversations to be digitally recorded.

4. I understand that my responses will be anonymised before analysis. I give permission for members of the research team to have access to my anonymised responses. I understand that my name will not be linked with the research materials, and I will not be identified or identifiable in the report or reports that result from the research.

5. I agree to take part in the above research project.

-----	-----	-----
Name of participant	Date	Signature
-----	-----	-----
Lead researcher	Date	Signature

To be signed and dated in presence of the participant

Copies:

Once this has been signed by all parties the participant will receive a copy of the signed and dated participant consent form, the letter /information sheet and any other written information provided to the participants. A copy of the signed and dated consent form will be placed in the project's main record, which will be kept in a secure location.

Appendix II: Prompts for first narrative interviews

Introduction to interview and recap on right to terminate/ withdraw at any point

I am interested in your story, how you see things, how you think about things and how you say things in your own words. I'd like you to talk as much or as little as you want to.

- **Theme: Overview:**

- What background information is important to include about you- (such as your age, who you live with? Length of time in care? And history?) Do you want to choose a pseudo name?
- School History grid - 'If your experience of school was written as a book what would each chapter be about?'

- **Theme: Past:**

For each 'chapter' identified:

- What is your reason for starting/ stopping this chapter/ episode here?
- Can you tell me about this time? What was important for you? What was school like for you then?
- Tell me about a significant memory or episode that you remember from this time.

- **Theme: Present**

How is (school) life for you now? How do you feel about it?

- **Theme: Future**

What are your hopes and plans for the future?

- **Ending:**

Have we missed anything? Is there anything that you would like to add? Next steps in research?

Appendix III: School History Grids

Zacharay's School history grid

Chapter	Title	Age
1	Primary School (living with mum)	7 years old
2	Primary School Urbantown (living in foster care)	8 years old
3	Metropolis (living in foster care)	8-10 years old
4	Primary School in Urbanville	11 years old
5	Home-tutored	Y9 11-13 years old
6	High-School Urbanville	13-15 years old
7	High-School Farshire (living in residential care)	15 years old
8	College: Now (living in residential care)	15+ years old

Jimbo's School History Grid

Chapter	Title
1	Meadow view School, Ruralshire
2	Park View School, Urbanville

Appendix IV: Transcripts and Analysis

Transcript conventions

The following notations were used within the transcriptions (adapted from Riessman, 2008; Emerson & Frosh, 2009; Gee, 1991):

(.)	Pause less than 1 second
(1)	Number in () indicates approximate length of pause in seconds
[Speakers overlap
[coughs]	Word in [] indicates non-verbal action or event.
???	I could not decipher the words spoken
<i>Italics</i>	word emphasised by the speaker
/	change of tone, signifies new idea unit

Line breaks indicate pacing of phrases around pauses or slight hesitations

Transcript 1: Analysis of First interview with Zacharay

Part 1: Getting started

Strophe 1: Before we start

Stanza 1: before and after the interview

1. K: I'll just turn this on and then hopefully we'll just *forget* that this is here (1)
2. O-K umm/ *Before* we start I just wanted to go back to the things we talked about with the consent form that (.) um
3. once we've *done* the interview I'll give the transcripts back to *you* and then if there is anything that we've talked about that you don't want me to include you can take out
Z: ok
4. K: erm if I ask you any questions that you don't want to answer /then don't feel

Stanza 2: opening the window

5. Z: yeah..I'm just going to open this window umm
K:
yeah it's hot [K and Z open windows]

Stanza 3: consent and questions

6. and again you can withdraw your consent at any point so if you change your mind decide that you don't want to take *part* that is fine
7. Z: OK
8. K: ok (.) and did you have any other questions for *me* /before we get *going*?
9. Z: No that's ok

Strophe 2: Life as book

Stanza 4: Time at school as a book made up of chapters

11. K: *Ok/* (.) I thought that (.) ermm (3) /that it would be *helpful* (3) really t to /almost (2) think about (.) umm (.) /you *your* kind of *time* at school *as a book* (.) /*maybe*

Z: Yeah

12. K: and so kind of thinking about what each chapter (.) would *be* and what you would call each chapter

13. and then as we are talking I can refer back to *that* and we've got that /almost like a structure (.) of *your time* through school

Stanza 5: Negotiating writing; break up time into chapters

14. so *you* can write it /or *I* can write it

15. Z: *You* can write it

16. K: *OK* (3) ermm (2) yeah /so if you were to break up kind of all your *time* in school into different *chapters* (.)

17. I don't know *how* you would do *it/* erm

Strophe 3: Start with Primary school and go through each time

Stanza 6: Primary school: chapter one

18. Z: probably start it in primary school /chapter one

19. K: Yeah *chapter one/* so what would you call that one?

20. Z: What the school name?

21. K: *Or* the wh what would you *call* if that was a chapter what would you call the *title* of that chapter?

22. Z: Primary school

K: *Yep/* primary school [k writing chapter one primary school] (7) yep (2)

Stanza 7: What are we doing?

23. Z: I'm gunno *go* (1) through (.) /what we *doin* then? /Going through (.) *each*

K: *Yeah*

24. K: so just think about what each of the chapters would *be*

25. and then we'll talk about each (1) each *time*

26. Z: alright then

Strophe 4: Primary schools

Stanza 8: Chapter 2: Primary school in Urbantown. Chapter 3: Primary School in Urbanville

27. Z: Chapter 2 (10) yeah we'll go for (6) umm (3) go for (.) *primary* school in Urbantown /*chapter 2*

28. and then chapter three /primary school in *Urbanville* (???)

29. K: [writing] primary school in/ Urbantown *yep*

30. Z: Chapter 3

31. K: Chapter 3/ primary school in

Stanza 9: Writing is not very neat

32. K: you'll have to excuse my writing it's not very *neat* [laughs]

Strophe 5: Home tutored, high school and college

Stanza 10: Chapter 4: home tutored. Chapter 5: High school, Urbanville

33. Z: and 4 (1) er (2) /home *tutored* (6)

34. K: [K writing] home *tutored*

35. Z: and chapter 5 /high school in Urbanville (6)

36. K: [writing] *yep*

Stanza 11: Chapter 6: High school, Farshire

37. Z: (4) mm (.) chapter 6 (11)/ it was high school wasn't it?

38. yeah *high school* in *Farshire*

39. K: Ahh/ [writing] high (.) school (.) *Farshire*

Stanza 12: Chapter 7: College, now

40. Z: *Then* (3)/ number 7 is *college* I think

41. K: *College*

Z: Yeah *yep*

42. K: Yeah (.) and that's *now* (.)
43. Z: yeah
44. K: College *now*/ shall I *call* it? (2)

Strophe 6: How old in the chapters

Stanza 13: Can you remember how old you are in all of them?

45. K: *Can I* just ask roughly how *old* you are (1) /*perhaps* like
46. Z: the *top* one?
47. K: *Yeah* In *all* of them/ if you can *remember* (2) (???)
48. Z: Chapter 1 *I'd* go (6)

Stanza 14: Seven during Primary School

49. when do you start pri *primary school*?
K: Err ermm
50. Z: *Five* /is it
51. K: Yeah five/ four or five/ *five*/ four or five
52. Z: Well (.) about *sevenish*
53. K: *Seven* at the *end* of that?
54. Z: Well not at the *end*/ during
K: *During* it/ yep (4)

Strophe 7: Missed one out

Stanza 15: It's alright

55. Z: Err 2 (3) ddd I think it was *about* (.)
56. *oh* (.) I missed one out/ damn
57. K: *Oh* we can pop one in it's *alright*
Z: Yeah [laughs]
K: [Laughs]

Stanza 16: Primary School in Bigtown: between chapters 2 and 3

58. where does it need to *go*?

58. Z: In between 2 and 3

K: *yep*

59. Z: Primary school in (.) /*Bigtown* (3) /put 2a [laughing]

60. K: [writes] [laughs] *yeah* (.) /I can sort the numbers out (.)[

Z: Laughs

K:] later (.) /*Bigtown*/*yep*

Strophe 8: Age in schools

Stanza 17: Eight to ten

61. Z: *Yeah* (2) *err* (.) *so* /chapter 2 (.) *would be* (2) *eight*

K: *Eight* (3)

62. Z: *Then* (3) /*actually* (2) *yeah*

63. *and then Bigtown would be like* (5)

64. *finish at 11 don't you?*

K: *Yeah*

65. Z: *Yeah* /*it's be about eight to ten*

K: *Eight to ten/ yeah*

Stanza 18: Starting at eleven

66. Z: *What's the next one?*

K: The *next* one

67. Z: (???) *school in Urbanville* (2) / *so the last two years*

68. *well not last two years /but starting* (.)

69. *like* (.) *eleven*

K: *Yeah* (.) *eleven*

Strophe 9: How old would I have been?

Stanza 19: Home tutored: Year 9

70. Z: Then I got home *tutored* (3) *erm* (3)
71. how old would I've *been* in year nine?
72. K: *Ooh* (1) in year *nine* /we can work that out

Stanza 20: Thirteen to fifteen

73. so year 7 you're eleven and twelve /8 (.) twelve and thirteen (1) / thirteen (.)
fourteenish
74. Z: yeah (.) probably that (.) so
K: yeah
75. Z: *thirteen* to (4) *fifteen*
K: *yeah*

Strophe 10: Difficult to remember

Stanza 21: Fifteen: is this right?

76. Z: and then I was at high school *Farshire* (.)
77. /*fifteen* (2)
78. K: *oh* this *one* /sorry have I *got* that [
Z: Yeah
K:] in the *wrong* place
79. Z: No/ that one's *right*

Stanza 22: Is that right? No

80. Z: no (.) what does that say?
81. K: Home tutored
82. Z: Yeah/ that's about *right*
K: *Yeah*
83. Z: No (.) what does that say/ home tutored

84. no *home tutored* was from about (4) /like *eleven to thirteen*
K: Yeah (2) /*eleven to thirteen*

Stanza 23: About thirteen to fifteen and now, fifteen plus

85. Z: And that one was from *about* thirteen to fifteen
K: Thirteen to *fifteen*
86. Z: College *now* (.) really /*fifteen plus*
87. K: Fifteen *plus*/ thank you

Strophe 11: An overview

Stanza 24: Divided by locations

88. K: can I ask *you* /how you *chose* to *divide* it? Was it *by* (1)
89. Z: *Locations*
90. K: Yeah (.) /divided by *locations*
91. Z: [laughs] (6)
K: *Locations* (3) /ok (3)

Stanza 25: Your story and your words about these different times

92. K: /ok so *when* when I'm asking you about these *different* times
93. really I'm just interested in /*your your* story
94. how *you* see things urmm /how *you* think about things and /in *your own* words for *your* experiences (2)
Z: Yep
95. K: Umm (3) /so *really* /I guess if we go through *these chapters* (.)
96. ermm and maybe if you could just tell me a little bit about each *time*

Part 2: Chapter 1, Primary School in Urbantown

Strophe 1: Setting the scene

Stanza 1: What do you remember from then?

97. K: so if we start with chapter 1
Z: chapter 1
98. K: ermm d'you know like /what was important for you *then*
99. what was school like for *you*?
100. What do you *remember* from *then*?

Stanza 2: Went there when I went into care aged seven

101. Z: Err (.) chapter 1/I was at school *in* (1)
102. primary school in Urbantown (.)
103. err like cos (.) I went in *there* when /and that was *like*
104. when I went into *care* /I went into *care* (.) /like about aged *seven*
- K: *Yeah*

Stanza 3: I was naughty, they reduced my timetable and so I missed out school

105. Z: And then (1) I (1) a *well* in primary school I was (.) was *naughty*
106. and then I like got expelled a few times excluded whatever it is called
- K: Mmh hmm
107. Z: Like (.) and *then* (1) and then /they reduced my timetable *then* as well
- K: Oh yeah
- Z: *Yeah*
- K: *Yeah*
108. Z: and *then* /so like I missed school out *then*/ and then (.) I just didn't bother going

Strophe 2: Got excluded near Christmas

Stanza 4: A memory from near Christmas

109. K: ok/can you *remember* like a (.) significant *memory* /or an *event* or an *episode* at any point in this *time* [

Z: Yeah

K:] that you could tell me a little bit *about*

110. Z: it *was* (.) it was near (.) Christmas

111. and I had like (.) kicked off in school or whatever

112. I had probably threw over a table or something

K: yeah

Stanza 5: I got expelled

113. Z: s so as I was kicking off /*the* (.) head teacher was talking to me in her office (.) and (.) I started (.) throwing stuff around the office

114. / so like she tried to (.) restrain me /just calm me *down*

115. I ended up kicking her in the head /and then I wasn't allowed to the Christmas party

116. and then I got *expelled* from that school then

K: *after* that

Z: yeah

Strophe 3: Leading up to the expulsion

Stanza 6: I can't remember much else except for kicking off, not doing any work

117. K: can you remember (.) /was there anything else/ leading up to that *time* (.)

118. Z: Err (5) no /I (.) I can't remember much else in that school (.) except for kickin off now and again

119. I can't remember actually doing any *work*

120. K: No (3)/is that like your big biggest *memory* (.) probably from it

121. Z: it's that *one* (.) yeah

K: yeah (.) yeah (1)

Stanza 7: they just told me to go

122. K: ermm/ and (.) did *you* feel like you were involved in any *decisions*/ at that point

123. Z: no

K: no

124. Z: just (.)they *just* told me to (.) *go*

K: yeah

125. Z: and I went /it was alright

Strophe 4: Talking with an educational psychologist about behaviour

Stanza 8: Support from an Educational Psychologist

126. K: and did you have any *support*

127. do you remember anyone giving you any support at that time?

128. Z: yeah there was (2) one of *the* (3) I don't know ermm (1) educational *psychologists*

129. they like came to see me and stuff like that

K: yeah

130. Z: so we kinda like talked about (1)

Stanza 9: We talked about behaviour and then cut down my timetable

131. Z: we were talking about stuff (.) and then (.) /like about behaviour *behaviour*

132. and that's when we decided to cut down my timetable (.)

133. and then like only do like mornings (.)and *stuff* like that

K: uh *huh* (3) yeah (2)

134. and *then* there was the incident that you just talked about /and then (.) *that's* when you left that school *was it?*

135. Z: Yep

K: Yep

Part 3: Chapter 2, primary school in Urbantown

Strophe 1: When did I go there?

Stanza 1: Primary School in Urbantown

136. K: so (.) would that *move us into*
137. Z: *Chapter 2*
138. K: chapter 2/primary School in *Urbantown /where* was [
139. Z: well that one was in Urbantown
140. K:] that one was in Urbantown *as well* (4)

Stanza 2: Moved from Metropolis

141. Z: the the chapter 2 I was only in there for a *few weeks /cos* I moved from (3)
141. /oh god (.) I forgot the name of that as well
142. /err there was a primary school in *Metropolis* as well
- K: *ok*
143. Z: I forgot what it was /that was *in between* the *Urbantown / no* (.) that was in between Bigtown and Urbanville (4)
144. K: *Metropolis* (.) ok (2)
- Z: Err () 1

Strophe: 2: They just moved me out after a few weeks

Stanza 3: I just started going and they moved me

145. K: so *this school/* you said you were only in *for*
146. Z: only for like a a few weeks cos I moved *from* (.) Urbantown *to* (.) Metropolis [clears throat]
147. so I didn't really do anything there
148. / I just *like* started going / and *then* they just moved me

Stanza 4: Just moved me out: I was annoyed

149. K: Yeah (.) / what was that like *for you /moving* (.) *between* the *schools*
150. Z: Well (.) the *two* weeks
151. /I'd got like settled into that school /in a routine/met some friends (.) and stuff
- K: *mm*

152. Z: and then *just* (.) moved me *out*

K: yeah

153. Z: so (.) I was *annoyed* with *it* /because because/ I wanted more out of that school

Stanza 5: Moved me because of a placement move

154. K: yeah/did they tell you why (.) they were *moving you*

155. Z: no (.) it were just like a *placement move*

K: ah (.) right (.) ok (.)

156. and you would have quite liked to have stayed (.) stayed in that school

Strophe 3: Can you remember a particular memory?

Stanza 6: Meeting the head teacher: it was just a few weeks

157. K: so is (.) have you *got* any particular memory /that you *can* remember?

158. I know it was a very long (.) it was a *long* time ago (.)

159. but I don't know if you have got any like *particular* memory of that school

160. Z: *no* (.) / it was just a few weeks (.) like *meeting* (.) the head teacher and stuff

K: yeah

161. Z: and (.) that was *it*

K: and *was it* (3) /okay (2)

Part 4: Bigtown

Strophe 1: Overview

Stanza 1: Bigtown was a good one

162. K: *so* that moves us *into* (1)

163. Z: *Bigtown*

K: Bigtown (.) *yeah*

164. Z: Yeah (.) that was a *good one*

165. I was in there for like 1 to 2 years

K: mm hmm

Stanza 2: I went to the local school, my behaviour and grades were all right

166. Z: so (.) I was at a *placement* in Bigtown and like/ I went to the *local* school (1)

167. err did (.) *like* year three and *four*

168. /my behaviour wasn't the best (.) but it was *all right* /my grades were *all right*

K: yeah

Stanza 3: The placement broke down and I couldn't stay

169. Z: and then cos the placement broke down

170. they moved me to Metropolis (.) / and I couldn't *stay* at the school

171. K: *Ah* (.)so you moved *into* (.) you moved to Metropolis (.)

172. K: so you had to move

173. Z: the school. Yeah

K: yeah (2)

Strophe 2: A good school: friends

Stanza 4: A good school: Staff were alright and quite a few friends

174. K: so (.) umm (.) you said that this school was quite *good*

175. can you remember (.) kinda *anything* about it /that you *liked* [

Z: yeah

K:] or that was going *well*

176. Z: staff were *all right*

K: mmh huh

177. Z: I had (.) a few (.) quite a few *friends there* (3) errr (3) /that was about *it*

K: Yeah

178. it was (.) it was a *good school*

K: yeah (2) yeah (2)

Stanza 5: Did a performance with a gang of friends

179. K: again umm (.) can you *remember* like (.) / can you *tell* me about any *particular* memory or episode or something from that *time*

180. Z: (3) ermm (.) it was like (.) I had like a *gang of friends* and we *did* like a performance (1) /cos we did like an X –factor thing

K: oh (.) *brilliant*

181. Z: I don't know what they called it (.) cos X factor wasn't around then *was it*

K: Yeah

Z: Errmm

182. K: a (.) a talent show

183. Z: yeah, like a talent show/and we like did a *song* or whatever/*dance* routine sort of like that (3)/about five of us/in front of like (.) the *whole* school

K: oh fantastic

Stanza 6: We lost the world cup

184. Z: also in (.) 2002 I think it was (.) /we watched the World Cup (.) England versus Brazil

185. K: oh (.) in *school*

186. Z: yeah (.) that was a bugger that (.) / we *lost*

K: did we *lose*

187. Z: *quarter-finals*

188. K: [laughing] oh *no* (.) it's *always* the way isn't it

Z: it *is*

189. K: we never quite get *there* (1)

Strophe 3: Performance extra to lessons

Stanza 7: S-club junior performance

190. And was that (.) part of was that (.) like the performance (.) was that something *extra* or part of part of your lessons *there*

191. Z: no *extra*

192. K: yeah (.) can you remember what it *was* (.) the *performance*

Z: *yes*

K: what *was* it?

193. Z: it was (.) what *was* it (.) /S club *Juniors*

K: *oh great*

194. Z: one step closer to heaven

K: *ahh* (1)

Stanza 8: Singing and dancing

195. K: were you *singing* and *dancing*?

196. Z: *yes*

K: oh brilliant

197. Z: glad no one got it on *camera*

198. K: [laughs] oh it sounds *good* (3)

Stanza 9: They are the best memories from Bigtown

199. K: *so then* (2) /is that like your *best* memory from Bigtown or those memories (.) /do you think?

200. Z: Yeah yeah (.) those ones

201. K: Yeah (.) and it sounds like you had quite a good group of *friends*

202. Z: Yeah (2)

Part 5: The impact of placement on school exclusion

Strophe1: the school aspect is helped by a foster placement

Stanza 1: I didn't get expelled because I was in a foster placement

203. Z: *and* (.) I think that was about the *only* school /that I didn't get expelled from
204. K: oh was it (1)/ *what* do you think it was that was going *well* for you there or (.) *why* do you think? (3)
205. Z: err (3) because that placement was a *foster* placement (.)

Stanza 2: The stable family environment helped

206. and most of my others were residential care homes
- K: Aahh (.) right
207. Z: so I reckon being in that like stable family environment /probably *helped* (.) with the school aspect
- K: Yeah (4)
208. Z: that's about it

Strophe 2: Difference between foster and residential placements

Stanza 3: In foster carers' they'd treat you like a normal family

209. K: did you notice a difference /how *you* felt in school /kind of between *different* like residential placements versus [
Z: yeah
K:] foster?
210. Z: yeah cause in the foster carers'/ they'd like treat you like normal family
211. you'd go to (.) school (.) from like nine to three or whatever
- K: yeah

Stanza 4: In residential care they'd ease you into school which messes it up

212. Z: and in residential care home (.) they'd try to *ease you in gradually* into it (.)
213. like starting in the *mornings* and then do an *afternoon* and stuff like that/
214. which I think just *messes it up*
- K: *aahh* (.) right (.)/

Strophe 3: The effect of placement on starting a new school

Stanza 5: In residential care they put you in school 2 mornings a week while in foster care they put you straight in

215. K: what so what if you start a new

216. Z: if you start in a *new* school/ well (.) *all* the care homes (.) *I've* been in

217. Z: they'd only put you in like *two* mornings a week and that was it

K: ahh *okay* [

Z: (???)

218. K:] Whereas

Z: Whereas living with the foster carer/ they just *did it* /put you *straight* in (.)

Stanza 6: unclear questioning from Kate

219. K: Yeah (.) So that works *better*/ you think /or worked *better* for you?

Z: which *one*?

220. K: going go like going *straight* into school and just *staying* in (.) rather than this kind of

221. and did they then *build up* your *time* in school/or (.) *how* did that how did that *work*?

222. Z: *in* which placement

K: umm

223. Z: the *Bigtown* one

Part 6: Chapter 2a, Metropolis

Strophe 1: A new school with a full timetable

Stanza 1: The same, well new

224. K: yeah *sorry*/ shall we move to [laughing]

225. Z: yeah

226. K: chapter 2
227. Z: chapter
228. K: chapter 2*a*
229. Z: chapter 2*a* was basically the *same*
230. well new *in* Metropolis

Stanza 2: We had a reward chart

231. they put me into *another* primary school
K: Oh *yeah* (.) *yeah*
232. Z: and that one was *all right*
233. but (.) we *had* like (.) well *I* had like a (.) like a *reward chart* or whatever
234. if I did *good* I'd get like a reward *rewarded* at the *end* of the week
235. K: *In* school
Z: *Yeah*

Stanza 3: I was there about a month with a full timetable

236. Z: I had like a *full* timetable (2)
237. and I was *probably* there about what a *month* (1) *I think* (2) and then I moved to (1) *Urbanville*
238. K: Ahh (.) and umm (.) / *so* in Metropolis you were in res residential care in Metropolis [
239. Z: no that *one* was fos
K:] that one was foster care (.) *sorry*

Part 7: Chapter 3, Urbanville

Strophe 1: Moved into residential care

Stanza 1: I had only been in foster care and at my mothers

240. Z: [clears throat] up till *Urbanville* (.) I had only been in foster care (2)

241. except for the *top* one [pointing to school history grid] that was *me mother's*

K: that was your *mothers* (5)

241. so what *happened* you *moved* from

Z: *Bigtown*

K: Bigtown to Metropolis to different foster *carers?* /is that *right* yeah

242. and you *stayed* there about a *month* /and *then* what *happened* next? what *moved* into

243. Z: errr *Urbanville*

K: yeah

Stanza 2: They moved me into the same care home as my brother

244. Z: well [coughs] my *brother* lived in *Urbanville*

245. so they just *moved* me into the same care home that he was in

K: Yeah (6)

246. Z: I think (.) I didn't know/ well *that's* where I got *home tutored*

K: ahh right (.) yeah

Strophe 2: Starting primary school in Urbanville

Stanza 3: Into primary school on a staggered timetable

247. Z: and I got / what *chapter* is that in?

248. K: ah (.) we've got *three* / so you *moved* to Urbanville /*moved* into umm the (.) same (.) care

249. Z: well *yeah* (2) / *was that* primary school yeah

K: yeah

Z: yeah (.) oh yeah yeah / Primary School in *Urbanville*

250. yeah / they *tried* to move me into err (.) primary school/ *like* on a staggered timetable

K yeah

Stanza 4: Staff had to sit in school with me to monitor my behaviour

251. Z: and they (.) they said that like *one* of their *staff* had to sit in *class* with me in school as well
252. K: from *the* residential care
253. Z: *yeah* (.) from the home
K: *yeah*
254. Z: to monitor my *behaviour* and stuff

Stanza 5: It let people know that I was different

254. K: so (.) how was *that* for *you* having them come in with you every day?
255. Z: *well* errr (3) I dunno / but like it *let* let people know that *I was different* (.) from *the* other people
K: *yeah* (.) *yeah* (.) definitely
255. Z: and (.) then (.) *my behaviour* (1) like went just went totally to *pot* there
256. I was only there for like a I don't know how long
K: uhh huh

Strophe 3: Home tutored

Stanza 6: A teacher came in everyday

257. Z: and then that's *when* I went into be home tutored
258. the home had *like a teacher* that came in every day
K: ah right
Z: mm (2)
259. K: and what did *you* think about *that*?
260. Z: which one
261. K: what did you think about *moving* from school into being *home tutored*?

Stanza 7: Less hours, got more done and more interaction with the teacher

262. Z: it was *less hours* (.) like only did from *nine* until *half* past twelve
K: *yeah*
263. Z: and (1) we got *more work done*

264. well (.) like a lot more *interaction* with teachers

265. cause like in school it's like thirty to one

K: yeah

266. Z: whereas that one was *only* like 3 to 1

K: yeah a much *smaller* group

Z: mm

Strophe 4: A memory of being thrown out

Stanza 8: Can you remember any memories?

267. K: umm and when you were in *this* school

Z: yeah

268. K: and you *had* someone with you *all* the *time* (.) umm

269. have you got *any* kinda or *can* you remember kinda *any* memories (.) or *one* point (.) or *an episode* in that school (4)

270. Z: errr (.) duno (.)

Stanza 9: I kicked off and they threw me out

271. Z: *well* (.) there was *one* where I was like

272. because I had *kicked* off and went into the *cloakroom*

273. and was like *throwing* everything *everywhere*

274. so the staff (.) *teachers* (.) *caretaker*/ like just like *five people* (.) had *jumped* on me to try and *restrain* me / so I would not like *kick* off anymore

275. and that's when they *threw* me out of *that* one (2)

K: yeah (2)

Strophe 5: Support

Stanza 10: I didn't have much support

276. K: and umm *did* you feel that you had much *support* from that *school* [

277. Z: no

278.] in *terms* of kinda (.) *helping* you

279. *no* (.) I don't think so

K: *no* (3)

Stanza 11: School did nothing to help

280. Z: the *best* supporting *school* was probably the *high* school in *Urbanville*

281. K: *was it* (3) /what *did* (.) *did* you (.) *did* you know (.) what did they *do* /to kind of help *you* when you were *in* the school there? (.)

282. when you were in this one (.) in *Urbanville* primary school?

283. Z: not much (.) *nothing*

K: *nothing*

Z: *nothing* no

Stanza 12: They asked one of the carers to come in with me

284. Z: they just like (.) enrolled me in a school and then *asked* if I (.)

285. like if one of the carers could *come* in with me

286. and they said yeah

287. and that was it

K: yeah (1)

Strophe 6: Nine mornings in school and then excluded

Stanza 13: my shortest time in school ever: nine mornings

288. K: *so* (.) how *long* did you say you were in *that* school (.) *primary* school?

289. Z: a *week*

K: a *week*

290. Z: *nine* mornings

K: gosh

291. Z: so like my *shortest* ever

K: *yeah* (.) *yeah* (.) it was short (2)

Stanza 14: Excluded

292. K: so *then*/so that you had (.) *nine* mornings
293. so that you *weren't* in full-time
294. Z: no
295. K: *no* / and then they *excluded* you (2) *and* (1)

Part 8: Home tutored

Strophe 1: Overview

Stanza 1: Some guy came in and tutored us

296. so *that* is when you *were* being home tutored?
297. Z: yep
298. K: yeah / can you tell me a little *bit* about *that*?
299. Z: err (1) there was some *guy* came in (1)/ tutored us (.)
300. maths (.) English (.) science (.) everything

Stanza 2: There was appoints system for rewards

301. Z: and we had like reward charts in there as well like if (3)
302. err (.) so like (.) / *well* there was like a points system (.) /we got like (.) so many points for like (.) good work and stuff like that (1)
303. we got like a trip at the end of the week
K: alright
304. Z: and so that was alright

Strophe 2: Trips and activities

Stanza 3: Trips everywhere

305. K: where *did* you *go*? / can you remember any
306. Z: Theme Park (.) Seaside Town (3) *everywhere* (.)

307. that's *about* it

K: Yeah

308. Z: so that was *nice*

Stanza 4: Day trips budgeting so that the teachers could get their shopping

309. K: did you *choose* where you are going to go?

310. Z: yeah

K: yeah

311. Z: yeah (.) we had *day trips* (.) like *budgeting* and stuff

312. we used to go to *Staples* and stuff like that

313. I think that was so the teacher could get their *shopping* as well

Stanza 5: A practical curriculum with sports

314. K: so (.) it sounds like quite a *practical* (.) curriculum that you followed

Z: yeah

315. K: lots of activities and things

316. Z: yeah (.) yep *sports* like in the garden and stuff like that

317. (.) *cricket* (.) *volley ball* (.) *tennis* (2)

318. that was about it

K: Yeah (.)

Strophe 3: Timings

Stanza 6: We didn't have to do full days

319. K: what did you *think* of it?

320. Z: it was *alright* cause we didn't have to do *full days* at *school*

K: mmm

321. Z: so (1) From nine until half twelve (4) [sighs] errr (2)

322. I *can't* remember if it was *every day* or *not*

323. I think it *was every day yeah*

K: yeah

Stanza 7: We worked through the holidays: it was something to do

324. Z: but we didn't *get* six weeks holidays either

K: oh didn't *you*?

325. Z: we had to work through them

K: oh *did* you /oh *no*

326. Z: it was alright / it was *something* to do

327. K: *yes* (.) I *suppose* so

Part 9: High school, Urbanville

Strophe 1: They moved me into high school

Stanza 1: I started high school in Year 9

328. K: erm and what *about* d do do you *think* /did you *feel* at the *time* that you were *happy* (.) there would you have *preferred* to have been in *school*?

329. Z: cause I was coming *up* to my GCSEs they thought it *better* to get me *into* high school

330. K: yeah (3) *ahh* (.) so that takes *us*

331. Z: but I sat my *year nine SATs* in the high school

332. so I started in *year nine* just before *year nine SATs*

K: yeah

Stanza 2: They asked if I wanted a full or staggered timetable

333. Z: that's when *they* moved me into *there* that school

334. K: okay (2)/ and how was *that* one?

335. Z: (3) *err* (.) yeah it was *alright* (3)

336. Z: well they first they asked me what *I wanted* to do/ either a *full* timetable or (.) *staggered*

K: mmm

337. Z: I said *full* timetable, I said *put me in* for full

K: Yeah

Stanza 3: My SATs were all right, I haven't got a certificate

338. Z: did *my sats* /can't remember what the results *were* but they were *all right* (.)

339. I haven't got a *certificate*

340. do you get a *certificate* from sats?

K: umm (.) / (.) / I don't *know*

341. Z: I can't remember

342. K: I would have thought you would get *something*

Z: Oh you *would*

K: yeah

Strophe 2: Educational statement and support

Stanza 4: I had an educational statement and chose which lessons I wanted support in

343. Z: errr (2) ummm (2) and *it's* like (3) I *had* like (.) Cos I had a *statement* an *educational* statement

344. so I got 10 hours *support* a week

K: yeah

345. Z: so I like *chose* what lessons I *wanted* the support *in* and stuff like that (1)

346. so say that was *like* science or *whatever*

K: mmm

Z: cos I didn't like the teacher that much

K: mmm

Stanza 5: I had support in science lesson, but the placement broke down and I had to move

347. Z: and I had like the *support* in most of my science lessons (2)

348. and the err (1) think it was / *I think I sat* like my science GCSEs

349. and *then* err that *placement* broke down

350. and so I *had* to *move* to eerm *Farshire*

K: To *Farshire* yeah / and umm (.)

Stanza 6: They asked me lots of things

351. K: so *this* school / it sounds like *you had* quite a lot of kind of *opportunity* to *talk* about what was gunna *work* for *you* and [

Z: Yep

352. K:] choosing your *support* and things

352. Z: *Yeah* / they asked me *loads* of things like what *lessons* I wanted *support* in

Strophe 3: Supportive systems in school

Stanza 7: You could walk out to a cool-off room with perhaps

353. and like they had a *Cool-off* room where you *could* go

354. so you could just *walk* out /cos they like they *gave* you a *pass* or whatever

355. so I could just like walk out of the *room* and have half an hour

K: *mmm* (2)

356. was *this* the school that *you* said *you* felt *most* supported in?

357. Z: yeah

K: yeah (.) *yeah* it sounds good/

Stanza 8: Staff were strict but fair

358. K: and umm what about relationships with *staff* there (.) and other *pupils*?

358. Z: yeah the staff were *all right* there / *strict* but *fair* [

K: *mmm*

359. Z:] / and I had a *good* group of *friends*

Strophe 4: Leaving

Stanza 9: I moved to Farshire in the Aprilish before GCSEs

360. Z: but *then* it was *like* (3) year 10 /in year 10 like *the* (.) *Aprilish* before you sit GCSEs
361. *well* your science GCSEs you do in year 10/
K: Yeah
362. Z: I don't know *why* /I don't know who invented *those* /that was stupid
363. and *then* (2) I *moved* to Farshire

Stanza 10: My behaviour deteriorated: they said if you don't leave we will have to expel you

364. Z: but before I *moved* to Farshire I was like (.)
365. my *behaviour* deteriorated and I was just like getting *kicked* out of *that* school *anyway*
366. So they basically said *if* you don't *leave* the *school* we will have to *expel* you
367. K: oh *right* (1) just before you *moved*?
Z: yep
K: yeah

Strophe 5: moving away from school placement

Stanza 11: I was fighting and shouting in school, I had to leave

368. K: could you *tell* me a little bit more about *that* incident maybe / what was leading up to *that*?
369. Z: ermm mostly *fighting* in school
K: yeah
370. Z: getting into *fight*s with *pupils* (.) and *shouting* at (.) [clears throat] *shouting* at the *staff*
371. K: *yeah* and so *then* that's *when* they said to you umm that that *basically* you *had* to *leave* or they were going to
Z: yep

K: take *action*? (.) yeah (2)

Stanza 12: It got resolved: I moved

372. K: so so what *happened* at the *end* then (.) how did it get *resolved*?

373. Z: I *moved*

K: you *moved*

Z: yeah

374. K: was that related to what *school* had said?

375. Z: no

K: no

Strophe 6: The only option was to move down South

Stanza 13: The placement broke down and I moved to a home down South

376. Z: no they said it was the *placement* breaking down *as well*

K: okay

377. Z: because the company that I was *with* /the residential private company that I was *with* in Urbanville

378. they had some more *homes* down *south*

389. I *moved* to one of *them* down there

K: ah okay

Stanza 14: It was the only place, I had to move there

390. K: and again did *you* have *much* decision you know

391. did *they* ask *you* about that if *you* were *happy* to move or you *wanted* to go?

392. Z: *no* it was just like the *only* place that my social worker could get

K: yeah

393. Z: so I *had* to move to there

Stanza: 15 I had 28 days notice

394. K: so how much *notice* did you have about you know that you were going to move?

395. Z: err 28 day *notice*

K: 28 *days*

Z: Yep

396. K: how was *that*?

397. Z: it was *alright*

K: yeah

Z: [clears throat]

Part 10: Farshire

Strophe 1: Home tutored

Stanza 1: I did more subjects

398. K: so *then* you *moved* to *Farshire*?

Z: yeah

399. K: and then when you *moved* to to your *new* ermm *new placement*

400. how how *long* until you kind of got into a *school* placement?

401. Z: well (.) they *home* tutored me for a while (2)

402. and but like it was like a *better* than the one at *Urbanville* because we cause we did *more* subjects /language (.) maths (.) English (.) science *everything* like /I can't remember what else we did

K: Yeah

Stanza 2: We had different teachers, a teacher each

403. Z: but we had like *different* teachers as well

404. like three teachers so we had like a *teacher* each basically

K: yeah

Strophe 2: I was moved into a new school for two weeks

Stanza 3: I tried to do my GCSEs but that placement broke down

405. Z: and *then* they moved me into the high school there

406. I *tried* to do my (1) err GCSEs again (.)

407. *but* because that placement broke down

408. I *had* to *move* back to Urbantown

Stanza 4: Home tutored for a month and in school for two weeks

409. K: *ah* right so *here* /so how *long* were you at this school?

410. Z: two weeks

K: two weeks

411. K: and how *long* were you *home* tutored before going into this school?

412. Z: about a *month*

K: about a *month* yeah

Strophe 3: A member of staff came into school so I had to explain the situation

Stanza 5: One of the staff that had come into school with me

413. K: and when you went *into* school /was it slow *again* kind of graduated or straight *in* full-time?

414. Z: errm (2) I don't know *but* one of the *staff* had to come *in* with me anyway

K: *did* they

Z: yeah

K: yeah yeah (2)

415. K: and umm *that* happened to you in *Urbanville* as *well* didn't it /having *staff* coming in with you / was it *Urbanville*

416. Z: ermm yeah/ yeah the *primary* school in *Urbanville*

Stanza 6: It felt strange, everyone asking who he is: you might not want to explain the situation

417. K: *yeah*/did that *feel* did that feel *okay* or did that feel *strange*?

418. Z: Well it does feel *strange* cos you've got some member of staff sitting next to you

419. and everyone is *asking* like *who's* he *who's* he /and stuff like that

K: Mmm

420. Z: So you like explain the *situation* whatever

421. and you *might not* necessarily *want* to

Stanza 7: I'm not that bothered if people know

422. K: No (2) no (.) did you want people to *know* kinda?

423. Z: Not *that* bothered me

K: You *weren't* that bothered

Z: No

424. K: *No* (2) no /I guess some people might not *want* to *say* or might be *happy* to *say* or might y'know chose who to say to

Z: Yeah

425. K: so then

Strophe 4: Leaving the placement

Stanza 8: I didn't know I was leaving, I had 20 minutes notice

426. But I *didn't* I didn't *know* I was *leaving* that school

427. cos when I moved the placement from six to seven *chapters*

K: Yeah

428. Z: Err they *only* give me like *twenty* minutes *notice* that I was leaving yeah

429. [laughs] it was well *bad*

Stanza 9: All the manager said was 'grab a bag you're leaving'

450. Z: all all they said was '*grab a bag you're leaving*'

K: *Really*

451. Z: I was like '*allright then*'

452. K: Who *said* that to you?

453. Z: The manager

K: The *manager*

Stanza 10: Cos I've put a window through in a caravan

453: Z: Cos I *put* a window through

454: like an *old* ca cos like they had old *caravans* round the back

455: and I put one of them windows *through*

K: Yeah

456: So he said *you're* leaving

Strophe 5: Moving to Urbantown

Stanza 11: I got my bin bag: I didn't know where I was going

457: Z: they phoned social services and like three *massive* white guys came

458: like about *20* stone each and like in this *tiny* car

459: so I got my black *bin bag* like *this* [gestures holding bag over his shoulder]
'*where're* we *going?*'

460. cos I *didn't* actually *know* where I was *going*

K: *No* /so when did they *tell* you?

461. Z: About *twenty* minutes before they *came*

Stanza 12: They moved me on the Sunday

462. Z: and they *take* me to Urbantown

463. K: When did you find out that you were going to *Urbantown* /about *twenty*
minutes notice *or*

464. Z: No cos my placement had already broken down *then*

K: Yeah

465. Z: And it was the the *Sunday* and I was meant to be moving on the *Thursday*

K: *Ah* right

466. Z: But because I had broke a *window* they moved me on a *Sunday*

467. K: Oh *instead* of waitin till the *Thursday?*

Z: Yep (1)

Strophe 6: A successful learner

Stanza 13: I'd done my English coursework: it was good

468. Z: b but I was *in* that school *until* (1) cos I'd done *most* of my English coursework *there*

K: Mm

469. Z: And/ god *knows* where it is though

470. it was *good* though I *liked* it

471. and I was like predicted like *Bs* and *As* and *Cs* mostly

K: *fantastic*

Stanza 14: I was predicted As, Bs and Cs: I did loads of subjects

472. Z: It was a (1) *C* in *English* (.) *A* what *A* in science (.) *A* in *maths* and *B* in *ICT* and a few other subjects /but I can't remember what they were

473. K: That's really good

474. Z: There were just *loads* of subjects, loads of *random* Subjects

475. I can't remember what they were / I've got no idea what they *were*

Strophe 7: GCSEs

Stanza 15: I picked nine options in Urbanville

476. K: did you *choose* what they were *or*

478. Z: yeah I chose my options when I was in *Urbanville*

479. K: yeah /and *did* you *carry* on them /so when you *left* *Urbanville* and went *into* *Farshire*?

480. Z: no cos I *picked* about *nine* in *Urbanville*

K: yeah

Stanza 16: I couldn't sit my exam this so I got to college with no GCSE

481. Z: but *because* (.) my *predicted* grades I was predicted mostly *Cs* and *Bs* and stuff

K: uh huh

482. Z: but because I couldn't *sit* them I couldn't *get* them so I *left*

483. *well* I got to college with like *no* GCSEs

484. K: because you were *moving* /so was that your GCSE year?

Z: yeah

K: that's the *year* you were *would* have *sat* your GCSE's

Strophe 8: Which years in each school

Stanza 17: Year 10 and 11 in Farshire

485. K: so was that like yeah you were *15* /so that was kind of like *year*

486. Z: year 10 and 11

487. K: year 10 and 11 that you were *there* and you were you in Urbanville in *year*

Z: errr

Stanza 18: Year nine and 10 in Urbanville

488. K: when did you move [

Z: year nine in Urbanville

K:] from *Urbanville*

489. Z: year nine and 10

K: year nine and *10*

Strophe 9: I couldn't transfer my coursework

Stanza 19: I did my English coursework in Urbanville

490. K: so did you have any kind of *coursework* in the year [

Z: yeah

K:] 10 in Urbanville?

491. Z: I did my *coursework* my English *coursework* / that was it English

492. cos maths doesn't have coursework anymore

493. K: and did you *take* that (.) could you take that with *you* to Farshire and use that for your GCSE's?

Stanza 20: I couldn't contact anyone to get my coursework

494. Z: I *could* of but I *couldn't* get hold of the school

K: Ah

495. Z: cause the *teacher* there had already *left*

K: *oh* no

496. Z: and like massive like *new* building /*new staff* everything

K: yeah

497. Z: so there was like *no* one's *contact* there to get the coursework

Stanza 21: I didn't start again: I was only there for a month

498. K: oh / so did you have to start *again*

499. no I *didn't* / I was only there for like a *month*

K: yeah of course

Part 11: Return to Urbantown

Strophe 1: City View funded educational placements

Stanza 1: City View was full up but I got registered there for funding

500. K: so *then* you have 20 minutes notice (.) from Farshire [

501. Z: yeah [came *back* to Urbantown well *went* to Urbantown and (2)

502. there was *no* place in City View because it was already all *full* up

K: right

503. Z: but I got registered with City View for like *funding* from social services

K: okay

Stanza 2: The ASDAN educational placements were rubbish so I didn't finish them

504. Z: and then like d'you know like *educational* placements
505. like *ASDANs* (.) /English *level* 1 and 2 stuff like that
506. but *didn't finish* them cos (.) they (.) were (.) *rubbish*
507. [clears throat] /cos like *ASDANs* don't do *anything*

Strophe 2: College

Stanza 3: I went to college and did maths and English courses

508. Z: so I err went to college / I was what *15* asked him *what* courses were available
509. and like there was like *maths* and *English* level 1 and two and stuff like that
K: uhh huh
510. Z: and then (.) what about a *year* ago/ went into *college* /when I was *16* yeah
K: yeah
511. Z: went to college at 16 and did some courses *there*

Stanza 4: I'm going to college again this year

512. Z: then I'm going to *college* again this year
513. K: so what *what* are you *doing*?
514. Z: did a *BTEC* level two *last* year and I'm doing I-media and graphics level two *this* year
515. K: ah sounds good
Z: uhhuh

Strophe 3: There were no places at City View, but cos I'm a kid in care they had to put me on the role

Stanza 5: There were no places left at City View

516. K: Yeah (3) so umm when you *said* you you were *brought* to *Urbantown*
517. and you got on role at City View School [
518. Z: Yeah they (.) *Well* they *tried* to get me a *place* at City View

K: Yeah

519. Z: but there was *no* places *left*

K: ah right

Stanza 6: I'm a kid in care so they had to offer me a place: there was nowhere to go so they couldn't take me

520. Z: cos I'm a kid in *care* they *have* to offer me a *place*

K: yeah

521. Z: but they *had* absolutely cos like *classes* were like 30 38 in a class now anyway

K: mmm

522. Z: so there was like *nowhere* to go

523. K: so they they *put* you on *role* because you are in *care*

Z: yeah

524. K: but they couldn't *actually*

Z: *take* me yeah

K: *take* you

Strophe 4: No schools had any places

Stanza 7: They tried a few different schools but there weren't any

525. K: so did *you* have the *opportunity* to choose a *different* school that *did* have a space *or*

526. Z: mm they *tried* a few schools but there weren't *any*

527. like River View School are and green *what's* that Green *called*?

528. K: *umm* Town

Z: yeah *Town* Green

K: yeah

Stanza 8: No one had any places, '92 and '93 had high birth rates

529. Z: and *no* no one had any *places* round *Urbantown*

K: *oh* right

530. Z: like '92 '93 had had high *birth* rates

K: oh right

531. Z: so loads of kids

532. K: yeah busy years

Strophe 5: Did you choose that school?

Stanza 9: No it's full of scrotes and chavs

533. K: and was *that* your / did *you* choose that *school*

534. Z: which *one*

City View

535. Z: *Na*

K: No

536. Z: it's full of *scrotes* and *chavs* and (2) *people*

Stanza 10: I didn't choose any school

537. K: who *chose it* for you?

538. Z: well that were like the *only* school that was there

K: ah that could *take* you yeah that could take *you*

539. K: so then *they* put you

540. Z: I *didn't* choose *any* school

K: *didn't* you

Strophe 6: I was sent to a separate school from my brother

Stanza 11: They didn't want us going to the same school

541. Z: cause in *Urbanville* my *brother* went to one like just up the *road*

542. but *they* they didn't *want* him in me going to the *same* school

K: okay

543. Z: so I went to one like 4 miles *away*

544. I was driven *there* every morning

K: did you?

545. Z: it was all *right* [clears throat]

Stanza 12: It took 45 minutes to get there

546. K: how *long* did that *take*?

547. Z: 45 *minutes* half an hour *traffic* as well

548. K: that's a long day *isn't it*?

549. Z: uhh huh half seven picked *up* in *morning* get *back* about *four* o'clock

K: Gosh

Z: [clears throat]

Stanza 13: We lived in the same house and went to different schools

550. K: that's because they wanted to *separate* you and your brother

Z: uhh huh

551. K: into different *schools*

552. Z: we *lived* in the *same* house

553. just went to *different* schools cause we *went* to school in Urbantown *together* / and that didn't go too well

Strophe 7: Negotiating time

Stanza 14: What time is it?

554. Z: what *time* is it?

555. K: it's *umm* twenty past *three*

556. Z: no it's not

557. K: no it *isn't* / twenty past four/ *sorry* can't read my watch

558. Z: I was going to *say* I *wasn't* here until about twenty past three

559. K: [laughing] I can't read my watch

Stanza 15: All right for another 10 or 15 minutes

560. K: are you *all right* for *time*?
561. Z: Yeah
- K: Yeah
562. Z: yeah another *10* or *15* minutes
- K: yeah / oh that's *great*

Strophe8: ASDAN courses

Stanza 16: I didn't choose they just gave me a timetable

563. K: umm yeah so so did you *choose* the kind of the ASDAN courses and *the* the other kind of [
564. Z:] *no* it was only just 'there you *go*' they just gave me a piece of paper with the *timetable* saying 'there's your *timetable*'
565. that was it
- K: and that was it
- Z: Yep

Stanza 17: it wasn't structured work; I wasn't learning anything I didn't already know

566. K: so *how* did they *go* for you?
567. Z: err well there *wasn't* really *structured* work it was mostly like (1)
568. *well* (.)cos there was like an *engineering* one / they *basically* gave you an *engine* [
- K: right yeah [
- Z: to take *apart* and put back *together*/which was *easy* enough /
569. Z: but I wasn't actually *doing* anything constructive I don't think
570. cause I *wasn't* learning *anything* that I didn't *already know*
- K: no

Strophe 9: Maths and English at college now

Stanza 18: Not learning any new maths or English

571. Z: it's like with college *now* (1) like when you do *maths* and *English* and stuff

572. you *don't* actually *do* maths and English *lessons* /you *only* do like *practice* tests

K: oh okay

573. Z: which is *isn't* actually *learning* any like *new* maths or English that I *didn't* already *know*

K: no

Stanza 19: I am looking to maths tuition outside of college

574. Z: so (.) I th I'm *looking* to like maths *tuition* and *stuff* now

575. K: to have *outside* of college [

Z: yeah

K:] or *in* college?

576. Z: outside of college cos I *didn't* really *do* maths like after year *10* so

577. Z: I'm still year *11* *maths* and stuff like that

K: mmm

Stanza 20: I was good at maths

578. Z: I didn't I *know* most of my maths anyway / cause I *started* like algebra like *GCSE* GCSE maths in year (.) year five and *6*

579. Z: I had a *home* tutor cause I was *good* at *maths* so it was like/ and I was *meant* to sit my GCSE's *early* anyway

K: oh *did* you

580. Z: yeah but I *couldn't* because I *moved* places

K: oh *yeah* / yeah you were *going* to take it but then got moved

Z: uhh huhh

581. Z:] and *couldn't* sit the exam

Strophe 10: Practice tests every week in college

Stanza 21: Practice tests in college

582. K: yeah (1) so when you are *doing* your *practice* tests do they *go* through things with *you* afterwards
583. so like say '*okay* maybe this area you need you could do with a bit *more* you *know* learning?
584. Z: no not really/ because *basically* it is like on the *Internet* there's s just like *practice* tests / so you do *one* of them
585. well do a *few* cos I *only* had *maths* like *once* a week once a week in college
- K: mmm

Stanza 22: I would like to do something different

586. Z: so (1) I'd *go* there *once* a week/ do a *practice* test / and that's it
586. K: oh *right* / and *you'd* like something a bit (.) *different* to that
- Z: *yeah*
587. Z: yeah (1) / and can *they* offer *you* anything *different*
588. well they've got *GCSE* maths where you *do* learn like *GCSE maths*
- K: mm

Strophe 11: Level 1

Stanza 23: I couldn't get my GCSEs in my old school so I started at level I

589. Z: but they don't *offer* it like only they *don't* offer it unless you've *got* *GCSE* maths *already* / like a *low* level
- K: oh *right*
590. Z: *well* cos my *predicted* were B and A but I *couldn't* get that in my old school
- K: yeah
591. Z: so they had to *start* me at the *bottom* of level I
592. K: oh that's *frustrating*

Stanza 24: I did the hour and a half test in 15 minutes

593. Z: level I *test* was like an hour and a *half*
594. I did it in *fifteen* minutes

K: oh *wow*

595. Z: I was like click click click click click click [gestures clicking on a computer mouse]

K: Yeah

Strophe 12: Level 2 maths

Stanza 25: I had to do the level 2 test in my head

596. Z: but I went for level *two* (1)

597. but when when I came in / sat *down* and everything *yeah*

598. I *started* the test but I wanted a *pen* and a *piece* of paper cos I hadn't brung them in / and she said we *hadn't* haven't got *any*

599. so I *had* to do it like all in my *head* and that /and I only like to *14* out of *30* or whatever

Stanza 26: they haven't got any parent or paper so I'll have to sit it again

600. K: they *hadn't* got any pen or paper

601. Z: *no* so I had to do like level *two* maths / they give you like *15* numbers and you need to find the mean or something /

602. so I was going like *this* going have you *not* got any

603. [laughs] no too *hard*

K: yeah of *course* /that's *crazy* isn't it

604. Z: I *know* so I am going to *sit* that one *again*

Stanza 27: I'm now rushing a course that hopefully gives you level 2

605. Z: so I am doing like a course *now* that gives you a *level*

606. well *hopefully* gives you a level two English and maths

K: Yeah

607. Z: so it's *meant* to be a *12 week* course but I've only got six *weeks* before I start college

K: *ahhh* ok

608. Z: so I've *got* to like *rush* it

K: do it in quick *time*

Z: yeah

K: *yeah*

Z: [clears throat]

Part 12: Future

Strophe 1: Starting College in September

Stanza 1: I've got interviews for two courses

609. K: and then *when* do you *start* college?

610. Z: 13th of *September*

K: Thirteenth

611. Z: I've already been accepted onto *two* courses well not two courses

612. I've *applied* for *two* courses and they've both given me *interviews*

613. so I'll have to see which one I *want*

K: yeah

Stanza 2: Business studies and media: I'll see which I want to do

614. Z: cos *one* of them is you know a *National* Enterprise Specialist

K: uhh huh

615. which is like *business* studies and stuff like that and the other one is *media*

K: yes

616. Z: so I'll see which one I want to do *first*

617. K: mmm so that's *good* and did you have quite a lot of *choice* of things to *do*?

618. Z: well well (4) *yeah* I think there was *quite* a lot

Strophe 2: College and university towns

Stanza 3: Level 2 in college this year and level 3 in 2011 2012

619. K: yeah (.) Yeah (4) okay I *was* going to ask you *really* kind of what your *hopes* and *plans* are for the *future* / and you told me about *college*

Z: uhh huh

620. K: have you thought *anything* kind of *beyond* there? [

621. Z:]*College* level two this year

K: yeah

622. Z: get a *merit* / so I'll do like / cos I *didn't* get a merit this year /so I *need* to get a merit /

623. well I *didn't* get a well *this* year yeah so I *need* to get a merit *this* year *next* year / so I can go for a level *three* 2011 2012

K: yeah

Stanza 4: I need to get a university place before I'm 21 for social services funding

624. Z: so then I'm going to *go* for level *three* (1) go for

625. how *old* will be *then*? how *old* am I *now*? 17 (.) 18 (.) 18 /I'll *be* like 19

K: mm

626. Z: so I've *got* like *two* years to get a university place so like I *need* to get a university place before I'm 21

K: oh right *okay/why* is *that*

627. Z: cause I'm sure these / *social* services will *only* fund *you* if you *get* on a university course before the age of 21

K: oh *okay*

628. Z: so I've *got* to *get* on before I'm 21

K: yeah

Strophe 3: I hope to open my own IT shop

Stanza 5: I'll do something computery at university and then open an IT shop

629. Z: and *then* go for (5) / god knows I don't know *what* I'm going for yet I'll figure that out *later*

630. K: yeah you've got time / *you* haven't you haven't thought then *yet*?

631. Z: it will be *something* computery

K: computers

Z: yeah

632. Z: and *then* hopefully I can *open* my own *IT* shop

K: fantastic

Stanza 6: I'll start that at 18 with a bank loan

634. Z: *well* I think I'm going to start *that* when I'm *18*

635. get some money and then / *when* I'm *18* I'm gunna get a loan from the *bank*
(1)

636. and *then* like *rent accommodation* and *equipment* stuff like *that* (.)

637. hire *employees*

Strophe 4: Roles and skills in the business

Stanza 7: Employees: my brothers

638. Z: well I've *got* employees *already* me brothers

K: ahhh

639. Z: like one *brother* is a really good at is like *networking* and problem solving
and stuff like that / *one* is like a *salesman* he can sell *anything*

K: uhh huh

Stanza 8: I'm the manager: going for a business course so I can structure the business

640. Z: and *I'm* more of like the *manager* that's *why* I'm going for like a *business*
course

K: yeah

641. Z: so I can *structure* the business and everything like that

642. K: *definitely* / it sounds like a good *combination* of *people* and different *skills*

Stanza 9: I've just done some programming and will see if I can do it at university

643. Z: the course I've *just* done now has covered things like *programming* as well

644. so I'm going to see *if* I can do *programming* at *university*
645. K: yeah yeah (1) yeah no that's *good* (???????)
646. Z: *yeah* /I've got hiccups now/you shouldn't have a *cake* before you come *out*
[laughs]

Part 13: Ending

Strophe 1: Other details

Stanza 1: Anything we missed? Further questions

647. K: yeah so umm is there *anything* anything *else* that we have kind of *missed* when talking about your *history* and things *anything* we *should* have covered *anything* I should have *asked* you?
648. Z: can I have a look at them *cards* [reaches for my interview theme prompt cards]
649. K: *yeah* [passes them] they're just *kind of* umm my questions while I haven't got *clear* questions they're just kind of *prompts* for me [laughs]
- Z: [laughs]
650. K: but what I'll probably *do* if it's *okay* with you is / *listen* back to this *type* up what we *said* and then I *might* have some *more* kind of *questions* or things to *ask* you
- Z: yes
- K: a bit more about

Stanza 2: What would a summary of you be?

651. Z: why *didn't* you just *type* these out?
652. K: well I *did* but then I thought it might be a bit *easier* for me to *read* on *cards* rather than kind of on sheets of paper so [laughs] I *stuck* them on / yeah and um
653. I *thought* maybe *also* that it might be *helpful* to *umm* to *think* about kind of if we were kind to give some *summary* of some background information about *you* kind of what *what* that would *need* to *be*
654. I don't *know* like your *age* anything you might want to *say* /I don't *know* kind of and a *pseudo*-name I explained before I wasn't going to use *your* name

Strophe 2: Negotiating confidentiality

Stanza 3: use my real name

656. Z: why *why* not? / use my real name I *don't mind*

657. K: would you *like* me to use your real name?

Z: *yeah*

658. K: the *reason* why I was thinking *not* too was

659. Z: spell it *right* though

K: yeah how do I spell it?

660. Z: pass me a *pen* Z a c / you can *write* it / h a r a y

K: a y

661. Z: my surname is Name N A M E

Stanza 4: I'd only use your first name and take out all other names

662. K: I'd just put your *first* name / I was only going to use *first* names and I was going to /

663. the *reason* why I was going to do was thinking about kind of using *pseudo-*name was to *do* with erm making it *anonymous* and *confidential*

664. you know I would *still* take out the names of the places and the city's and school names

665. Z: *leave* them *all* in (1) / you *should* (5)

Strophe 3: School details and ending

Stanza 5: School names

666. Z: I can give you *all* the *school* names

667. I've not *even* told you *any* of the *schools* yet (3)

668. White Primary School/ God knows (4) erm what was it now/ God knows (1) / White primary School

669. Bigtown/Red Primary *School*/ can't remember/*Urbanville* Blue Primary School/ God Knows forgot the name/ *High* school du du du Green High School / Six Purple College and now Urbantown college

670. K: *thank you*

Stanza 6: The end: this has all been recorded

671. Z: Have you got them *all*?

672. K: Well I've got them all recorded/ *luckily* I've got it all on tape else I wouldn't be able to remember *very* much

673. shall I turn this *off* now then?

674. Z: well you should say something like interview *ended* so you *know* when it *ended*

675. K: okay / interview *ended*

Summary of the macro-analysis of the first interview with Zacharay

Part 1: Getting started

Strophe 1: Before we start

Stanza 1: before and after the interview

Stanza 2: opening the window

Stanza 3: consent and questions

Strophe 2: Life as book

Stanza 4: Time at school as a book made up of chapters

Stanza 5: Negotiating writing; break up time into chapters

Strophe 3: Start with Primary school and go through each time

Stanza 6: Primary school: chapter one

Stanza 7: What are we doing?

Strophe 4: Primary schools

Stanza 8: Chapter 2: Primary school in Urbantown. Chapter 3: Primary School in Urbanville

Stanza 9: Writing is not very neat

Strophe 5: Home tutored, high school and college

Stanza 10: Chapter 4: home tutored. Chapter 5: High school, Urbanville

Stanza 11: Chapter 6: High school, Farshire

Stanza 12: Chapter 7: College, now

Strophe 6: How old in the chapters

Stanza 13: Can you remember how old you are in all of them?

Stanza 14: Seven during Primary School

Strophe 7: Missed one out

Stanza 15: It's alright

Stanza 16: Primary School in Bigtown: between chapters 2 and 3

Strophe 8: Age in schools

Stanza 17: Eight to ten

Stanza 18: Starting at eleven

Strophe 9: How old would I have been?

Stanza 19: Home tutored: Year 9

Stanza 20: Thirteen to fifteen

Strophe 10: Difficult to remember

Stanza 21: Fifteen: is this right?

Stanza 22: Is that right? No

Stanza 23: About thirteen to fifteen and now, fifteen plus

Strophe 11: An overview

Stanza 24: Divided by locations

Stanza 25: Your story and your words about these different times

Part 2: Chapter 1, Primary School in Urbantown

Strophe 1: Setting the scene

Stanza 1: What do you remember from then?

Stanza 2: Went there when I went into care aged seven

Stanza 3: I was naughty, they reduced my timetable and so I missed out school

Strophe 2: Got excluded near Christmas

Stanza 4: A memory from near Christmas

Stanza 5: I got expelled

Strophe 3: Leading up to the expulsion

Stanza 6: I can't remember much else except for kicking off, not doing any work

Stanza 7: they just told me to go

Strophe 4: Talking with an educational psychologist about behaviour

Stanza 8: Support from an Educational Psychologist

Stanza 9: We talked about behaviour and then cut down my timetable

Part 3: Chapter 2, primary school in Urbantown

Strophe 1: When did I go there?

Stanza 1: Primary School in Urbantown

Stanza 2: Moved from Metropolis

Strophe 2: They just moved me out after a few weeks

Stanza 3: I just started going and they moved me

Stanza 4: Just moved me out: I was annoyed

Stanza 5: Moved me because of a placement move

Strophe 3: Can you remember a particular memory?

Stanza 6: Meeting the head teacher: it was just a few weeks

Part 4: Bigtown

Strophe 1: Overview

Stanza 1: Bigtown was a good one

Stanza 2: I went to the local school, my behaviour and grades were all right

Stanza 3: The placement broke down and I couldn't stay

Strophe 2: A good school: friends

Stanza 4 : A good school: Staff were alright and quite a few friends

Stanza 5: Did a performance with a gang of friends

Stanza 6: We lost the world cup

Strophe 3: Performance extra to lessons

Stanza 7: S-club junior performance

Stanza 8: Singing and dancing

Stanza 9: They are the best memories from Bigtown

Part 5: The impact of placement on school exclusion

Strophe 1: the school aspect is helped by a foster placement

Stanza 1: I didn't get expelled because I was in a foster placement

Stanza 2: The stable family environment helped

Strophe 2: Difference between foster and residential placements

Stanza 3: In foster carers' they'd treat you like a normal family

Stanza 4: In residential care they'd ease you into school which messes it up

Strophe 3: The effect of placement on starting a new school

Stanza 5: In residential care they put you in school 2 mornings a week while in foster care they put you straight in

Stanza 6: unclear questioning from Kate

Part 6: Chapter 2a, Metropolis

Strophe 1: A new school with a full timetable

Stanza 1: The same, well new

Stanza 2: We had a reward chart

Stanza 3: I was there about a month with a full timetable

Part 7: Chapter 3, Urbanville

Strophe 1: Moved into residential care

Stanza 1: I had only been in foster care and at my mothers

Stanza 2: They moved me into the same care home as my brother

Strophe 2: Starting primary school in Urbanville

Stanza 3: Into primary school on a staggered timetable

Stanza 4: Staff had to sit in school with me to monitor my behaviour

Stanza 5: It let people know that I was different

Strophe 3: Home tutored

Stanza 6: A teacher came in everyday

Stanza 7: Less hours, got more done and more interaction with the teacher

Strophe 4: A memory of being thrown out

Stanza 8: Can you remember any memories?

Stanza 9: I kicked off and they threw me out

Strophe 5: Support

Stanza 10: I didn't have much support

Stanza 11: School did nothing to help

Stanza 12: They asked one of the carers to come in with me

Strophe 6: Nine mornings in school and then excluded

Stanza 13: my shortest time in school ever: nine mornings

Stanza 14: Excluded

Part 8: Home tutored

Strophe 1: Overview

Stanza 1: Some guy came in and tutored us

Stanza 2: There was appoints system for rewards

Strophe 2: Trips and activities

Stanza 3: Trips everywhere

Stanza 4: Day trips budgeting so that the teachers could get their shopping

Stanza 5: A practical curriculum with sports

Strophe 3: Timings

Stanza 6: We didn't have to do full days

Stanza 7: We worked through the holidays: it was something to do

Part 9: High school, Urbanville

Strophe 1: They moved me into high school

Stanza 1: I started high school in Year 9

Stanza 2: They asked if I wanted a full or staggered timetable

Stanza 3: My SATs were all right, I haven't got a certificate

Strophe 2: Educational statement and support

Stanza 4: I had an educational statement and chose which lessons I wanted support in

Stanza 5: I had support in science lesson, but the placement broke down and I had to move

Stanza 6: They asked me lots of things

Strophe 3: Supportive systems in school

Stanza 7: You could walk out to a cool-off room with perhaps

Stanza 8: Staff were strict but fair

Strophe 4: Leaving

Stanza 9: I moved to Farshire in the Aprilish before GCSEs

Stanza 10: My behaviour deteriorated: they said if you don't leave we will have to expel you

Strophe 5: moving away from school placement

Stanza 11: I was fighting and shouting in school, I had to leave

Stanza 12: It got resolved: I moved

Strophe 6: The only option was to move down South

Stanza 13: The placement broke down and I moved to a home down South

Stanza 14: It was the only place, high hat to move there

Stanza: 15 I had 28 days notice

Part 10: Farshire

Strophe 1: Home tutored

Stanza 1: I did more subjects

Stanza 2: We had different teachers, a teacher each

Strophe 2: I was moved into a new school for two weeks

Stanza 3: I tried to do my GCSEs but that placement broke down

Stanza 4: Home tutored for a month and in school for two weeks

Strophe 3: A member of staff came into school so I had to explain the situation

Stanza 5: One of the staff that had come into school with me

Stanza 6: It felt strange, everyone asking who he is: you might not want to explain the situation

Stanza 7: I'm not that bothered if people know

Strophe 4: Leaving the placement

Stanza 8: I didn't know I was leaving, I had 20 minutes notice

Stanza 9: All the manager said was 'grab a bag you're leaving'

Stanza 10: Cos I've put a window through in a caravan

Strophe 5: Moving to Urbantown

Stanza 11: I got my bin bag: I didn't know where I was going

Stanza 12: They moved me on the Sunday

Strophe 6: A successful learner

Stanza 13: I'd done my English coursework: it was good

Stanza 14: I was predicted As, Bs and Cs: I did loads of subjects

Strophe 7: GCSEs

Stanza 15: I picked nine options in Urbanville

Stanza 16: I couldn't sit my exam this so I got to college with no GCSE

Strophe 8: Which years in each school

Stanza 17: Year 10 and 11 in Farshire

Stanza 18: Year nine and 10 in Urbanville

Strophe 9: I couldn't transfer my coursework

Stanza 19: I did my English coursework in Urbanville

Stanza 20: I couldn't contact anyone to get my coursework

Stanza 21: I didn't start again: I was only there for a month

Part 11: Return to Urbantown

Strophe 1: City View funded educational placements

Stanza 1: City View was full up but I got registered there for funding

Stanza 2: The ASDAN educational placements were rubbish so I didn't finish them

Strophe 2: College

Stanza 3: I went to college and did maths and English courses

Stanza 4: I'm going to college again this year

Strophe 3: There were no places at City View, but cos I'm a kid in care they had to put me on the role

Stanza 5: There were no places left at City View

Stanza 6: I'm a kid in care so they had to offer me a place: there was nowhere to go so they couldn't take me

Strophe 4: No schools had any places

Stanza 7: They tried a few different schools but there weren't any

Stanza 8: No one had any places, '92 and '93 had high birth rates

Strophe 5: Did you choose that school?

Stanza 9: No it's full of scrotes and chavs

Stanza 10: I didn't choose any school

Strophe 6: I was sent to a separate school from my brother

Stanza 11: They didn't want us going to the same school

Stanza 12: It took 45 minutes to get there

Stanza 13: We lived in the same house and went to different schools

Strophe 7: Negotiating time

Stanza 14: What time is it?

Stanza 15: All right for another 10 or 15 minutes

Strophe 8: ASDAN courses

Stanza 16: I didn't choose they just gave me a timetable

Stanza 17: it wasn't structured work; I wasn't learning anything I didn't already know

Strophe 9: Maths and English at college now

Stanza 18: Not learning any new maths or English

Stanza 19: I am looking to maths tuition outside of college

Stanza 20: I was good at maths

Strophe 10: Practice tests every week in college

Stanza 21: Practice tests in college

Stanza 22: I would like to do something different

Strophe 11: Level 1

Stanza 23: I couldn't get my GCSEs in my old school so I started at level 1

Stanza 24: I did the hour and a half test in 15 minutes

Strophe 12: Level 2 maths

Stanza 25: I had to do the level 2 test in my head

Stanza 26: they haven't got any parent or paper so I'll have to sit it again

Stanza 27: I'm now rushing a course that hopefully gives you level 2

Part 12: Future

Strophe 1: Starting College in September

Stanza 1: I've got interviews for two courses

Stanza 2: Business studies and media: I'll see which I want to do

Strophe 2: College and university towns

Stanza 3: Level 2 in college this year and level 3 in 2011 2012

Stanza 4: I need to get a university place before I'm 21 for social services funding

Strophe 3: I hope to open my own IT shop

Stanza 5: I'll do something computery at university and then open an IT shop

Stanza 6: I'll start that at 18 with a bank loan

Strophe 4: Roles and skills in the business

Stanza 7: Employees: my brothers

Stanza 8: I'm the manager: going for a business course so I can structure the business

Stanza 9: I've just done some programming and will see if I can do it at university

Part 13: Ending

Strophe 1: Other details

Stanza 1: Anything we missed? Further questions

Stanza 2: What would a summary of you be?

Strophe 2: Negotiating confidentiality

Stanza 3: use my real name

Stanza 4: I'd only use your first name and take out all other names

Strophe 3: School details and ending

Stanza 5: School names

Stanza 6: The end: this has all been recorded

Transcript 2: Analysis of Second interview with Zacharay

Part 1: Returning to our previous interview

Strophe 1: Returning to our conversation about Metropolis

Stanza 1: You wanted more out of school- what did you mean?

1. K: I referred sometimes to pages in *there* [pointing to printed out transcription from previous interview] / *OK*
Z: Hang on [turns microphone towards himself]
2. K: there were just a couple of *things* /just clarifying *things* really/ so (.) I *asked* you
3. you *talked* a bit about a school in *Metropolis*
Z: I did yeah
4. K: and you said that you wanted *more* out of that *school*
5. and I just *wondered* what you meant really by wanting more out of the *school*?

Stanza 2: What did I say? Looking to the transcription

6. Z: I'm not sure what I said / *what* did I say?
7. K: Don't worry/ if you can't remember it
8. Z: [reading transcript] errr blur blur blur placement in Bigtown blar blar
9. K: *Oh* there we go [pointing to transcript]/ so *before* that [turning page]

Strophe 2: In Metropolis for two weeks

Stanza 3: Finding Metropolis in the transcription

10. Z: Err Metropolis (?????)
11. K: so you were *only* there for a couple of weeks I think you said
12. Z: [reading transcript] you said *ermm* / no that's mmm
K: Yeah *mmm*
Z: Mmm

K: [laughs]

13. Z: And then just paused for more *no* that's *less* than a second/ they are called *breaths* you know

14. yes exactly they *are* / *exactly* yeah you can't *possibly* /it's just that the *convention* of of ermm umm /this way of transcribing

Stanza 4: I was settled in that school: it would have been better to carry on there

15. Z: I wanted more out of that *school* / I wanted more out of that school / what do I mean by *that?*/ *errrrr* (6)

16. because I think I was probably *settled* in that school [moves microphone closer]

17. I think I was probably settled in that *school* so I thought it would be *better* to carry on with *the* education there

K: yeah

18. Z: because I probably get / *better* education out of that

K: yeah (.) yeah (.) thank you

Strophe 3: Bigtown

Stanza 5: Checking out that the school was positive for you

19. K: ermm and then we talk we talked about your school in *Bigtown* / we don't need to find in *there*

20. K: and it sounded to *me* like that was a school that was really positive for *you* /and you felt really part of the *school* and kind of the (1) / what's the word I'm looking for (1) / kind of the school *community* and everything there

21. would that be *right* /in thinking that?

Z: Yes

22. K: Ok/ I just wanted to check *out* rather than to *say* you *know* /what *I* think

Stanza 6: The only school that you haven't been excluded from

23. K: ermm / and *you* said as well that the school in Bigtown was the only one that you *hadn't* been excluded *from* or pretty much the only one that you hadn't been excluded *from*

24. Z: Yep

25. K: and you said that you thought that was because you were living at *foster* placement
26. ermm so I just wanted to ask you a bit *more* about the impact of kinda *where* you were living you think had on *you*?
27. and then had had on you your *school*?

Part 2: Effect of the type of placement on school

Strophe 1: In foster care they put you into school like everyone else

Stanza 1: Foster care: in school full time. Children's home: part timetable

28. Z: because *in* / whilst you are in *foster* care / the foster carers obviously want to make a more *stable home*
29. so they like put you in to school *full-time* straight away
30. whilst at / like children's home and stuff they like tried to (.) build up to *it*
31. so like put you on *part* timetables and stuff like *that*
32. so it worked *better* because I went straight into it

Stanza 2: I was just like every other kid in school

33. K: *why* do you think that worked better for *you*?
34. Z: because *then* I was just *like* every other kid in *there*
35. just went to school nine till *three* or whatever

Stanza 3: You aren't very obviously different to others in school when you are in residential care

36. K: yeah so do you think it was something about being *different* when you were in residential care if you are going in *part-time*?
37. Z: yeah probably / because you had to go err with a member of staff as *well*
38. so you had a like a member of *staff* sitting with you for like *three* hours and then you went home
39. K: mmm yeah so it's very obvious *that* that there's somebody there with you isn't it?

40. K: ok so *that*/ yeah so *that* was really my question about that/ umm how *how* that ermm tran *transition* could mess *up* your new school (2) /

Strophe 2: In foster care you are treated more like a normal family

Stanza 4: you make more of a relationship with foster carers

41. K: ermmm (2) / and you *said* also (.) that kind of when you were in foster *care* you were treated more like a (.) normal *family* and that the environment was more *stable*
42. and I just wondered if you / if you *know* or what you *think* was more *stable* about the environment and how it felt more like a *normal* family / being with foster *carers* a [
43. Z:] because being with foster *carers* / you can probably make more of a *relationship* / cos there's only *two* err (.) well (.) normally only *two* of them / just *all* the *time*

K: Yeah

Stanza 5: It's harder to build up relationships in care homes because they change staff every day

44. Z: Whist in residential care *homes* / they change staff every *day*
45. K: Ahh so those relationships are harder to (1) b build up
- Z: Probably
- K: yeah yeah (1) / ermm (2)

Part 3: Moving between schools and placements

Strophe 1: Who made the decisions about moving and placements?

Stanza 1: Who are they?

46. K: and *then* / the other kind of ermm thing I wanted to ask about *is*/ well we talked a lot *about* ermm moving between *schools* / and moving between *placements* / and things like *that* /
47. *and* you sort of *said* 'oh *they* moved me and *they* put me here'

48. and I wondered *who* / if you knew / who is *making* the *decisions* about/ who are *they*?

Z: who are *they*?

K: yeah who are *they*?

49. Z: Urbantown social services

K: Urbantown social services

Z: *Yep*

50. so it felt like *they* were making / *Urbantown* social services were making those[

Z:] yeah *decisions* [

K: decisions]

Stanza 2: This will be written down

51. Z: see that's going to be hard to write down

52. we both spoke at exactly the same time

53. K: Exactly yeah it's very *hard*

Stanza 3: The place where I was living or the social services decided when to move me

54. K: so ermm so it *was* / so like the social services decided which *schools* you were going to

Z: Yeah

55. K: is that *right* /and then *what* about when you had to *move* the *school* or *leave a placement*/ who made that decision

56. Z: either *the* place where I was living / or the social services

K: yeah

Strophe 2: Placement and school moves

Stanza 4: I would know roughly if my placement was temporary or long-term

57. because when you go to a *placement* it's either temporary or *long-term*

K: Oh *OK*

Z: it depends what is

58. K: and would you *know* when you went *there*?

Z: which *one*?

K: yeah

Z: yeah

59. K: so would you *know* when you went somewhere how *long* you would be staying *there*?

60. Z: roughly (.) yeah

Stanza 5: a placements move didn't always involve a change of school

61. K: *okay*/ and did that *always* involve a *change of school* as well?

62. Z: not necessarily

K: mm

63. Z: because *when* when I moved *from* (1) /like around *Urbantown* I stayed in the school that I was in in *Urbantown*

64. yeah/ oh OK so *yeah* / your school would *stay* but you might be moving different *places*

Strophe 3: Making decisions about college

Stanza 6: You are more independent and make more decisions for yourself over 16

65. and *again* would that be the *same* with social services deciding which courses you going to do when you first (.) started at college in *Urbantown* as well?

66. Z: *no* / because I was over like *16* and stuff you make more decisions for *yourself*

K: yeah

67. Z: as well as being *more* independent

Stanza 7: I went to the college open day and picked courses I liked

68. K: so when you first *came* / when you first started *Urbantown College* / ermm how how kind of how was it set *up* / how did you decide what you were going to *do*?

69. Z: just went to the open *day* and picked courses that I *liked*
K: yes
70. Z: so that was *it*
71. K: so you picked a course that you liked/ it was your *choice*
Z: mmm hhm

Strophe 4: What effects did moving schools have on you?

Stanza 8: Co-constructing the meaning of the question

72. K: ermm and I just *wondered* what / what kind of *effects* / moving between different schools had on *you* / do you think?
73. Z: *education* wise?
74. K: *any*
75. Z: [coughs] cough see/

Stanza 9: I didn't learn as much, I didn't sit the tests

76. Z: err well *education-wise* / I think it probably disrupted my education so I didn't *learn* as much in the (.) amount of time that we were *sposed* to/
77. and I didn't sit *me* / sit *the* like (.) *tests* and stuff that you are supposed to as well
78. K: yeah (3) / *ok* did it have any *other* effects on *you* in anyway?
79. Z: don't think so

Strophe 5: What helps you get to where you are today?

Stanza 10: what was it about you?

80. K: *ok* ermm/ and then *really* as I was I was reading *through* / our interview and our pages of transcripts I was thinking *that* you know you had quite/
81. in some ways you could say it could have been quite *tough* because you've moved through so many different *schools*
82. but things for you *now* sound like they are going really well and positive
83. college is going *well* / and you've got some good plans for the *future*

84. so I wondered what is it about *you* that has meant you could overcome all *that* / and get to where you are *today*?

85. dunno

Stanza 11: In Urbanville I got into the routine of staff doing most of the stuff for me

86. K: what has helped *you* get *there* / you know what

87. Z: *every* social services / well not social services / every residential home is different *anyway* /

88. and the one I was in in Urbanville I was in for like *six* years or whatever so I got into the routine of like that *anyway* of like the staff doing most of the stuff *anyway*

Stanza 12: Urbanville was more independent so I got into the pattern of doing stuff myself

89. Z: but when I *came* into living in *Urbantown* it was totally different

90. more *independent* / so you had to do stuff *yourself* / sort out your own appointments and stuff like *that* /

91. so that's probably got me into a *pattern* of how it's going to be *like* / when I get my own flat and stuff

92. yeah (.) so you have taken on that independence (.) *now* and that means you are able to / kind of / make *plans* and *go* to college [(????)]

Z:] yep

K: yep / thank you (2)

Stanza 13: I am happy with most of my educational experience

93. K: ermm (2) I guess *really* it's not *part* of a *story* / and our interviews have been thinking about the *story* of your school life

94. but I just *wondered* whether you are *happy* with the experience / educational experience that you have *had* throughout your life

95. whether you would have wanted it to have been different in anyway?

96. Z: no I'm *happy* / happy with *most* of it

Part 3: Other details relating to the research

Strophe 1: The participation group

Stanza 1: Ask Jane about the group

97. K: and (.) just (.) for (.) for my ermm / when I'm writing *about* / kind of like the group / the participation groups that you are *part of* / kind of *how* how I met *you* to to take part in *this*/

98. I just wanted to give some basic information when I'm writing about the *group*

99. so could you tell me just a little bit about

100. Z: *ask* Jane you know / she's out *there*

101. K: I could ask *her* yeah/ I thought I'd ask *you*

102. Z: Just ask Jane she'll tell you *everything*

Okay (.)

Stanza 2: I've been coming to the group once a week for about a year

103. K: how *long* have you been coming to the *group*?

104. Z: don't know probably about a *year*

105. K: about a *year*/ and you come once every two weeks?

106. Z: once a week

K: once a week/ once a week/

Strophe 2: Confidentiality and ethics

Stanza 3: Use Zacharay

107. K: and *then* / again when I'm writing about umm the *young* people that I've been working *with* I'm going to just sort of write a quick / just like an *introduction* to you

108. so we've *agreed* that you want to use your your name / do you still want to use your name?

109. Z: yep/ my *full* name Zacharay

110. K: yeah *Zacharay*/ I won't be putting your surname *in*

Stanza 4: Ethical agreement to take out local authority and school names

111. K: but erm like I said I've *got* to take *out* the names of local authorities and school names because that's part of my agreement with the authority for letting me do my research with/ with erm young people in Urbantown

112. Z: why / *have* they said *that*?

113. K: yeah it is part of it is part of my *ethics* agreement

[disturbance when somebody came into the room]

Stanza 5: The ethics have been agreed and signed

114. K: Errmm what was I trying to say (2) / *yes* that was part of my ethical *agreement umm* that the local authority can't be identified

115. Z: did you sign a contract?

116. K: yes / well yes I signed my ethical form

117. Z: you actually signed?

118. K: well yes it is all signed and that is why it was *agreed* / and you know if I was saying that I was identifying *places* / then I may not have been able to do *it*

119. Z: yeah but you could get it published before they find *out* / then it's *done* / it's like the *Bible* / it wasn't written in English until the 15th century something like that

[disturbance when somebody came into the room again]

120. K: well I have made an agreement about it really

Strophe 3: How to describe and write about you

Stanza 6: Age and time looked after by the local authority

121. K: and in terms of *you* I just want to check/ are you seventeen now?

122. Z: yep

K: 17

123. K: ermm and I was just / I am going to *write* about your *story* and things that we have talked about *anyway* / but I was just going to *say* you know like your *age*

124. and can I ask how *long* you have been umm looked after by the authority as well?

125. Z: Ermm (3) 10 years-ish

K: 10 *years*

Stanza 7: Into computers and games

126. K: and umm would there be anything *else*?

127. ermm you know if I was talking about *myself* you know I'd say I was 32 and this is my *job* / you know just basic things

128. Z: into *computers*

K: into *computers* yeah

129. Z: games (2) / that's *it*

Stanza 8: I will check out what I write with you

130. K: okay so I can kind of have a / and I'll show you *again* what I'm writing

131. you know describing *you* and obviously I'll be going into more detail about this *story* and things

Z: yeah

132. K: I want to kind of check everything out with *you* that I'm putting *in*/ ermm and *then* (1)

Strophe 4: The process of our meetings

Stanza 9: It was easier to split life into locations

133. K: the only other question *is* kind of how has it *been* so far/

134. *how* you know when we split your life or asked you to kind of put your school life into *chapters* was that *helpful* to talk about it or was it confusing?

135. Z: easier *well* yeah / well not necessarily into *chapters* but into like *locations* or different *schools* and stuff like that

136. K: yeah (1) yeah / because *that* would be my *worry* if I just said *tell* me everything all about your life at school / it might have been harder to [

137. Z:] although because most people would start at the start *anyway*

K: that's *true* (.) yeah (.) yeah

Stanza 10: I didn't tell you about nursery

138. Z: although I didn't tell you about *nursery*/ damn
139. K: well you *can* tell me about / would you *like* to tell me about nursery?
140. Z: *no* /that was *ages* ago / I can't remember that
141. K: no (.) okay (.) it was a long time ago
142. Z: I know that I *went* / that's about it
143. K: Yeah/ well that's *fine*

Stanza 11: There is no set way of doing this: people might choose different ways

144. K: there there is no *set* way of (.) like spitting it is there?
145. and people might choose / I dunno / might choose different ways
146. different places to start

Strophe 5: Next steps

Stanza 12: I will transcribe this

147. K: *great* well that is all kind of I need for *now*
J: Yeah
148. K: *so* so what I'll do now *is* type this up *again*
149. umm there won't be as *much* to type up for this one as *that* [pointing to transcript from previous interview]
150. Z: you still could put all them dodgy *lines*
151. K: yes / for the basic *transcription* / it's just the research *method* that I'm *using*

Stanza 13: We can meet again after you have looked through the transcripts

152. K: and then you *can* look through *those*
153. and I could come again and meet *you* / whenever it's convenient for *you* to meet and you can tell me if there is anything you want to get *rid* of or *change*
154. I can *also* give you my *e-mail* address if *that's* helpful
155. Z: was it on your *letter*?
156. K: *yes* yes it was yeah so you've got *that*/ umm

Stanza 14: Planning our next meeting

175. Z: what *about* half past *five* next *Wednesday*?

K: *great* yeah

Z: I think I'm free

176. K: that will keep me on my toes with the *transcription*

177. next *Wednesday*, the 8th of September

Z: Yep

K: Five *thirty*

178. Z: Yep/ I'm at college until 5 (.) I *think*/ actually no I'm not/ put five thirty

179. K: Yeah/ it *might* be that I'm not allowed *this* room if it's five thirty / but we could use one of the other little rooms

Z: you will

K: you think that will be all right?

Stanza 15: Finish recording

180. K: *lovely* shall I turn this one off now?

181. Z: if you can figure out *how*

Summary of the macro-analysis of the second interview with Zacharay

Part 1: Returning to our previous interview

Strophe 1: Returning to our conversation about Metropolis

Stanza 1: You wanted more out of school- what did you mean?

Stanza 2: What did I say? Looking to the transcription

Strophe 2: In Metropolis for two weeks

Stanza 3: Finding Metropolis in the transcription

Stanza 4: I was settled in that school: it would have been better to carry on there

Strophe 3: Bigtown

Stanza 5: Checking out that the school was positive for you

Stanza 6: The only school that you haven't been excluded from

Part 2: Effect of the type of placement on school

Strophe 1: In foster care they put you into school like everyone else

Stanza 1: Foster care: in school full time. Children's home: part timetable

Stanza 2: I was just like every other kid in school

Stanza 3: You aren't very obviously different to others in school when you are in residential care

Strophe 2: In foster care you are treated more like a normal family

Stanza 4: you make more of a relationship with foster carers

Stanza 5: It's harder to build up relationships in care homes because they change staff every day

Part 3: Moving between schools and placements

Strophe 1: Who made the decisions about moving and placements?

Stanza 1: Who are they?

Stanza 2: This will be written down

Stanza 3: The place where I was living or the social services decided when to move me

Strophe 2: Placement and school moves

Stanza 4: I would know roughly if my placement was temporary or long-term

Stanza 5: a placements move didn't always involve a change of school

Strophe 3: Making decisions about college

Stanza 6: You are more independent and make more decisions for yourself over 16

Stanza 7: I went to the college open day and picked courses I liked

Strophe 4: What effects did moving schools have on you?

Stanza 8: Co-constructing the meaning of the question

Stanza 9: I didn't learn as much, I didn't sit the tests

Strophe 5: What helps you get to where you are today?

Stanza 10: what was it about you?

Stanza 11: In Urbanville I got into the routine of staff doing most of the stuff for me

Stanza 12: Urbanville was more independent so I got into the pattern of doing stuff myself

Stanza 13: I am happy with most of my educational experience

Part 3: Other details relating to the research

Strophe 1: The participation group

Stanza 1: Ask Jane about the group

Stanza 2: I've been coming to the group once a week for about a year

Strophe 2: Confidentiality and ethics

Stanza 3: Use Zacharay

Stanza 4: Ethical agreement to take out local authority and school names

Stanza 5: The ethics have been agreed and signed

Strophe 3: How to describe and write about you

Stanza 6: Age and time looked after by the local authority

Stanza 7: Into computers and games

Stanza 8: I will check out what I write with you

Strophe 4: The process of our meetings

Stanza 9: It was easier to split life into locations

Stanza 10: I didn't tell you about nursery

Stanza 11: There is no set way of doing this: people might choose different ways

Strophe 5: Next steps

Stanza 12: I will transcribe this

Stanza 13: We can meet again after you have looked through the transcripts

Stanza 14: Planning our next meeting

Stanza 15: Finish recording

Transcript 3: Analysis of First interview with Jimbo

Part 1: Setting the scene

Strophe 1: (Kate) Leading into the interview

Stanza 1: (Kate) Inviting questions

1. K: We can just try and ignore that this is here [turning on digital recorder]

J: yeah

2. K: Ok do you have any other *questions* for me about anything?

3. J: No

K: No (.) okay (2)

Stanza 2: (Kate) Asking Jimbo to think about his time at school as a book with chapters

4. K: I wanted to *start* then

5. if we were going to think *about* your time in *school* / umm *and* I was wondering if you could try and *think* about *it*

6. as if it was a *book* that was broken down into *chapters* / so if you were to divide *up* kind of all of your time in *school*

7. I don't know how you might choose to do *it*

Strophe 2: Life in school broken into chapters

Stanza 3: (Kate) asking Jimbo what he would call the chapters which break up his life

8. J: I can only remember two

9. K: Okay that's *fine*/ umm so if we were to *break*/ is this two of your schools?

J: Yeah

10. K : Yeah / So if we were to *break*/ would you make that two separate chapters of your *life* or

J: Yeah

11. K: Yeah/ can I write down what you would *call* them?

Stanza 4: Meadow View in Ruralshire: first chapter

12. J: The first one were *Meadow View*

K: Me

J: Meadow View school m e a d o w v i e w

K: Thank you / Meadow View school

13 J: That were in *Ruralshire*

K: *Ruralshire* (1) / yep

Stanza 5: Park View in Urbanville: second chapter

14. J: And the second one were err *Park View* p a r k

K: Par

15. J: Par / that were in Urb in *Urbanville* (5)

Stanza 6: Now- none: third chapter

16. K: and where are you *now*?

17. J: *none*

K: none (.) no (3)

18. K: ok so if we put that *there* [writing]

Strophe 3: Tell me about a memory from each school

Stanza 7: Tell me about a memory from each school

19. K: and then *really* (1) ermm (.) I am just interested *in*

20. if you can *remember* like a particular *memory*

21. or something that *happened*

22. something *from* your *time* in each *school*

23. that you could tell me a little bit *about* (4)

Part 2: Park View

Strophe 1: excluded, with no evidence, for selling weed

Stanza 1: Selling weed in Park View and getting kicked out with no proof

24. J: I used to sell *weed* in me secondary in me sec / at that *Park View*
K: Mm hmm
25. J: and then they kicked me *out* because they said I was selling weed in it
K: yeah (.) okay
26. J: but they didn't actually *catch* me (.)
27. they couldn't actually *prove* it

Stanza 2: Confronted and excluded for selling weed

28. K: oh so can you tell me a bit more about what happened *when* did they *confront* you *or*
29. J: yeah they *confronted* me
30. and they they tried they excluded *me* for it for two *weeks* or so
31. K: because of that *reason*?
J: yeah (.)
32. because they said I was selling *weed* to people int school

Stanza 3: Excluded with no evidence

33. K: and did they tell you what *evidence* they had for that or *anything*?
34. J: no they *didn't* say (.)
35. they had no *evidence* they just *excluded* me /
36. because the kids after break were coming in *high*
K: mm hmm
J: so (2)

Strophe 2: Moved to a behavioural school by my social worker

Stanza 4: A behavioural school: pupils ran riot and did no work

37. K: and what was that school *like*?
38. J: that was just a *behavioural* school *that*
39. everyone were just running round *riot*
40. and they didn't do no *work* / they didn't do *nothing*

Stanza 5: I've been in care since I was two and was moved there by my social worker

41. K: what about for *you*/ when did *you*/ how *long* were you *there*?
- J: a couple a year
42. K: when did *you* / like did you *choose* to go *there* / or did *someone*
43. J: no I'd been in *care* since I were two year *old*
44. so I got *moved* there / by my (1) social worker
- K: your social worker (1)

Strophe 3: answering Kate's questions

Stanza 6: what it was like on the first day

45. K: what was it like on your first day *there*?
46. J: ar-reet (3)

Stanza 7: I had to get a taxi there and back each day

47. K: was that *near* to where you are living as well *or*
48. J: yeah (1) / I had to get a *taxi*
49. K: you got a taxi there and back each day
50. J: yeah (2)

Strophe 4: Teachers

Stanza 8: Teachers were only bothered about being paid

51. K: and umm / what were your teachers like there?

52. J: they were *ar-reet*

53. they weren't gonna say ought

54. cos all *they* were *bothered* about was getting

55. *money* for their *job*

Stanza 9: Teachers were not interested in you; they let us do whatever we wanted

56. K: you didn't *feel* like they[

J: no

K:] were really *interested* in *you*?

57. J: No/ well they just used to let us do whatever we wanted *really*

58. K: in your *lessons*?

59. J: yeah (2)

60. K: did you feel *like* umm

Strophe 5: It wasn't a school: a place to chill out

Stanza 10: It was supposed to be a school but I didn't see it as a school

61. J: it *weren't* a *school* / it weren't a school

62. K: what was it *like*? / can you tell me a bit *about*

63. J: well it was *sposed* to be a *school*

64. but *I* didn't see it as a school

Stanza 11: it was a place to chill out

65. J: I just saw it as a place to go to chill out

66. cause you didn't do much work there

67. you just did a few pieces of work and then you just get to chill out

K: ahh

68. J: and if you *didn't* get to chill out and you had to do more *work*

69. you just kick *off* and they'd end up letting you chill *out*

Strophe 6: A day in this school was full of smoking spliffs

Stanza 12: I'd wake up in the morning and make me spliffs

70. K: so could you tell me like about a *day* in this school?

71. J: I'd wa/ *back* when I were going to *Park View*

72. I'd wake up int *morning*

K: mm

73. J: make me *spliffs* go get in a *taxi*/ go to *school*/

Stanza 13: All I used to do was have spliffs

74. have a spliff with me *mates* / in school int *car park* before going *school* /

75. go in *class* / go in (.) do my work and break *time*/ have a *spliff*

76. then go back in / work again and it were *lunchtime*/ went out for *more* spliffs then ke/

77. that's *all* I used to *do*

K: and[

Strophe 7: Everyone was bringing in weed but I smoked the most

Stanza 14: If I didn't bring it in other kids did

78. J:] and when I didn't bring it *in* then *other* kids used to bring it *in*

79. K: so that was something that was (.) kind of really *big* any way

80. it *felt* like *everybody* was doing the same thing

Stanza 15: Everyone was bringing it in but I was blamed for it

81. J: yeah/ but I got *blamed* for it *all* (2)

82. *everyone* else everyone else were bringing it *in*

83. but I got blamed for *it* / for *selling* it

Stanza 16: I was the biggest smoker

84. K: why do you think it was *you* that

85. J: I don't know because I was the *biggest* one out of them
K: the *biggest*?
J. the biggest *guy*
86. K: *oh* like the *tallest* person
87. J: the one that smoked it *most* (.) often
K: yeah (4)

Strophe 8: Leaving Park View

Stanza 17: I had no choice

88. K: did you want to leave the *school*?
89. J: I didn't have a *choice*
90. K. If you *had* a choi

Stanza 18: I ran away to Urbantown after being excluded

91. J: I ran *away* / and come to *Urbantown*
92. K: Oh *from*
93. J: Urb
K: from that *school*?
J: yeah
K: yeah
94. was that after you were *excluded* from *it*?
95. J: yeah

Part 3: Urbantown

Strophe 1: I came back to Urbantown and was put on a Prove It course

Stanza 1: They've not done much; because I misbehaved they put me on this course

96. K: and *what* happened when you came to *Urbantown* did you get

97. J: I'm not *really*
98. I *came* back to *Urbantown* and umm
99. they've (.) not done *much* / they've just put me on
99. *well* cause I've *misbehaved*
100. they've put me on this course

Stanza 2: Prove It: a course to get qualifications

101. J: on prove it
- K: Oh
- 101: J: And that's *just* to get qualifications *back*
- 102: K: I haven't *heard* of *prove* it / what's *that*?
103. J: some *course* (.) that you get your *qualifications* out of / or something
- K: oh *ok*

Strophe 2: I started the course 4 weeks ago and haven't got EMA each

Stanza 3: They are supposed to pay you EMA each week but I'm not getting it

104. J: they are *supposed* to *pay* you 30 pounds EMA each (.) *week*
- K: yeah
- J: yeah
105. and *like* / cos they said that my *number* / my *number* for someone's house/
wrong *house*/ wrong *address*
- K: mm hmm
106. J: I've got to *wait* another *two* weeks *now*
107. until I get another *number*

Stanza 4: Started four weeks ago and haven't had anything yet

108. K: Oh (.) and when did you *start* on the *course*?
109. J: about four weeks *ago*
110. K: and you haven't had anything yet

J: no

111. K: are they (.) is it going to get sorted ou

Strophe 3: I feel like walking out but I can't

Stanza 5: I don't like it that I can't leave: I have to take part because of my order

112. J: that's one thing I don't *like*

113. I'm going to *start* walking *out* me

114. it it's it's not like I *can* walk out though

115. do you know what I mean?

116. it's an *actual* course that I've *got* to take part in cos of me *order*

K: ah I *see*

Stanza 6: I feel like walking out cos they are not paying my EMA

117. J: but (.) I'm feeling like walking *out*

118. do you know what I mean?

119. cos they are not paying me my *EMA*

120. K: you feel that you don't *want* to be there because they're not paying you *EMA*

J: yeah

Strophe 4: Plenty of people have asked me what I want to do but it's hard to quit weed

Stanza 7: plenty of people have asked me what I want to do

121. K: and so like when you *came*/ when you came to *Urbantown*

122. you said that you *started* on this *course*/

122. did anyone like sit down and *ask* you like what you *wanted* to do?

123. J: plenty of people have asked me *what* what I'm doing

Stanza 8: It's hard to move on and quit weed: I like being chilled out

124. J: *but* it's *just* being bothered to do it / and actually *quitting* weed and

K: mm hmm

125. J: just moving *on*/ that's the *hard* part

126. when I *like* just being *chilled* out

127. K: you feel that that makes you feel relaxed

J: yeah

K: yeah

Stanza 9: Weed is the biggest barrier at the moment

128. so do you feel like that's kind of the biggest *barrier* I pose at [

J: yeah

129. K:] at the *moment* (3) /and (.) umm (1) / when (.)

Part 4: Park View

Strophe 1: Returning to Park View

Stanza 1: Kate returns the topic to Park View

130. K: we were talking about *Park View* just *then* weren't we?

131. where you ran *away* from/ ermm

Stanza 2: 15 years old when started there

132. when you *started* there can ask how *old* you were?

133. J: I can't remember

K: No

134. J: 15 or 16 (.) 15

K: 15 yeah

Strophe 2: Given courses to do

Stanza 3: Did cooking, computers and some of the same courses

135. K: and did you like /um did you do particular *courses* when you were *there*?

136. J: *Cooking* err *computers* sports

K: Mmm

137. J: the *same* like / maths (.) English science

K: yeah

138. J: stuff like that

Stanza 4: No choice: that's what they gave us

139. K: and did you choose *those*?

140. J: no that's what they gave *us*

141. K: that's what you had to *do* when you went *there*

142. J: Yeah

Strophe 3: It wasn't like a proper school

Stanza 5: Didn't do much education at that school

143. K: okay (2) so umm / you were *saying*

144. / like you didn't really feel that you did *much* education at that *school*

145. J: no

146. K: kind of what what were the teachers like *doing*? / you know you said like you

Stanza 6: It was chilled, not like a proper school

147. J: we were we were like doing *stuff* but it weren't like a proper *school*

148. it were just (.) *chilled* / laid-back

149. K: *yeah* did you feel / did you *want* to be there?

150. J: yeah it were *alright* / for what it was

K: yeah

Part 5: Meadow View

Strophe 1: Meadow View in Ruralshire was well before Park View

Stanza 1: Meadow View was well before Park View

151. K: and umm before going *there*/ is that what
152. *when* you were at Meadow View was that the school *before* Park View?
153. J: *well* before
154. K: oh was it?
155. J: yeah

Stanza 2: I went to Meadow View when living in Ruralshire

156. K: can you tell me a bit about Meadow View school?
157. *when* did you go there?
158. J: that were when I were living in *Ruralshire* that
K: in *Ruralshire*
159. J: *errr*/ I went/ I must have *been* 10
K: *ah* right
J: 11
K: Yeah
J: maybe 12

Strophe 2: I had to go there because of my behaviour

Stanza 3: I gotta go there

160. J: and then I gotta *go* there
161. that were *al-reet*
162. that were a proper secondary school *that*
K: mm

Stanza 4: I ended up there because of my behaviour; I couldn't cope in lessons

163. J: I ended up because of my *behaviour*

164. and I couldn't cope in *lessons*

165. and I just wanted to be the class clown

Strophe 3: because of my class clown behaviour I was moved to a supported building for teaching

Stanza 5: They moved me into a supported building for teaching

166. J: they ended up moving me into *this* (.) like *supported accomo / supported building outside*

167. K: as part of Meadow View?

168. J: yeah on the side of Meadow View

169. so they could like teach me in *there* because I weren't behaving well int classes

K: mm hmm

Stanza 6: I was the class clown to get everyone to laugh

170. J: I were chucking rulers

171. firing pieces of tissue at teachers

K: Yeah [quietly]

172. J: Basic class clown shit (3)

173. just to get (.) everyone to laugh

174. K: you were wanting everyone to laugh

J: yeah

Strophe 4: Meadow View was al-reet: a long placement with me mates

Stanza 7: Meadow View was al-reet because I was with me mates

175. K: and then they moved you *into* (.) the (.)

176. so *how/ which was better* in the school or in the umm / supported bit?

177. J: well to Meadow View/ Meadow View was al-reet
178. because I was with all me *mates*
179. but then er er you make mates anywhere where you go don't you so
180. K: some people do yeah (.) yeah/ so you didn't *mind*
J: no

Stanza 8: it was a long time in that school, compared to other ones

181. K: *and* (.) did you stay / how *long* did you stay do your remember how long you stayed like in the *main* school?
182. J: errm for a good three year
K: mm hmm
183. J: that were that were a *long* one that
184. K: yeah *compared* to others?
J: yeah

Part 6: Being in care meant being moved around lots of different schools

Strophe: I've been in care since I was two and have been moved to lots of different schools

Stanza 1: Been to loads of different schools: can't remember how many

185. K: have you been to lots of different schools?
186. J: yeah yeah
187. K: can you remember how *many* you've been to?
188. J: lo loads
K: loads
189. J: don't know

Stanza 2: Been in care since I was 2 so have moved round more schools; if you've got your own parents you stay in one area until they move their house

190. J: I've been in *care* since I were two so

K: have *you*

J: yeah

191. K: and does that *mean*/ do you *think* that you have moved round more *schools* than you might have done?

192. J: yeah (1) of *course* (2)

193. because if you are not / if you are not in *care* and you've got your own *parents* then (.) they'll move you to one *school*

194. and you stay in one *area* and till they move their actual *house*

K: yeah

Strophe 2: When you are in care you are chucked into a school and moved into another one when your care home gets up

Stanza 3: When you are in care they chuck you into a school and think that you'll be al-reet.

195. J: whereas when you are in *care*

196. they they will move you to a *school*

197. just *chuck* you in/ oh we'll *chuck* him in *here* (.)

198. we'll put him in *here* he'll be *al- reet* (1)

K: mmm

Stanza 4: When that care home gets up you are moved on to another school

199. J: and when that care home gets *up*

200. they'll move you *on* and chuck you in another *school*

201. that's how they work *now*

202. K: oh does it? (2) / so where ever you are *living* (1) /

Strophe 3: You get used to being forced to move

Stanza 5: You get used to it

203. K: that could be quite tough [quietly]
204. J: you get *used* to it after a while
205. K: did you *feel* that they were thinking about *you* when they [
J: no
K:] moved *schools*?
206. J: well they / *no*

Stanza 6: Forced to move between placements due to bad behaviour

207. K: no (.) no (2) / what you think was ma/
208. K: *yeah* it sounds *like* you know they moved you between placements
209. *when* you moved *placements* did you have did you *choose* to move placements?
210. J: no/ I were *forced* to move
K: oh
211. J: bad *behaviour*
K: oh ok (3) ermm [quietly] (5)

Strophe 4: Moving

Stanza 7: A guess of six different schools

212. K: could you *guess* how many schools you've *been* to?
213. J: probably (.) / *six*
K: probably *six*

Stanza 8: Moved to lots of different places: I've been everywhere

214. K: and I *noticed* that Meadow View was in Ruralshireshire and then *that* one was in Urbanville and now you are in Urbantown
215. have you moved to lots of *different* [
J: Yeah
K:] like cities and towns?

216. J: yeah / been Urbridge (.) Ruralshire (.) Bigtown (.) Townville (.) Seatown

217. I've been *everywhere*

Strophe 5: Seatown

Stanza 9: Two weeks holiday in Seatown: bed behaviour

218. K: mmm / even *Seatown*

219. J: yeah that were for about two week

K: two *weeks*

220. what *happened* then?

221. J: bad behaviour

222. K: did they put put you into a school *then*?

223. J: *no* / that were like I just went on a *holiday*

K: uh huh a holiday

Strophe 6: Time between moving placement and getting into a school

Stanza 10: It took a good few months to get into a school after moving placement

224. K: and how *long* did it *take* / like say if you *moved* placements

225. how long did it *take* to kind of get into a different *school* from a move?

226. J: well I'd get in a *placement*

227. and it would take a good few *months* before they would move me into a *school*

K: would it?

J: yeah

Stanza 11: I wouldn't do much: just chill

228. K: what would you *do* in that time?

229. J: not *much* / just (.) basically *chill*

K: yeah

230. J: watch TV (.) play on computer / and shit like that

Strophe 7: I didn't care about qualifications but I do now

Stanza 12: At the time it were good, now I wish I had more qualifications

231. K: yeah/ and what did you think about *that*?

232. J: at the time it were *good* / but now I *don't*

233. J: I I wish I had got more *qualifications* (.)

234. do you know what I mean?

K: mmm

Stanza 13: I know what I need qualifications for now

235. J: now I *know* (1) / what I *need* them qualifications for / but back then I *didn't*

K: no

236. J: I thought what the *fuck* qualifications / I don't give a shit what the fuck they are

237. K: Mmm (2) / I *think* it can be hard when you're *younger* isn't it / to *know* kind of *what's* the point of everything you're being asked to do

J: Yeah

K: Yeah [quietly] (1)/

Strophe 8: If I were with me mum things would have been different

Stanza 14: It would have been different but I can't say that

238. K: *so* do you *think* that things might have been *different* umm (1)

239. if you hadn't been being moved *round* so much?

240. J: probably *yeah*/ but I can't say *that* can I

241. / that's not one of them things you can say

Stanza 15: If I was with my mum I'd probably be in one school instead of moving

242. K: Why not?
243. J: then if I were / if I were with me *mum* then I'd probably be in I mean one school *only*
- K: mmm
244. J: instead of moving from *Urbantown* to *Ruralshire* to *Urbridge*
245. do you know what I mean?
- K: Mmmm (1) yeah [quietly] (7)

Part 7: Behaviour and support in school

Strophe 1: Support in school and class clown behaviour

Stanza 1: One to one support in school cause me behaviour were getting bad

246. K: Umm did um / did umm / did you receive much *support* in your schools to kind of *help* you with your behaviour or to help you with
247. J: well they put me on a *one-to-one* / in *most* schools
- K: did they?
248. J: cause of/ me behaviour were getting *bad*
- K: yeah

Stanza 2: I was being the class clown squirting fire extinguishers

249. J: the class *clown* / getting fire *extinguishers* (.)
250. *squirting* chairs and throwing under a table or
251. squirting next kids neck by the side of *me*
- K: yeah(2)

Stanza 3: Kate questions about support in school

252. K: *so* can you *remember* like / think *back* to one of the *schools* umm where you were kind of being the *clown* and things / can you *remember*
253. ummm *did* like did *you* go into the school with support with you all the *time*
254. or did / you know/ kinda something *happen* or

255. J: they left me *alone* but *then* like (.)

Strophe 2: We took over the school

Stanza 4: I took over the school and they called the coppers

256. J: one of the times I took oer all *school* an locked all teachers *out* (.)

257. and got all kids to come into school

258. and we took it *ooer*

K: mmm

259. J: and then they called coppers and rushed *ooer*

Stanza 5: We got back in and got the staff out

260. K: what happened after that?

261. J: well they got all kids *out* / and tha all staff got let back *in*

K: mm hmm (3)

262. J: but *we/* we jumped all in *windas* in office *windas* pushed and got the

263. set the fire alarms off so all *staff* went outside

K: mmmm

Strophe 3: When staff called the police we did a runner

Stanza 6: A few people stayed in and locked the doors

264. J: gone inside/ we stayed/ a few people *stayed* and locked *doors* (.) / so they couldn't come *in*

265. for a good *hour* or two hour (2) / and then one of folk one of the staff phoned on their phone (??)

266. K: oh phoned (.) *the* (.) Police?

J: yeah

K: yeah (2)

Stanza 7: We did a runner out of the fire exit

267. J: and that is when we all did *runner*

K: mmm

268. J: broke out of fire *exit* and ran out of back

269. K: how did you *decide* to do that/ did you like have a plan or

270. J: we *just* (.) discussed it *break* / we said we were gunna do it / we did it (.) / yeah

Strophe 4: Park View: what it was like

Stanza 8: Park View was the last school before Urbantown

271. K: which *school* was that in?

272. J: that were in Park View

K: in Park View (1)

273. which was the *last* school that you were at before / before *Urbantown*?

274. J: probably *Park View*

Stanza 9: You could have a laugh and enjoy yourself in Park View

275. K: yeah (2) / which was *umm* which was your *favourite* school?

276. J: probably Park View

K: *Park View* yeah / what made it your favourite one?

277. J: You could just go there and *enjoy* yourself

278. have a *laugh*/ (.) and I *mean* have a *laugh*

279. K: what kind of *things*?/ well you just *told* me about *that*

280. J: just run *riot* / an play *football* in school / and play *football* in classroom or

K: mmm

J: play on the *computers* (2) go *out*/ enjoy *yourself*

Stanza 10: it aint a school: you sit down and do work in a proper school

281. K: yeah (2) and what do you *think* like school *should* be *like*?

282. J: proper *school* where you *sit* down and do *work* (.)

283. that *aint* a *school*

284. K: mmm (2) I wonder why it was like that

J: don't know

K: no (1)

Stanza 11: 3 or 4 in a class and laidback teachers

285. K: *were* there/ how *many* were there how many of you were there like in a *class*?

286. J: three four (3)

287. K: what were your teachers *like*?

288. J: laid-back

K: yeah (4)

Part 8: Now and the future

Strophe 1: Now: Prove It course

Stanza 1: Prove it course: getting Maths and English qualifications

289. K: umm (3) and I *guess* now you are *doing* your course

290. J: prove it

291. K: yeah prove *it* course/ what does that involve now?

292. J: that involves getting some qualifications

293. K: *which* /what are you /*which qualifications* are you working for?

294. J: me *maths* and me *English*

K: mm hmm (.) /

Stanza 2: Based in town

295. K: and where's it *based*?

296. J: up in *town*

K: uhh huh (2) yeah (.)

Strophe 2: Hopefully get a job when Prove It finishes

Stanza 3: Hopefully get a job if I don't get sent down

297. K: and umm (.) / what do you want to *do* when you *finish*?

298. J: *hopefully* get a *job*

K: do you *know* (.) kind of

299. J: if I don't *get sent down*

300. K: do you think that might happen?

301. J: yeah

K: mmm (3) umm (3)

Stanza 4: might be interested in a physical job

302. K: well have you have you *thought* kind of / what kind of *job* you might be interested in?

303. J: working in a *shop* (.) warehouse (1) ought with physical *lifting* really

304. K: yeah kind of *physical* stuff

J: yeah

Strophe 3: Prove It course

Stanza 5: 12 week course and then free for work

305. K: and how *long* is your course going to last *now* till you get these qualifications?

306. J: probably *12* week

K: *12* weeks

J: *12* yeah

K: Yeah

307. K: and *then* are you *free* to kind of look for *work*?

308. J: yeah

309. K: that's not very long is it really?

310. J: no

Stanza 6: It's all-reet

311. K: do you *enjoy* it?

312. J: yeah (.)it's all-reet

K: mm hmm (2)

Stanza 7: Didn't choose past courses but can choose the future

313. K: *and* you said you *didn't* really *choose* like what courses you were going to *do*

314. J: no

315. K: but I I guess you can have some choice when you finish about what you want to do next

316. J: yeah

Part 9: Moving between schools

Strophe 1: Previous schools and moving between them

Stanza 1: Cannot remember Primary schools

317. K: *umm*(2) / can you remember your *primary* schools at all?

318. J: no

K: no (3)

Stanza 2: I had instant notice of a placement move

319. K: and *umm* *when* you *moved* between *schools* / how much *notice* did you have?

320. well I *guess* between *placements*/ did you / like *how* how many weeks or days or / how much *notice* did you have?

321. J: what before I *moved*?

K: yeah

322. J: *instant*

323. K: oh *really*

J: yeah

Stanza 3: I got kicked out from foster carers; we had an argument, I kicked off and ran off

324. K: can you tell me how that *worked*?

325. J: got kicked *out*/ cos like one / one of my carers / my foster carers came *back* from *work* / and he were in a *mood* (2)

326. so I / we had an *argument* and I kicked *off* and I whacked him round the *leg* with an air rifle

K: mm

327. J: and I stormed out/ ran *off*

K: and then *you* went

J: yeah

Stanza 4: I ran off to a respite carer's, asked to move and got a different place

328. K: what happened did you go back after *that*?

329. J: no I ran *off* to one of me / like a respite carers house where I knew where it *were*

K: yeah

330. J: I got like *train* and I went to their *house* and I went / right I want to *move* (2)

331. and they *rang* social workers and told em *situation* and then I got put in a different *place*

Stanza 5: I left my things

332. K: and what about your *things*/ did you go *back* and pack

333. J: no (2) left them [quiet] (5)

Part 10: Ending

Strophe 1:Ending the session

Stanza 1: How long have we been talking?

334. J: *Right* how *long* has this *been*?

335. K: it's been quite a while

336. J: how *long* has it been?

337. K: it's *been* / well it's quarter to *two* (1)/ probably half an *hour* I think

Stanza 2: Negotiating finishing

338. J: have we nearly *finished*?

339. K: we can finish *whenever* you want to

340. do you *want* to want to *finish*?

341. J: yeah

342. K: okay I'll turn this off

Summary of the macro-analysis of the first interview with Jimbo

Part 1: Setting the scene

Strophe 1: (Kate) Leading into the interview

Stanza 1: (Kate) Inviting questions

Stanza 2: (Kate) Asking Jimbo to think about his time at school as a book with chapters

Strophe 2: Life in school broken into chapters

Stanza 3: (Kate) asking Jimbo what he would call the chapters which break up his life

Stanza 4: Meadow View in Ruralshire: first chapter

Stanza 5: Park View in Urbanville: second chapter

Stanza 6: Now- none: third chapter

Strophe 3: Tell me (Kate) about a memory from each school

Stanza 7: Tell me (Kate) about a memory from each school

Part 2: Park View

Strophe 1: excluded, with no evidence, for selling weed

Stanza 1: Selling weed in Park View and getting kicked out with no proof

Stanza 2: Confronted and excluded for selling weed

Stanza 3: Excluded with no evidence

Strophe 2: Moved to a behavioural school by my social worker

Stanza 4: A behavioural school: pupils ran riot and did no work

Stanza 5: I've been in care since I was two and was moved there by my social worker

Strophe 3: answering Kate's questions

Stanza 6: what it was like on the first day

Stanza 7: I had to get a taxi there and back each day

Strophe 4: Teachers

Stanza 8: Teachers were only bothered about being paid

Stanza 9: Teachers were not interested in you; they let us do whatever we wanted

Strophe 5: It wasn't a school: a place to chill out

Stanza 10: It was supposed to be a school but I didn't see it as a school

Stanza 11: it was a place to chill out

Strophe 6: A day in this school was full of smoking spliffs

Stanza 12: I'd wake up in the morning and make me spliffs

Stanza 13: All I used to do was have spliffs

Strophe 7: Everyone was bringing in weed but I smoked the most

Stanza 14: If I didn't bring it in other kids did

Stanza 15: Everyone was bringing it in but I was blamed for it

Stanza 16: I was the biggest smoker

Strophe 8: Leaving Park View

Stanza 17: I had no choice

Stanza 18: I ran away to Urbantown after being excluded

Part 3: Urbantown

Strophe 1: I came back to Urbantown and was put on a Prove It course

Stanza 1: They've not done much; because I misbehaved they put me on this course

Stanza 2: Prove It: a course to get qualifications

Strophe 2: I started the course 4 weeks ago and haven't got EMA each

Stanza 3: They are supposed to pay you EMA each week but I'm not getting it

Stanza 4: Started four weeks ago and haven't had anything yet

Strophe 3: I feel like walking out but I can't

Stanza 5: I don't like it that I can't leave: I have to take part because of my order

Stanza 6: I feel like walking out cos they are not paying my EMA

Strophe 4: Plenty of people have asked me what I want to do but it's hard to quit weed

Stanza 7: Plenty of people have asked me what I want to do

Stanza 8: It's hard to move on and quit weed: I like being chilled out

Stanza 9: Weed is the biggest barrier at the moment

Part 4: Park View

Strophe 1: Returning to Park View

Stanza 1: Kate returns the topic to Park View

Stanza 2: 15 years old when started there

Strophe 2: Given courses to do

Stanza 3: Did cooking, computers and some of the same courses

Stanza 4: No choice: that's what they gave us

Strophe 3: It wasn't like a proper school

Stanza 5: Didn't do much education at that school

Stanza 6: It was chilled, not like a proper school

Part 5: Meadow View

Strophe 1: Meadow View in Ruralshire was well before Park View

Stanza 1: Meadow View was well before Park View

Stanza 2: I went to Meadow View when living in Ruralshire

Strophe 2: I had to go there because of my behaviour

Stanza 3: I gotta go there

Stanza 4: I ended up there because of my behaviour; I couldn't cope in lessons

Strophe 3: because of my class clown behaviour I was moved to a supported building for teaching

Stanza 5: They moved me into a supported building for teaching

Stanza 6: I was the class clown to get everyone to laugh

Strophe 4: Meadow View was al-reet: a long placement with me mates

Stanza 7: Meadow View was al-reet because I was with me mates

Stanza 8: it was a long time in that school, compared to other ones

Part 6: Being in care meant being moved around lots of different schools

Strophe: I've been in care since I was two and have been moved to lots of different schools

Stanza 1: Been to loads of different schools: can't remember how many

Stanza 2: Been in care since I was 2 so have moved round more schools; if you've got your own parents you stay in one area until they move their house

Strophe 2: When you are in care you are chucked into a school and moved into another one when your care home gets up

Stanza 3: When you are in care they chuck you into a school and think that you'll be al-reet.

Stanza 4: When that care home gets up you are moved on to another school

Strophe 3: You get used to being forced to move

Stanza 5: You get used to it

Stanza 6: Forced to move between placements due to bad behaviour

Strophe 4: Moving

Stanza 7: A guess of six different schools

Stanza 8: Moved to lots of different places: I've been everywhere

Strophe 5: Seatown

Stanza 9: Two weeks holiday in Seatown: bad behaviour

Strophe 6: Time between moving placement and getting into a school

Stanza 10: It took a good few months to get into a school after moving placement

Stanza 11: I wouldn't do much: just chill

Strophe 7: I didn't care about qualifications but I do now

Stanza 12: At the time it were good, now I wish I had more qualifications

Stanza 13: I know what I need qualifications for now

Strophe 8: If I were with me mum things would have been different

Stanza 14: It would have been different but I can't say that

Stanza 15: If I was with my mum I'd probably be in one school instead of moving

Part 7: Behaviour and support in school

Strophe 1: Support in school and class clown behaviour

Stanza 1: One to one support in school cause me behaviour were getting bad

Stanza 2: I was being the class clown squirting fire extinguishers

Stanza 3: Kate questions about support in school

Strophe 2: We took over the school

Stanza 4: I took over the school and they called the coppers

Stanza 5: We got back in and got the staff out

Strophe 3: When staff called the police we did a runner

Stanza 6: A few people stayed in and locked the doors

Stanza 7: We did a runner out of the fire exit

Strophe 4: Park View: what it was like

Stanza 8: Park View was the last school before Urbantown

Stanza 9: You could have a laugh and enjoy yourself in Park View

Stanza 10: it aint a school: you sit down and do work in a proper school

Stanza 11: 3 or 4 in a class and laidback teachers

Part 8: Now and the future

Strophe 1: Now: Prove It course

Stanza 1: Prove it course: getting Maths and English qualifications

Stanza 2: Based in town

Strophe 2: Hopefully get a job when Prove It finishes

Stanza 3: Hopefully get a job if I don't get sent down

Stanza 4: might be interested in a physical job

Strophe 3: Prove It course

Stanza 5: 12 week course and then free for work

Stanza 6: It's all-reet

Stanza 7: Didn't choose past courses but can choose the future

Part 9: Moving between schools

Strophe 1: Previous schools and moving between them

Stanza 1: Cannot remember Primary schools

Stanza 2: I had instant notice of a placement move

Stanza 3: I got kicked out from foster carers; we had an argument, I kicked off and ran off

Stanza 4: I ran off to a respite carer's, asked to move and got a different place

Stanza 5: I left my things

Part 10: Ending

Strophe 1: Ending the session

Stanza 1: How long have we been talking?

Stanza 2: Negotiating finishing

Transcript 4: Analysis of second interview with Jimbo

Part 1: Second Meeting Together

Stanza 1: Negotiating the Interview: Make it quick

1. J: Can you make it quick
2. K: it doesn't have to be *long* because we talked quite a lot last time [
3. J:] well fire fire away with your questions cos like
4. I aint got *time* to be hanging around here in *town* when I've just been / stopped and searched for *drugs*
5. K: ah *ok*/ Are you ok to be here *now*?
6. J: Yeah just make it *quick*

Stanza2: (Kate) Do you want me to change the transcripts?

7. K: Oh ok well the main thing that I *wanted* to ask *really* was you know last time when we tal *talked*
8. you know we talked a *lot* and you've had chance to look at the transcripts
9. J: Yeah
10. K: I wondered if there was anything anything you didn't want me to *write* about / from what we talked *about*, anything you want me to take *out*?[
J:] Ner
K: or to change?
11. J: No

Stanza 3: Park View and Meadow View: the main ones

12. K: And umm I just *wondered* why you chose to talk about Meadow View and Park View schools
13. kinda *why* those ones in particular?
14. J: because they were me *main* ones (???????)

K: your *main* ones *yeah*

Stanza 4: Would like to use the name Jimbo

15. K: OK (2) and another thing was/ you know last time we met we talked about making your story *anonymous* about not using your name using a *different* name that isn't your *name*
16. have you thought about that have you thought about a name you'd like me to *use*?
17. would you like to choose one?
18. J: Jimbo/
K: Jimbo

Stanza 5: I ripped my fiver: can I use it?

19. J: [pulling money out of his pocket] oh I've ripped the fiver in *alf* / straight in *alf* ahh ahhh ahh ahhhh (4)
20. Is that *acceptable* can I use *it*?
21. K: (2) *yeah* (2) just (.) don't (.) rip it any *more* (.)
J: arrgggh
22. K: I think it should be *ok*

Stanza 6: Can't remember anymore about Seatown

23. K: can I ask you a bit *more* about something that you said last *time*
24. you said that you went to Seatown for two weeks
25. J: [coughs] Yeah Seaside town
26. K: Oh was it *Seaside* town?
27. I wondered if you could tell me a little bit *more* about that?
28. J: (3) I can't remember
K: Okay (3) okay

Stanza 7: Nothing else to talk about that we didn't talk about last time

29. K: is there *anything* that you've thought *about* /that we didn't talk about last *time* / that *you'd* like to talk about *now*?
30. J: no

Stanza 8: How can I (Kate) describe you?

31. K: okay/ well before we *finish* can I ask/ kind of I want to write *about*/ there's been you and another young person who I've been working *with* and I want to write a little *bit* about you both to *introduce* you both/ like any interests /
32. or how you want me to *describe* you (3)
33. so you've said Jimbo for a *name* (3)
- J: *Uhh* (3)
34. K: what would I write about *you*?

Stanza 9: I smoke weed

35. J: smoke weed *every day*/ (3) I get high/(2) I'm a drug sort of person
36. K: mmm/ is there anything else you'd like me to put about *you*?
37. J: no

Stanza 10: No questions and happy to write about everything we spoke about

38. K: okay (2) I wondered if you had any other questions for me or anything that you think we missed last *time*?
39. anything else you'd like to *say*?
40. J: no
41. K: no/ ok thank *you* / and you're happy for me to write about everything from last *time* too?
42. J: yeah
43. K: great / thank you

Summary of the macro-analysis of the second interview with Jimbo

Part 1: Second Meeting Together

Stanza 1: Negotiating the Interview: Make it quick

Stanza2: (Kate) Do you want me to change the transcripts?

Stanza 3: Park View and Meadow View: the main ones

Stanza 4: Would like to use the name Jimbo

Stanza 5: I ripped my fiver: can I use it?

Stanza 6: Can't remember anymore about Seatown

Stanza 7: Nothing else to talk about that we didn't talk about last time

Stanza 8: How can I (Kate) describe you?

Stanza 9: I smoke weed

Stanza 10: No questions and happy to write about everything we spoke about

Example of the process of interoperating the macroanalysis

Example of the process of interoperating the macroanalysis

Appendix V: Feedback interview with Zacharay raw transcript

The recorder did not pick up the first part of our conversation

1. Z: why did you put that first?
2. K: Ok yeah, so I felt that you had been to lots of different schools and
3. things and for me I felt it was quite hard to keep track in my head of all
4. the different places and all the different schools so I just started with that
5. quote for me to say that I found it quite confusing at first just to keep
6. track of all the different places that you'd been to I felt that there were a
7. lot of different places kind of throughout your school history.
8. Z: I can't remember how many there were now, eight chapters
9. apparently which means that there would have been eight moves well
10. eight different schools.
11. K: Yeah yeah
12. Z: [clears throat] what's that? Metropolis?
13. K: Oh right, of course. I've changed all the names of the local authorities,
14. the cities school names that you've been to. I've had because of my
15. ethical agreements [
16. Z: yeah yeah
17. K:] so I just came up with some names [laughing]
18. Z: Metropolis isn't random, it's superman.
19. K: [laughing] well I was thinking I wanted something to be a big town and
20. I thought of Metropolis
21. Z: So we've got Metropolis we've got Urbantown, we've got Urbanville,
22. we've got Bigtown Farshire or something
23. K: Farshire meaning far away
24. Z: So that one probably was in (City Name) But how am I meant to know
25. which ones they are I can't remember

26. K: I've got a key for you here of what each place has been called
27. Z: Yeah than I will know what it really says
28. K: Yeah it makes a bit more sense to you with that
29. Z: Sweet names though. Metropolis that's a good un
30. K: [laughing] thank you
31. Z: Metropolis that's funny
32. K: I should have asked you to choose the names shouldn't I
33. Z: I wouldn't have gone with Urbantown and the boring ones but
34. Metropolis and I don't know where does Batman live?
35. K: Err he lives in
36. Z: Goth City or something
37. K: Gotherville is it?
38. Z: I can't remember
39. K: Yeah we could have done superhero places hmm
40. Z: Do you have to pay at university to print out?
41. K: Yeah but I did this at home it's no problem.
42. Z: You know when I read back I don't normally say things like 'like' and
43. you know gestures, like puts a bin bag over his there bag over me
44. shoulder
45. K: yeah. No I think it's funny you know[
46. Z: it's quite good though you know how you've analysed it and people can
47. read it back and can find out more about themselves
48. K: Yeah it might give you an insight. But it is just my
49. interpretations, my ideas I'm interested in what you think of it. I didn't
50. look too much at you know when we say 'like' 'eerr' we both did that
51. all the time like you know like I am doing now. It's just it's just that you
52. don't normally look at your language in such detail.

53. Z: So I moved from, I moved out of metropolis [reading Zacharay's story]
54. (30) that school [quietly] yeah (28)
55. so what you think the emphasis on the word naughty
56. K: yeah
57. Z: [coughs] sorry I have got a sore throat are you going to write this up all
58. the sore throats and stuff
59. K: well I won't be putting as much detail in this when I type this up
60. because I won't be analysing it. Really it is just to give you the
61. opportunity to comment on what I have written or if you want me to take
62. anything out or add any changes or if you have any questions
63. Z: So this chapter here you put I feel that Zacharay put emphasis upon
64. The word naughty and so constructed the school's action to be
65. consequences of my behaviour (???????) [reading Zacharay's story aloud
66. very quietly]
67. K: Yeah (.) I thought that the way that the emphasis was on there you
68. were saying that you were excluded cos of your behaviour [
69. Z: mmm
70. K:]Umm whereas another way that you could look at schools is that they
71. that it is a school failing if they exclude a child that it is because they
72. cannot cope not because of the child. It's another way that I think you
73. could look at it. So it could be that you know that they weren't doing the
74. right things to support you. So I guess another way of saying it could be
75. they couldn't cope with my behaviour so they excluded me. Do you see a
76. difference?
77. Z: Yeah. Urbanshire is in (City name)
78. K: Yeah
79. Z: [reading] (56) it seems all right [reading] (68) Bigtown (city name)

80. [reading] (350) It's good but I don't think that you have ended it very well
81. it just kind of stops
82. K: It needs a bit more of an ending
83. Z: Well is there anymore are there any more young people that you are
84. doing that you will be putting into the same chapter
85. K: Yeah (.) yeah so following yours there is another story from a young
86. person and then I'm going to have, well there is a final chapter where I
87. kind of discuss it and talk about just kind of the themes and things that
88. have come out within your story and the other young person's who I have
89. worked with
90. Z: Some things will have changed like you know where I put here that I
91. have to go to university by the time I am 21 because of funding. Well all
92. the fees have gone up so social services will probably have to change how
93. much they give out and stuff as well
94. K: Oh will they do you think (.) oh that's a shame
95. Z: But I don't know what it will be until later
96. K: Yeah
97. Z: Yeah it seems good. I'll keep this [points to copy of Zacharay's story]
98. K: Yeah great
99. Z: And I'll give you my new mobile number as well
100. K: Yeah thanks . And from looking at that today is there anything that you
101. think I have got wrong or missed or that you want me to take out
102. Z: You should put capital letters in when we are talking but no. Yeah it all
103. looks good my mobile number is XXXXXXXX
104. K: oh brilliant thank you. So have another look at that again and you know
105. you have got my email and phone number so if you did look at it again
106. and wanted me to make any changes or remove bits then please just

107. contact me. When I have written the whole thing would you like a copy of
108. my whole thesis when it is written and published
109. Z: yep that would be good. I'll read it and then can say that I was
110. published in a thesis
111. K: yeah
112. Z: what is your thesis called?
113. K: Umm it's called engaging with two Young People who are looked after
114. in local authority care and who have experienced exclusion from school
115. co- constructing narratives. I wanted to emphasise that it wasn't the case
116. that I just talked to you and you had told me this story it was kind of
117. through our discussions together. I will have swayed what you said a bit
118. by the questions that I asked you and I wanted the title to reflect that
119. that we were doing this together.
120. Z: Well I like that then.
121. K: Oh good (2) so shall I when I have finished it I have got a draft
122. written but I am not submitting until the end of April and then we go
123. through an examination process in June so it will probably be July August
124. by the time it is finished unless I have to make some corrections so when
125. it is completely finished I shall contact you
126. Z: What does your tutor say about it what does your tutor say about it all
127. K: Well I am meeting with him next week to discuss it so I don't know yet
128. Z: Well it's good. I hope it all works out all good
129. K: Thank you and thank you so much for your time again today and all
130. through this process. I have really appreciated it and have really enjoyed
131. working with you. I'll be back in contact soon when I have a copy for you
132. or if you think of any changes that you would like.

Discussion started by Zacchary about another research project he is involved with

Appendix VI: Examples of my 'raw' working to trace themes through the narratives

An example of an annotated page from the summary of macro-analysis of the first interview with Zacharay (p261)

A map of my interpreted themes occurring within my analysis of the two interviews with Zacharay (p262)

