



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

Teacher Narratives of Young People Who Show Sexually Harmful Behaviour

By:

Karen Jessup

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of
Doctor of Educational Psychology

The University of Sheffield
Faculty of Educational Psychology
School of Education

Submission Date: 30th August 2017

Contents

Chapter One.....	1
Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background and rationale	1
1.2 Scale of the problem	3
1.3 Working in schools.....	4
1.4 Structure of the research.....	7
Chapter Two.....	10
Critical Literature Review	10
2.1 Sexuality, Childhood and Morality	12
2.1.1 The construction of sexuality	13
2.1.2 The construction of childhood and adolescence	17
2.1.3 The construction of morality.....	25
2.2 Sexually harmful behaviour.....	29
2.2.1 Discourses of sexually harmful behaviour.....	30
2.2.2 Discourses about the young person	36
2.2.3 Discourses within Professional Practices	41
2.2.4 Discourses from young people	49
2.2.5 Summary	50
2.3 The role of school and education	50
2.3.1 Supporting emotional health and well-being	51
2.3.2 Safeguarding and child protection	54
2.3.3 The school context and sexually harmful behaviour	56
2.4 Conclusion	60
Chapter Three.....	62
Methodology	62
3.1 Assumptions of the research.....	63
3.1.1 Ontology and epistemology	64
3.1.2 Ontological and epistemological assumptions	64
3.1.3 What type of knowledge I want to produce	67
3.2 Social constructionism - an overview	68
3.2.2 Construction of the self	71

3.4 Narrative Approaches	73
3.4.1 What is narrative?.....	73
3.4.2 Narrative inquiry.....	75
3.4.3 Thematic analysis of narratives	78
3.5 Reflexivity.....	81
My Position	82
3.7 Ethics	84
3.8 Quality of research	86
3.8.1 Methodologies of the critical literature review	86
3.8.2 Criteria for qualitative studies.....	88
3.9 Conclusion	92
Chapter Four.....	93
Method	93
4.1 Choosing the participants.....	93
4.2 Exploring Group Narratives.....	96
4.3 Focus Groups	97
4.3 Narrative principles within group sessions	98
4.4 Analysis /Interpretation.....	101
Chapter Five.....	104
Data Analysis and Interpretation.....	104
5.1 Theme one: Normal and not normal	104
5.2 Theme two- Developing identity.....	122
5.3 Theme three: The professional voice and personal voice	136
5.4 Conclusion	164
Chapter Six.....	165
Discussion and reflections	165
6.1 Research Questions	165
6.1.1 How do teachers talk about young people who show SHB? Reflections on the themes.....	165
6.1.2 How do teachers construct the role of school for young people who show sexually harmful behaviour? Reflections on the themes around school	172
6.2 Reflections on the personal and professional voice	176
6.3 Implications for practice	180
6.4 Reflections on and cautions of the research	186
6.4.1 Methodological considerations.....	187

6.4.2 Future research	189
References.....	191
Appendices.....	216
Appendix One	217
Ethical Approval letter.....	217
Appendix Two	218
Initial Letter to School staff	218
Appendix Three.....	220
Information Sheet	220
Appendix Four.....	224
Information Gathering Sheet Narrative Research on Sexually Harmful Behaviour	224
Appendix Five	225
Participant Consent Form	225
Appendix Six.....	226
Appendix Seven.....	228
Transcript Conventions.....	228
Appendix Eight Transcripts	229
Session One	229
Session Two	262
Reflective Logs Reflective Log One RL1	300
Appendix Nine Thematic analysis	302
Initial Codes from sessions.....	302
Themes.....	305

Abstract

Young people who show sexually harmful behaviour is a growing phenomenon. There is a host of research into the characteristics of young people and effective interventions yet there is little if any research into the phenomenon within schools.

Underpinned by a social constructionist epistemology this study asks what narratives are available to talk about this phenomenon within schools and how adults in school view their role and the role of the school context.

Using a focus group approach this study explores the narratives of a group of adults working in an inner city secondary school. Using thematic analysis, three narratives were interpreted from the group sessions; normal and not normal, identity of young people who show SHB and professional and personal voice. In addition, a theme of uncertainty was interpreted within each theme which offered insight into dilemmas and tensions in the narratives.

Teachers in this study were positive about the role of school and recognised a role in supporting holistic needs of young people. Future ways of working are discussed in relation to schools, teachers and educational psychologists.

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Background and rationale

Awareness of the phenomenon of sexually harmful behaviour (SHB) by children has increased in the last two decades (Smith, Allardyce, Hackett, Bradbury-Jones, Lazanbatt and Taylor, 2014). It is acknowledged that a significant minority of sexual offences are committed by young people who are of school age (Hackett 2004) yet the role of schools and teachers remains undefined.

Since the 1990's the awareness of abuse of children has stretched outside of the family home and been recognised within institutions, care settings and organised groups. In 1992 a National Children's Home (NCH) report synthesised the thinking about children and young people who 'sexually abuse' other children. It identified a range of difficulties in this area including:

- Denial and minimisation of the problem.
- Difficulties with terminology and defining abuse
- The difference between young people who have sexually abused and other young people in trouble
- Managing these young people in the child protection systems and the lack of consistent and co-ordinated approaches to do this.
- Assessment, intervention and treatment work
- Training and supervision for practitioners
- Continuum of care and support

The review pointed to a lack of robust policy or guidance to practice, with much of the work being inadequately informed and evaluated. Ten years on, Masson and Hackett (2003) report some changes yet a number of areas of debate remained including a continued need for further understanding and consensus around terminology, the diverse nature of this population and greater localised responses to intervention. A decade later Smith, Allardyce, Hackett, Bradbury-Jones, Lazanbatt and Taylor (2014) considered both the Masson and Hackett (2003) review and

Criminal Justice Joint Inspection (2013). They concluded that services for this group have remained static for two decades. Welfare and child protection systems are still disjointed and multi-agency working for all areas has not materialised (Smith et al 2014).

The Criminal Justice Joint Inspection Report (2013) concluded that opportunities for early intervention are often missed and there are only a few examples where holistic, multi-agency assessments have been undertaken (p6). The need to improve is stated alongside recognising the difficulties identifying early problematic behaviour. Smith et al (2014) conclude that as practice in the UK remains variable, a national strategy is needed to provide pathways to 'targeted, consistent and proportionate response' (p277).

I became interested in this area of research following involvement in two pieces of casework. In the first case I attended a multi-agency meeting concerning a teenager who had been arrested for a serious sexual offence but not charged. He had a statement of Special Educational Needs but had not yet returned to the specialist setting where he was on roll due to the perceived risks he presented. Teachers spoke about how the young person posed a significant risk due to the level of threat of his sexual aggression. The stories told by the professionals from education contained a level of anxiety with a high level of concern of the risk to others, and an uncertainty if the school could 'manage the behaviour'. This narrative of risk was overwhelming and within the discussion it was difficult to offer an alternative. Risk had not been formally assessed and not all the participants held the same view. Some professionals in the meeting felt he posed less of a risk if he attended school. The tension created by the situation restricted open discussions and instead focused on a narrow description of the pupil in relation to the sexual behaviour. I remember at one point feeling shocked at the emotive language used as one adult used the term 'sexual predator'

In the second case I attended an annual review for a 16 year old who was placed at a residential specialist setting for young people with sexually harmful behaviour.

Professionals from the school reported how much progress he had made and the young person spoke about how he wanted to come back home, to carers who loved him. He said he did not need to be there (at the school). The discussion amongst professionals was of how well he would cope and whether a move back home should happen. The social worker felt he should remain in the residential setting to confirm the progress and change that had occurred. This view was held a significant position and power within the meeting as she would be making the decision about his care placement. He got frustrated and angry and said, 'I am not that person'. He then stated he was not going to engage in school any more as no-one was listening to him.

The language used again resonated with me, in particular how the label presented as a huge barrier. Perception of risk was preventing one child returning to a school and the other from returning to foster carers in his home city. In the latter case risk was considered so highly by one professional that the voice of the young person was dismissed alongside the voices of other professionals who were advocating for the young person's view. Alternative narratives about strengths and needs of the child were not given as high a prominence and I felt as if the power of the term sexually harmful was crippling to the discussion.

1.2 Scale of the problem

It is difficult to accurately quantify the scale of the problem. Sexual behaviour which is harmful is often identified through youth justice or child protection agencies and is frequently through events of significant harm. SHB which does not reach the threshold for prosecution or which is identified and responded to in other ways is not captured in data. Sexual acts of children and young people which are harmful to others are often secretive and stigmatising and as with all sexual offences, risk being under reported. Gaining reliable statistics is further complicated by a lack of voice of the young people themselves and the reluctance of wider communities to discuss or accept its existence (Grant 2000). Hackett (2004) suggests in order to take a view which is not limited to criminal convictions (often the older end of the age spectrum), a broader view of child protection should be used to examine the scale of the issue e.g. Glasgow, Horne, Calam and Cox (1992) in Hackett (2004).

The statistics, whilst patchy, represent a picture of a significant minority of sexual offences being committed by children and young people (, Hackett 2004, Ministry of Justice 2015). Young people were convicted of 1653 sexual offences in 2013/2014 (Ministry of Justice, 2015). Secondary school permanent exclusion figures for 2013/14 show 50 pupils were permanently excluded for sexual misconduct with a further 1880 fixed term exclusions (Department of Education, 2015). The exclusion categories for more than 120,000 fixed term exclusions and 2280 permanent exclusions from academies is not available, so more may be contained within these figures.

It is difficult to state which behaviours are present or if individual statistics represent the same thing, leading to difficulties making comparisons. Children living in Scotland are criminally responsible at aged eight, in England and Wales at age ten and in some European countries age sixteen. A sexual offence is a matter of time and place and of it being disclosed, observed or proven. This is an imperfect and arbitrary measure of responsibility. In the case of UK government statistics data of SHB relies solely on a conviction.

1.3 Working in schools

To talk of children and young people who have shown these behaviours can be difficult and intervention is often left to 'the experts'. Responses to the data may induce anxiety that SHB is highly prevalent in schools or anger that young people are being reduced to statistics. It may be a relief to some professionals that these young people are being identified. Young people who show SHB attend school and other educational settings. Many exhibit other difficulties within school (Taylor 2003); in one study, over 50% had been referred to an educational psychologist at some time in their school history (Dolan, Holloway, Bailey and Kroll 1996). How teachers and educational psychologists (EPs) respond to support these young people has not yet been explored and research into this area is difficult to find.

Although expertise is important being expert does not sit comfortably with many established ways of working in educational psychology. Common EP practices e.g. consultation (Wagner 2000), avoid expert models and are underpinned by collaborative working which sustains certain practices and excludes others. On initial reading the body of research feels exclusionary of those who do not have the expertise to deal with the phenomenon contradicting a collaborative approach. So, if the child is in school what would educational professionals 'do'? What is their role? How is the young person included in the approach?

EPs are often called upon when the school has a difficult situation to contend with and this includes when young people show SHB. How do EPs engage in discussions within schools which empower the adults within the settings? How do EPs support the construction of a narrative which open possibilities for the young person whilst being aware of the impact of the behaviour?

Billington (2006) suggests the children's workforce should consider the professional practices which position children as not having knowledge and adults as experts. He simplifies this into five easily accessible questions from which to reflect on practice:

- 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, p8)

The children and young people talked about are of school age and spend significant amount of their time within educational settings. Research is pitifully slight, much of it being aimed at front line practitioners working in the social care and youth justice fields. Understanding about young people is shared in terms of their characteristics,

their sexual behaviour, their history and current family circumstances. The research is written for specialist services and other agencies.

The construct of normal is prominent in the debate about these young people. Research identifies categories of normal, not normal, problematic and harmful. However normal is a social construct and reflects the dominant discourses available (Burman, 2008). These normative models of child development provide rationales for professional practices (Burman 2008). Cromby, Harper and Reavey, (2013) suggest that statistical, medical and social models of normal exclude or include factors from each other which one would intuitively wish to accept or deny and none provide an objective basis for the identification of normal. The lack of definition of normal leads to questions of how it is constructed and its meaning for individuals.

As a practitioner researcher, I question how the research and the focus on normal and not normal would be useful to me in my role. Labelling behaviours as normal, problematic and harmful could suggest that there is a 'scientific' basis for these categories. Feyerabend (1975) in a radical critique of science suggested that to work on the belief that there are universal rules under which science operates is unrealistic and rather than leading to a useful framework instead becomes dogma which restricts progress.

I feel uncomfortable with many of the ways young people are talked about within the literature and with the preponderance of one epistemological approach. SHB is written about as if all aspects of the young person can be identified and categorised. Much of the research shares knowledge as facts discovered and does not recognise the interpretive nature of a social phenomenon. The knowledge I aim to produce recognises this phenomenon is subjective and is interpreted by individuals. School environments are social in nature and the meanings constructed are fluid. As such this research is co-constructed between the participants and offers insight into the available narratives in this school of young people who show SHB.

1.4 Structure of the research

This research offers a framework to reflect upon SHB and the narratives shared within a group of teachers. Research from the health and justice fields leads to stark and upsetting reading at times. Narratives of victims and abusers and descriptions of sexual abuse within the literature can be harrowing. Although there has been a growing recognition of young people's developmental levels the literature base can be singular in its focus. There is a gap in research in terms of different methodological approaches and of the role of schools.

This research will use the term sexually harmful behaviour (SHB). The teachers referred to behaviours as harmful and problematic. SHB is sexual behaviour which is a problem for the child and which harms another. It is often characterised by a lack of true consent and the presence of a power imbalance. The behaviours discussed by teachers are judged as harmful by the individual participants in the group and is their interpretation of harmful. The chapters are set out as follows.

Chapter two will explore the relevant literature in this field. I will share constructs and understandings of sexuality, childhood and adolescence and morality drawing from philosophy, sociology and psychology. I will share current literature within the field of SHB including research into characteristics of young people and their needs and of assessment and intervention. I will then discuss the role of school in terms of curriculum and safeguarding, intervention for SHB for young people within schools and how young people are included within the process.

Chapter three will share the methodology which underpins this research. Ontological assumptions are presented and discussed. Decisions made are discussed in light of the research assumptions. Social constructionism and the narrative paradigm are presented and the decisions to use these approaches explored. Adopting a narrative approach can offer a simple but effective exploration of the stories people tell about their lives and the lives of others. As a method of inquiry, it offers an open opportunity to explore "different and sometimes contradictory layers of meaning" (Andrews Squire,

Tamboukou, 2008, p. 1). In an area of research which has little literature in this context and a host of mainstream research with a dominant discourse, an approach which encourages exploration of the layers of meaning can hope for unexpected results. Criteria for discussing quality is shared alongside ethical considerations.

Chapter four describes the research methods used in the project. I describe the interpretation of the transcripts, details of the participants and the process of interpretation. Data was collected using a two session focus group approach alongside reflective logs. The thematic analysis process is explained.

Chapter five presents the interpretations and findings of the data analysis. I share the three themes identified; normal and not normal, developing identity and the professional and personal voice. Within each theme there is a concurrent theme of uncertainty and this is discussed alongside the dilemmas which teachers expressed. I aim to share themes in a manner which allows the reader to explore the interpretations I have made. I want the reader to share in the interpretation of the young person but to question the themes and make meanings which are relevant to them and their experience. To do so I have included direct quotes and the full transcripts in the appendices. I want to offer an approach which has validity for future practice and in which others can interpret in a different way.

Chapter six discusses the research project in relation to the research questions and then considers implications for teachers, schools and educational psychologists alongside the wider system. I conclude by reflecting on the methodological considerations and cautions and potential future research.

This research is underpinned by social constructionist assumptions and much of the critical literature review is positioned in alternate paradigms. I want to deal with this topic in a way which explores meanings not categories. I aim to explore how teachers

talk about the young person and themselves and to consider SHB in a way which has practical application for daily work.

Chapter Two

Critical Literature Review

Educational psychologists work with schools, communities and multi-agency teams, on individual casework often when there are high emotions and concerns. Sexually harmful behaviour (SHB) is one such area. I aim to explore the literature on SHB and the role of education and schools and in doing so the possible significance for the field of educational and child psychology. This chapter will explore the current literature on SHB and the importance of the school context. Understandings of sexuality, childhood and morality influence and construct what is harmful, acceptable and normal. It is therefore important to reflect on how these are constructed and in doing so make explicit some of the current psychological and sociological thinking.

The chapter is divided into the following three main sections: i) sexuality, childhood and morality, ii) literature from the field of SHB in young people and iii) the role of education and school.

The first major section explores the themes of sexuality, childhood and morality. Theories and perspectives from a range of disciplines including psychology, philosophy and sociology are shared. Essentialism within sexuality is discussed first with reference to the theories of Freud (1920) and Erikson (1959) and their contribution to every day understanding of the phenomenon. A critical lens is taken to these theories with particular reference to Michel Foucault and his significant contribution to the theoretical debate. The social construction of sexuality is further explored within social models and perspectives using ideas from Weeks (2003) and Gagnon and Simon (1974). The theme of childhood explores how childhood is defined and conceptualised using modern global definitions. The discussion draws upon traditional social theories of childhood i.e. Freud and Piaget alongside critical reflections of these models. James and Prout (1997) introduced a then 'new' paradigm of childhood focusing academic writing and research in sociology towards childhood as a social construct. This new paradigm reflects on the construction of childhood within the western perspectives recognising positionality and the effects of globalisation (Boyden 1997). Western childhood remains mostly innocent. Even

though children are given some biological facts about sex, they are often 'protected' from subjective understanding of sexuality until teenage years. The next section brings together the constructs of childhood and sexuality including childhood constructed as innocence using ideas from Kitzinger (1998) and Robinson (2008) and then discusses how sexuality in adolescence is perhaps constructed differently drawing on ideas from research e.g. Bale (2011) and Allen (2011) alongside theorists already mentioned e.g. Weeks (2003). Normal sexuality is then considered in relation to childhood by drawing on literature relating to education and the western view of sexualisation of children. This leads to the final part of this first section sharing thoughts on the theme of morality. Morality and the concept of what is moral is often linked to norms in social systems and although not the same for everyone, morality is a reflection of a system in which understanding is constructed. Again, drawing initially from Freud and Erikson and then with reference to Foucault, the section of morality seeks to explore understanding of what is acceptable and the judgements of normal made within this. Using some contributions from anthropology, morality is located within the social context. Developmental models of how moral understanding develops are referenced and critical reflections on the models are shared e.g. Burman 2008. SHB can be an emotive topic. Briefly reflecting on ideas from Bion (1948), Damasio (1999) and Williamson (1997) the final section concludes by considering the place of emotion and how morality, values are often framed alongside emotion in professional practice and how or if it is referred to.

The second major section considers the literature on SHB and the current research and findings. It draws extensively on the writing and research by Simon Hackett and Steve Myers. Following the most recent review of practice (Smith et al 2014), the section explores the issues which arise from the language and terminology used. Much of the current research within the SHB literature focuses specifically on normal and not normal and the main factors which the research considers to be important when considering normal, i.e. age, gender and context. The discussion highlights the discourses in research which have a high focus on the young person who shows SHB and the variables which are key within their characteristics and environment. Following this the practices of professionals working in the field are explored including risk assessment and intervention. Whilst the research seeking evidence of

characteristics focuses on more positivistic methodologies and within child models, the theoretical underpinnings of interventions are often found within constructionist and interactionist models. Examples of models drawing on resilience (Rutter 1985), solution focused approaches (De Shazer 1988) and narrative e.g. the Junction project (Myers 2002) are explored. The section then considers the support needs for professional involved in delivering support. Lastly the discourses of the young person themselves are discussed (Hall 2006) and though brief they highlight an often-missing perspective.

The third and final major section explores the role of school and education for these young people. There is little direct research specifically into SHB and schools and subsequently the section considers the wider aspects of education and research which may have possible implications for future practice. The impact of emotional health and well-being initiatives in schools at the universal level including sex and relationship education are explored alongside key related issues of safeguarding and child protection. Lastly the literature which references the school context directly is shared, including how educational needs, interventions in school and multi-agency work are referred to in the research along with some identified roles for schools.

The literature review draws from many epistemological perspectives, many with a positivist lens. I recognise that I feel more drawn to some research than others, some discourses more than others and some research more than others. The conclusions drawn from research will be presented here and the issues of epistemology will be explored within the discussion of methodology.

2.1 Sexuality, Childhood and Morality

Understandings of sexuality, childhood and morality influence and construct what is harmful, acceptable and normal. Writing about sex and sexuality engages theories from biology, psychoanalysis, philosophy, and developmental psychology and spans the biological, social, moral and political. Sexuality and sex is often considered the domain of adults and as children become adolescents 'we' allow them to move into

this world. This section will discuss sexuality, childhood and morality separately drawing on major writers within the areas but recognises in this study the interrelatedness of the constructs.

2.1.1 The construction of sexuality

Sexuality is of interest to a range of disciplines and is discussed by biologists, psychologists, philosophers, sociologists and anthropologists. Who talks about it and why often determines how it is talked about. This section will share essentialist understandings of sexuality and then explore critiques from a sociological and postmodernist perspective.

Sexuality, sex and gender are often constructed as if one. Conventional wisdom is that they are natural and purely physical and therefore can be studied in terms of reproduction and biological responses. The assumption is sex is a physical act, constructed simply in biological theories, through innate drives and part of the natural order. Through this lens sex and sexuality are discussed as if a biologically pre-determined category.

This essentialism underpins many theories. Essentialism characterises sex and sexuality as an internal and innate aspect of our behaviour as humans. Drives and urges are discussed as pre-existing any context or experience and part of an explanation of the essence of the human condition. Sex and sexuality are reduced to a behaviour which can be understood in terms of nature, biology and development. Theories such as Maslow's hierarchy of need use the language of essentialism in describing sex as being a basic need (Maslow 1943) and a feature of life and existence of humans alongside other basic needs.

Psychological theories add to developmental knowledges of sex and sexuality. Early childhood studies concentrate on the development of gender and sex differences with desire and sexual intimacy usually left to adolescence. Some well-known theories

consider sexuality at an earlier stage, the most famous being Freud's (1920) psychosexual developmental model. Psychoanalysis has maintained that children are sexual beings. Freud described an innate sexual desire in children as part of their developmental progression and it is in this that understanding of gender and normal sexuality develops and in which future psychosis or neuroses are seated.

Erikson's (1959) psychosocial theory includes cultural influences alongside sexual influences (Smith, Cowie and Blades 1998). He identified a number of stages as a child moves from infancy into adulthood building on resolution of tensions between two conflicting forces. Erikson recognises the importance of identity and that adolescence is a key period when identity is confused. There follows the 'trailing' of identities, with the primary sources of this in social interaction with peers. Erikson suggests intimacy versus isolation is the stage which involves sexual intimacy and appears in young adulthood. The model allows for childhood first and then adolescence and young adulthood to deal with sexual behaviour. Whilst his theory references the social aspect in developing identity it is positioned within a predetermined developmental model and privileges the knowledge that sexuality is a facet of emerging adulthood.

Both models offer a normal developmental pattern for children to progress into adulthood. Later theorists would argue that 'normal' reflects society and culture (Gergen 2011). Human sexuality is not a fixed phenomenon and the meanings made about sex and sexuality have changed and are changing (Burr, 2003). Rahman and Jackson (2010) argue that this essentialism within psychoanalytic theory appears as if part of a natural order and as such offers a hierarchy of sexuality. It pervades thinking in society underpinning social structures. For example, sexuality driven by urges perceived as natural or normal support social structures such as the nuclear family. Whilst the psychoanalytic approach might have been founded in family dynamics, it is often viewed as pathologising of certain sexualities e.g. homosexuality (Rahman and Jackson, 2010). Feminist writers and those within the development of queer theory highlight the dominant positioning of the patriarchal and heterosexual within these

theories (Butler 1990). Weeks (2003) states 'we are looking at the world within its framework of reference' (p37) not through a lens of truth or fact.

The construct of normal sexuality emerging in the 18th and 19th century would not be recognised today. Society became more concerned with the individual and their lives. Weeks (2003) states, as normal emerged so it defined the person. Critical debates in society arose about moral degeneration of individuals some which can be found in more recent narratives e.g. the rise of AIDS in 1980s and the narrative of blame of LGBT communities. Weeks (2003) identified those earlier narratives especially, as crises in history with moral undertones, making sexuality of importance.

A growing interest in the social construction of sexuality led to the deconstruction of taken for granted knowledge about normal sex and sexuality. As such normal became a construct, one which is not fixed but culturally agreed. Sexuality now is being subdivided into more types, with more differences. What is normal is for now, for the UK, for different genders, for hetero, homo and trans sexuality? Sexuality and therefore sexuality for children is socially constructed in its current context.

In his seminal text, *The History of Sexuality*, Michel Foucault (1979) explores the historical and cultural nature of the knowledges about sexuality. He contributes significantly to the theoretical debate, of the construction of sex and sexuality and how these constructs are acted upon. The body and sexuality for Foucault are cultural constructs and as such are socially constructed not truth to be discovered. Foucault questions the assumptions held about previous truths and the sociological structures and culture in which this truth is constructed.

Foucault explores discourses not language, discourse meaning the 'production of knowledge through language' (Hall 2001 p72). He describes how constructs have changed through history, a position Hall (2001) describes as radically historicised. As an example, Foucault proposes that in Victorian times discourses were even more, not

less, present and these acted upon the rules and norms of sexuality. This proliferation of discourses on the subject regulated forms of sex, privileging those forms which added to the economic society. Foucault's (1979) perspective recognises that sexuality is not a fixed known entity but a constructed one and relevant and belonging to the historical and cultural time it exists within. Discourses of sexuality legitimised scientific and medical study of sex as an object and led to the self-policing of 'normality'. Foucault describes how medical discourses produced disorders, criminal discourses produced deviant criminal behaviour and Christian discourses produced oratory on sin and shame of certain acts. Sex and sexuality were described, analysed and regulated.

Hall (2001) summarises the criticisms laid at Foucault, a major one of being vulnerable to the charge of relativism. Subjects lose their privileged positions leaving them little agency (Jackson and Scott 2010) and the question of self and identity for example the gendered self are often unreferenced (Nash 1994). Although theoretically appealing Foucault's approach lacks a theory of action (Power 2011). Welcomed by many writers of those subjected to dominant discourses, criticism lead to the development of queer theory and feminism to question the natural order of sexuality identity, gender within culture and significant social change (Butler 1990).

Sociological approaches explore how sexuality is socially organised. Weeks (2003) states that sexuality is 'an invention of the mind' (p6) and that it is historically and culturally located, agreeing with Foucault's original work (1979). Sex may appear to be the object of study however it is a study in fact of how a culture has interpreted the phenomenon. Setting sexuality in a sociological frame, Weeks (2003) highlights the five areas of social organisation of sexuality: kinship and family, economic and social organisation, social regulation, political and cultures of resistance. The social system in which sexuality is constructed and maintained helps understanding of its importance in society. It gives a framework for what is normal in a society recognising the societal structures in place such as political and religious systems e.g., age of consent and marriage. This social organisation has links with Marxists theories e.g. economic

organisation and with the deconstructionist positions of Foucault (1979) in terms of regulation and subsequent practices, power and resistance.

Weeks (2003), states that research into and our interest in sex led to categories, codes and even moral assumptions and beliefs which shape and regulate sexuality and sexual life. Sex and sexuality is not an absolute, constructed and understood the same by all. The language of sex offers insight into the complexities of sexuality and how meaning is made by individuals. Constructing sexuality within an interactionist framework, Simon and Gagnon (1974) provided the first fully sociological account of sexuality (Rahman and Jackson, 2010). Sexual conduct is meaningful in construction by the reflexive self. They suggested a theory of scripts which respond to and construct social understanding of sexuality including the interpersonal, intrapsychic and contextual (cultural) allowing one to make sense of the sexual within the social systems. This allows individuals to take active roles in their own identity but also recognises the significance of context in relation to normal and acceptable.

The social construction of sexuality is a 'sensitive conductor of cultural influences' (Weeks, 2003 p2). The language used can be purely biological or describe joy, disgust, shame, fear, empathy warmth or connection. Weeks (2003) describes it as 'chameleon like' (p1) and it is this complex and changing social understanding that is relevant to the study. The construct of sex and sexuality constructs the social and moral framework for how it is understood as sexual and normal and acted upon in the social world. If sexuality is socially constructed how sexuality is then constructed in childhood and adolescence is of importance.

2.1.2 The construction of childhood and adolescence

Childhood is defined as a separate from adulthood, 'the state or period of being a child' (Def 1. Merriam-Webster online retrieved 8th April 2016 from <http://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary>). Enshrined in law, childhood is identified as a social group below the age of 18 and is legally constituted by UNHCR Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNICEF 1989). How childhood is conceived for the

different ages represented varies. Young people below the age of 18 are identified as children politically i.e. they are denied the automatic right to vote and parents hold responsibility for their children up until 18 suggesting the need for guidance and support. The participation age in education or training has been raised to 18 (The Education and Skills Act (DCSF 2008) therefore by attending school (a regulatory institution) until the age of 18 that young person is within an establishment identified with being a child. Whilst on face value this supports the construction of childhood as a homogenous state dependent on adults, other social structure and norms reflect the differences as the child becomes an adolescent or young person. A teenager may need guidance and support yet it is not the same support required for a younger child. Sixteen is the age where some children venture into the world of work. Economic responsibility for a child can cease at 16 with child benefit paid to parents only if the child is in education. Over the age of sixteen, access to some children's services changes e.g. CAMHS and family support, and some services have specific post 16 support as this age of child is considered a subset needing a specific type of support. Of interest for this study the age when a child can legally have sex is sixteen, lower than the age of adulthood, yet we teach sex education in schools to primary age children. It has also only been within the last two decades that same sex intercourse has held the same legal age status of 16.

Childhood is a conceptual category, a field of academic study and a marginalised group with lack of voice (Kehily, 2004). It is defined as a set of qualities or experiences (Kitzinger 1997) usually of innocence, often with nostalgia, and frequently gendered (Burman, 2008). It is understood within a range of appropriate contexts and experiences, relationships and behaviours and is often a time of nurturing or constraining (Boyden, 1997).

In a brief overview of sociological perspectives Cosaro (2015) identifies socialisation, development and constructivism as the major traditional theories of childhood. Within these the child is constructed as incomplete and unformed as an adult. They structure childhood as a temporary space in which children acquire the skills necessary for independence and adulthood (Wyness 2006). Socialisation theories see the child as a

passive receiver of knowledge ready to develop an understanding of the social world. The child is a novice who will develop understanding through training. Constructivists such as Piaget (1932) formed the child in a more active role. The child in Piaget's view actively constructs the world he/she lives in, engaging through interaction with the world and through a process of assimilation, accommodation and equilibrium develops logical and rationale thought at maturation. Donaldson (1978) critiqued Piaget's theories stating that often children can achieve more than Piaget originally thought if the tasks were located within their concrete world rather than offered from an abstract perspective. Theorists such as Vygotsky (1978) further identified the role of culture and language in the child's world.

The discourses from traditional theories bring with them the ability to categorise and identify normal. Developmental approaches claim a status of scientific inquiry with those interested testing and concluding what children can do at each stage and therefore identifying a normal route (Woodhead 2015). The child is either seen as a blank slate, as needing guidance to ensure their untamed side does not emerge or as a romanticised innocent (Kehily 2012). Children are perceived as incomplete adults who through normal development will become fully functioning individuals in society.

Children can be viewed as normally developing or at times abnormal, e.g. anti-social. Explicit policies and practices regulate today's childhood e.g. through counselling or descriptors of mental health such as conduct disorder. The anti-social child or delinquent is constructed through immaturity, lack of regulation and bad influences (Boyden 1997). Discourses of the delinquent brings with it calls for greater control and boundaries (Wyness 2006). The offer of support for these children of families who are identified as antisocial have the scent of moral judgement e.g. Troubled Families agenda (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2012).

Society supports the state of childhood through structures e.g. the family systems, and economic arrangements and practices e.g. education laws. Family rules are constructed within a society but are managed locally (Kitzinger 1997), for example age

related activities, age of maturity and division of labour. Wyness (2006) describes the contemporary agencies of socialisation for childhood as being family, school and peer groups. Family is key in a child's life and the structures within support the understandings of childhood. Parents mediate the child's experiences in the wider world and filter messages in the early years. School is described as a 'powerful determining force' (Wyness 2006,p129) offering a structure which develops understanding of authority, rules and boundaries alongside explicit and implicit learning of social norms and values. Lastly the peer group offer a more informal and democratic space for children to develop understanding of their self and society especially in later childhood. Peers become a new testing ground for self, linking with psychosocial theories such as Erikson (1959). The space offered within school is of interest to this study. Wyness (2006) suggests the position of children in schools 'reflects children's broader social status' (p145) e.g. their position as needing support and guidance, not knowing and becoming more knowing as they develop, learning they are protected and safe. Their identities are located in their future selves and implicitly so is their value.

James and Prout's (1997) 'new' paradigm of childhood describes childhood as a social construct, one which is culturally and historically located. Childhood is an adult construct changing over time (Gittens 2004). Historical and social understandings of childhood reflect the impact of social structures. For example, the industrial revolution drove women into the workplace and impacted the form of the family, the numbers of children born and what a child should do and not do. The tightening of child labour laws in the Victorian era highlights how childhood has been constituted in a contrasting time. The historical position of childhood has changed significantly, moving from being a financial resource for working class families to its current form as protected from the adult world. These radical social changes are often the result of the shifting economic and political landscape reconstructing childhood and children differently.

James and Prout (1997) brought together the new paradigm within sociology of childhood as socially constructed, an '*interpretive framework for understanding the early years of life*', (James and Prout, 1997, p13). They state childhood is a

marginalised, Europe centric construct often of white middle class origin. The construct suggests an ideal of norms and values which are historically and culturally bound within western priorities (Boyden 1997). Instead of viewing childhood as an inferior position to adult hood it should be studied as another variable of social analysis, and of importance as a sub group. It is a reconstruction of childhood. Whilst what is constructed may be a biological factor, what it means in society is socially understood (LaFontaine 1979 in James and Prout 1997).

Within this reconstruction of childhood in western culture, innocence is often seen as synonymous with childhood. A loss of innocence can become a loss of childhood. In relation to sexuality, innocence can be a sexual commodity, a stigmatisation to a knowing child or an ideology which denies access to knowledge and power and it may actually increase vulnerability (Kitzinger,1998). Kitzinger (1998) suggests that childhood as an institution makes a child vulnerable. Is this possibly also the case for those who are described as showing SHB?

Childhood is neither universally understood nor constructed in the same manner in all cultures. Through globalisation there is a historical move of social reform towards a regulated and moralised childhood (Boyden 1997). Foucault (1979) would argue that these are practices formed through the discourses being in play and that the subjects are being constituted via these discourses. Childhood is constructed in the available and dominant discourses of the context. Childhood is perceived by many as needing protection. This saving of children is observed in war, plight and famine and in terms of protection is nationally recognised as safeguarding. Boyden (1997) writes that the construct has led to international legislation and social policy e.g. UNHCR Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNICEF 1989). Within these rights of the child there is no reference specifically to a child's right to sexuality which leads one to question if a child has these rights?

Childhood, adolescence and sexuality

Childhood and sexuality are often separated. Robinson (2008) drawing on Foucault's theorising suggests that sexuality and childhood are socially constructed, the delineation between sexual and non-sexual being socially defined and negotiated. The child is '*perceived as being everything that the adult is not, i.e. naive, dependent, unsophisticated, immature, lacking critical thinking, inexperienced and unknowing*' (Robinson 2008, p 224). This creates the mutually exclusive world of childhood and situates sexuality in the adult world only.

In psychological theories childhood innocence is often protected. Freud's psychosexual theories have received much criticism, suggesting the influence of sexuality were over stated. However, by suggesting the unconscious status of sexual desire Freud protected the perspectives of childhood and innocence (Hawkes and Egan 2008). Thanasui (2004) suggests that children are not capable of formal operational thinking i.e. Piagetian stages of child development. Therefore, they cannot think abstractly about their experiences and their experience of sexuality is framed as not erotic as it does not have the learned element about sexual desire that adults hold. Both views position the child as not consciously sexual and the sexual nature of the child is not constructed as equivalent to adult sexuality.

Foucault (1979) states the deployment of sexuality takes four principles one being the pedagogisation of children's sex which permits an array of practices to prevent this activity and its perceived harmful moral and physical effects. Throughout the Victorian era this was seen through precocious sexuality in children being gradually stifled. Foucault's work further highlights how discourses of protection and social reformation legitimised social intervention by the government on childhood sexuality in the form of discipline, surveillance and scientific management. The understanding of normal in sexuality is through cultural and social processes and practices. Foucault (1979) questions sexuality in terms of power how the normalising force of power is exerted in and through these discourses.

Sexuality in childhood is often separated into child and adolescent, puberty being the biological marker. We use words to categorise this subset of childhood such as adolescent, teenager and increasingly young adult. Adolescence is a specific time, often of uncertainty, growth and development into adulthood (Smith, Cowie and Blades 1998). For many, sexuality becomes acceptable or normal if describing children as adolescents. Biological models may offer delineation of when a child can engage in sexual activity for procreation; this is not accepted by all as an age when children can engage in sexual activity, hence UK laws of consent remain at 16. Developmental models link sexuality with cognitive and psychosocial development marking children as more able to engage socially and emotionally as they move towards the pinnacle of development, i.e. adulthood. Yet these do not fully account for the social acceptability of sexuality for adolescents regardless of actual physical maturation (Rahman and Jackson 2010).

Weeks (2010) states sexuality is 'produced by society in complex ways' and is a 'result of diverse social practices that give meaning to social activities of social definition and self-definition of struggles between those who have the power to define and those who resist.' (p176). A child is sexual or not as constructed by the society he/she lives in. Age and location can act as guides to normality. In Iran, the minimum age of marriage is 13, an age which many in England would consider too young. At different periods in history there have been a wide range of sexual practices for children such as marrying in their first years, which some today would be considered abhorrent.

Understanding of sexuality in adolescents is not only constructed by adults but by teenagers themselves. Bale (2011) suggests that adolescents see themselves as sexual agents and sexual consumers but are often not seen as such in terms of policy. Today teenagers who are sexually active can be perceived through liberal discourses but also through discourses of promiscuity or at risk of child sexual exploitation. This brings a complex response from those who traditionally see protection as their key role. It may be that childhood before adolescence is protected differently which leads to an adult understanding of protection that is less relevant to adolescents who are sexual. Practices operate which attempt to shape this groups' understandings and

beliefs i.e. through education. However, research suggests education has 'de-eroticised the curriculum' and 'lacks a foundation in pedagogy' (Allen 2011) leading one to question whose knowledges are being expounded. The normative understandings of society are seen in advertising, social media, families and many more technologies. Peer groups become social structures to understand sexuality within (Furlong 2013) and teenagers see themselves as legitimate sexual subjects (Allen 2011).

There is a wealth of research into adolescence and sex, whether considering risk taking behaviours, the need for sex education or how parents talk with young people. In compulsory education, the control of childhood sexuality is institutionalized (Fishman 1982) with schools offering the ability to categorise and protect. Weeks (2003) identifies social regulation such as education as an area of organisation of sexuality in childhood. Society is more interested in the individual and with historical perceptions of a decline in morals (Weeks 2003) the institutions which support and shape sexuality become key. Sexual knowledge is one of the key parts which defines childhood in western understanding (Braggs Buckingham Russell and Willet 2011). Narratives in society about sexuality, risk and protection are intertwined when considering sexual behaviour in children and young people. Parents worry that children and adolescents are being exposed to an overtly sexualised culture. Governments in the United States, UK and Australia have commissioned reports to express their growing concerns over the sexualisation of children e.g. APA 2007, Papadopoulos 2010 and Taylor, 2010. Braggs et al (2012) contest the views of reports such as Papadopoulos as overly simplistic and describe the approach in her report as 'counter indoctrination' (p290).

Understanding normal is illusive. In contrast to some localised views, sexuality seems implicitly accepted by researchers in adolescents. There remains little consensus though of what normal looks like (Ryan 2000a) or if it exists outside of culture (Gagnon and Simon 1974). Whilst not the defining feature of normal the concept of normal comes from what is valued and held often as acceptable or moral. Gagnon and Simon (1974) state that normal is understood through scripts. Children acquire

gender and then the sexual scripts appropriate to them. Gender is the framework and therefore is important in the construction of sexuality. They contest the psychological approach that privileges childhood instead believing that it is a continuous interactive and interpretive process which constitutes appropriate acceptable and normal at various stages of life. Plummer (1984 in Weeks 2003) describes these as the 'who restrictions' and 'how restrictions'.

The sexualisation that society is concerned with requires understanding of what is acceptable to know what is too much or even too little and that area of discussion remains a vacuum filled with subjectivity. These cultural agreements are underpinned by values often defined as morals. Difficult to gain consensus in, morality offers a perspective on how normal or acceptable sexuality is agreed and the knowledges in place.

2.1.3 The construction of morality

Morality is defined as the 'distinction between right and wrong' or 'a particular system of values and principles of conduct' (Retrieved 06/04/16 from <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/morality>). It is subject to discourses which attempt to seek rationales for what is considered normal and acceptable and is formed within social structures offering a wider lens into institutions and society.

Moral development has been subjected to theorising from anthropologists and psychologists. The existence of a moral framework for sexuality in communities has drawn upon anthropological studies. Freud, (1913) writing in 'Totem and Taboo', suggested that taboos found in anthropological studies are alike to moral prohibitions. They are formed through the collective mind. Totems which are cultural indicators of communities are used as social boundaries and markers through which taboo practices are understood. Exogamy (the custom of marrying outside a community) is imposed intentionally on younger generations through these totems to forbid marrying within a totem group. Whilst Freud made links to neurosis and psychoanalytic

precepts he referred again to the thinking that impulses are available to people and it is through totem and taboos that behaviour is influenced and practices are judged. Foucault (1979) also identified the deployment of social alliances, e.g. marriage, as a control of the sexual body through social regulation. Both recognise that social practices direct moral thinking and behaviour and in Foucault's perspective regulate sexual behaviour.

A number of psychological theories adopt a developmental approach to understanding moral behaviour. Although developmental models have been previously critiqued they remain a dominant understanding. Freud's (1920) psychoanalytic model focuses on psychodynamic factors and places moral development subject to identifying with the parent, learning internal moral rules and then judging oneself consciously or unconsciously upon these. He proposed guilt and shame are overriding emotions in bringing to bear moral behaviour. Erikson (1959) believed that moral rules are learnt initially from parents and then through other contexts and emotions such as pride, shame and guilt support moral development. There are many competing findings which support and contest these views. Adding a social element, learning theories suggest that moral rules are learnt through consequences and rewards with social learning theory suggesting the need for context and explanation. Within cognitive frameworks Piaget in Piaget and Gubian (1977) proposes a level of reasoning or rationality which needs to be reached within moral decision making, which Kohlberg (1979) extended even further with a comprehensive theory of moral cognitive development. The latter theory recognised the context and larger social norms which are considered when making individual choices based on values and principles.

Once again a critical perspective on the developmental stance highlights the inherent difficulties in locating development within a person and ignoring the social structures and practices in play. Burman (2008) states that rationality is the main feature of developmental theories such as Piaget's. This rationale proposes that the greater a child's ability to see from another's perspective, the greater is the opportunity to reason in more abstract forms. However being able to talk about morality is not the same as acting morally. Burman further proposes that the theories of moral

development are culturally bound and have foundations in the role of class and gender of the time. With reference to Carol Gilligan's work, Burman (2008) identifies this perspective is one of a narrow yet dominant male view. Gilligan (in Burman 2008), suggests that this male perspective neglects the stance that moral reasoning may be different for different genders, not worse or better, but with women drawing on differing aspects. It is the male perspective of developmental theorists which reflects and/or produces the practice it perceives.

Burman (2008) further offers studies which recognise how western culture is privileged. The issue arises as to whose morality is superior? MacIntyre (2011) suggests that rival premises in moral arguments often have no way of weighting one against the other e.g. the rights of an individual to the rights of a society, and each assertion has weight in its own framework. Within the literature on SHB, morality is not mentioned directly though guilt and shame are. It is expected that adults who sexually harm need to accept responsibility and understand the impact with consequences of shame and guilt implicit and therefore so should young people. This is contained in some intervention models with young people and a lack of articulating a feeling of guilt is a sign of risk (e.g. Henniker, Print and Morison 2002). It does not even suspect that articulating and feeling are not the same.

Understanding truth as socially constructed radically challenges the assumptions of traditional psychologies instead placing all knowledge as socially organised and understood. The sexual norm is challenged by feminism, queer theory, and political and radical LGBT movements. Yet does that make these identities, sexualities and behaviours acceptable in terms of values and morality? I would argue that there are few fixed and agreed moral values true for everyone in each part of our society. Meanings are made within social systems and practices and within the intersubjectivity of our social relationships (Weeks 2003). One must consider the phenomenon in context and culture and how it has evolved within this framework.

The moral framework surrounding a pupil has often been constructed prior to meetings and discussions about young people. He or she has been judged through judicial systems or by social norms as transgressing boundaries and therefore when reading about the acts that have happened, it is often difficult to disagree with the assumptions of them being wrong. In working with young people who show SHB it is accepted that young people are sexual and that harm has been caused. The morality of individual acts is not discussed. However, a binary code of right or wrong lacks relevance for some wider moral choices of how to respond as an adult nor does it recognise how different adults may interpret these behaviours.

Moral codes are not absolute but negotiated in societies and in communities. Moral codes within professional communities consider professional ethics, often with professionalism being equated with being rationale and non-emotional (Mercieca 2011). The debate is whether a lack of emotion is preferable. Bion (1948) emphasises the connection between emotion and learning and one wonders if the lack of emotion equates to a lack of empathy or engagement? Each young person is judged through available social understandings and if emotional understanding is not available then the key aspects of relationships with young people so valued in many schools is ignored. Damasio (1999) states 'a selective reduction of emotion is at least as prejudicial for rationality as excessive emotion' (Damasio 1999 p41) suggesting that an emotional response can add value along with the rationale and 'professional'.

My moral framework is not something given to me but something experienced. Williamson (1997), states that understanding is not enough to achieve moral learning. He states there need to be 'a concern for the needs of others together with a strong inner conviction of an obligation to meet those needs' (p 98). He further states that morality needs to be 'lived and experienced' (p.96). I am a white woman in a western culture and my morality and understanding is shaped through the cultures I reside in, both personally and professionally. Engaging with the topic as a professional is subtly different from engaging with the subject as a parent, woman, feminist or mother. Although I am all of the above I actively attempt to position myself in certain roles at certain times. Offering an alternative perspective can feel as if I am minimising the

pain and impact on others of some actions. It feels uncomfortable and at times naive to be seeking solutions for a young person's holistic needs when their action has had such impact on another. Acting as a professional allows a distance but it can feel as if this is another barrier.

The following research literature is presented as an overview of the discourses available within the professional and academic world. It is important to acknowledge the discomfort which remains within me when talking professionally about these violent and aggressive actions mostly of young men and the significance their action can have on others. I also recognise that my values are influenced by who I am and my experiences.

2.2 Sexually harmful behaviour

Professional practices have moved towards developing an evidence base. The evidence base referred to within NICHE guidelines privileges positivist realist evidence and considers randomised controlled trials to be gold standard (Marks, 2002). Simon Hackett (2004) recognises that researchers struggle to implement controls, comparison groups and subsequent causal explanations when researching in this area. Often research is led by clinicians and practitioners whose work is carried out in a messy and complex social realm. Complications of producing 'gold standard evidence' are cited as ethical as well as practical (Chaffin, Letourneau and Silovsky 2002). Whilst practitioners report they are keen to include evidence from research, this is often not seen in their practice (Hackett 2004). Hackett suggests that being at either end of the subjective – objective spectrum would not be rigorous or tailored enough (Hackett 2003). To meet the individual needs of young people, practitioners need to combine critical reflection alongside the best available evidence (Hackett 2004).

Evidence from research into SHB seeks to identify characteristics of the abuse, causes and aetiological factors and identify risks and effective methods of intervention

(Hackett, 2003). Their purpose is to improve practice and understanding of the most effective ways to intervene. The prevailing literature is grounded in pragmatic and realist perspectives to expose agreements and consistencies in understanding and approach. Much of the type of research undertaken is not reflective of this research's epistemology. An increased breadth of methodologies is found within the literature about intervention but qualitative methods are few.

The following sections will discuss themes which emerge from the literature search. The literature reflects a range of discourses about SHB found in the literature, starting with terminology, then following with discourses of what normal and not normal behaviour is and characteristics or features of young people who show SHB. I will then discuss discourses of professionals including risk, assessment and intervention and the theoretical underpinnings which inform current practice. Lastly I will share the limited research of young people's voice. I use some terminology within the research papers and report within their frameworks but mostly I prefer to use the term young people who show SHB.

2.2.1 Discourses of sexually harmful behaviour

Terminology

The terminology used to describe the young person continues to be debated. Within the literature a range of terms are used including inappropriate child sexual behaviour (Vosmer, Hackett and Callahan 2009), sexually harmful behaviour (Hackett 2004) sexually problematic behaviour (Hawkes 2011), young people who sexually offend (Griffin, Beech, Print, Bradshaw, and Quayle 2008) and sexually abusive behaviour (Vizard 2006). The terms can separate the behaviour and the subject e.g. young people with sexually harmful behaviours, or locate the subject and behaviour as one e.g. adolescent sexual offenders.

The NCH (1992) review of practice in this area debated the terms used settling on the term '*children and young people who sexually abuse other children*'. With on-going

debate about the length of this term the uncertainty continues. Recent reviews conclude that the lack of consistency continues with even national documentation not standardised (Smith et al 2014). Practitioners report their concerns with the inappropriate placing of adult labels on young people and the oppressive influence of these labels (Hackett 2003). Legal terms such as offender are determined by country of residence and its legal age of responsibility as much as anything else. The use of the word abuser detracts from the vulnerabilities of the young person and reduces the act to binary positions of abuser and abused, one being signified as more vulnerable than the other. In the attempt to avoid an oppressive label, others suggest the behaviour could be minimised with details so inaccurate that professionals are left with little information to carry out some of their functions e.g. assess risk (Hackett, 2004).

Terms appear to have changed over the last ten years to those which resist reductionist accounts of labelling (Smith et al 2014) and reflect many favoured by the initial NCH report (1992). The range of different sub groups may mean that terminology will remain varied to reflect the differences in populations whom practitioners are working with (Masson and Hackett 2003). This potentially adds to the lack of clarity in communication and understanding between professionals (Smith et al 2014).

Hackett (2004) writes that the terminology suggests more about the perspectives taken by professionals within the field, '*the philosophical orientation of the field to its subject*' (Hackett 2004 p. 5), a view which is reflected by others (Hall, 2006). Vosmer et al (2009) report a significant majority of practitioners agree young people should not be termed 'sex offender' or 'sexual abuser' as it implies that children's behaviour is alike to adults and does not recognise the issues specific to adolescence. Interestingly the terminology which practitioners report is most helpful is that which describes the behaviour most accurately (Hackett 2003). Whether young people would agree is not known.

One project relaunched with an increased awareness of the role of language in its person-centred practices. Myers (2002) reported on the renaming of this project from the Sheffield Project for Young Sexual Abusers to The Junction Project.

'The language used reflected a particular view of childhood, of identity and of how behaviour is conceptualised.'

(Myers 2002 p.335)

In the project, the identity of the young person had previously been constructed in terms of being an abuser, identities which are commonly used about adults and not referential to developmental, contextual or social issues. The fixed identity of abuser was perceived as stigmatising and deficit led, a description of an individual rather than of their behaviour. This fixed identity was not one that was open to influence by professional discourse or social environments. As such the project chose to change its name reflecting a new underpinning philosophy. By renaming the project and using terms 'working with children and young people with sexual behaviour problems' it aimed to be less stigmatising, reduce the anxiety for families and decouple the complex behaviour from the child which is an underpinning value of the work.

Normal and not normal

Normal is defined as 'conforming to a standard; usual, typical, or expected.' (Retrieved from <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/normal>, March2015) and normal and not normal is a focus within the SHB literature

Ryan (2000a) reviewed the literature on child sexuality up to 1988 with an aim to increase the understanding of adults about childhood sexuality and to reduce the risk of problems developing through adult intervention. She reported that our (western) culture is resistant to the belief that children are sexual prior to puberty and that sexual behaviours in children are seen as a potential pathology. Looking for more information on normal sexual development Ryan found little objective information against which children's behaviour could be measured. She concluded that it is

necessary to explore normal developmental patterns and how adult interaction affects these patterns. Some working in the field of SHB have called for a developmental model of sexually abusive behaviour to be developed (Vizard, Hickey, French and McCrory 2007).

Much of the SHB research attempts to articulate normal sexuality in terms of age i.e. younger children, those pre and post puberty. What is expected of adolescents in terms of normal sexuality is not well articulated and defined differently for different purposes and by different people. Within the teenage population the research focuses on specific areas of risk or on assessment of young people already identified as showing harmful or problematic behaviour as opposed to a normal developmental pattern. Some organisations attempt to share guidelines for normal as adolescents (e.g. AIM Project <http://aimproject.org.uk/> Accessed 4th June 2016). Factors mentioned within the SHB literature and which are used to discuss 'normal' are age, gender and context.

- Age

Age often equates to developmental stage. Pre-five years old, pre puberty and post puberty are the usual demarcating factors and often this is simplified into adolescent and pre-adolescent. Pre-adolescents and adolescents are described as distinct categories. Hackett (2004) states this is for three reasons, one that the behaviour in pre-adolescence is not marked with the same sexual desire and meaning, secondly that children prior to the age of ten occupy a different place in the criminal justice system and thirdly the cultural and societal context plays a significant part in whether the behaviour is labelled as problematic. He goes on to state that the dangers of labelling a child too young and the resulting stigma are of major concern.

Pre-adolescent children are reported to engage in a range of sexual behaviours (e.g. Ryan 2000b, Larsson and Svedin, 2002) and whilst some can be deemed not normal it is a subjective decision. Studies have been undertaken to seek what is normal behaviour in children (e.g. Friedrich, Fisher, Broughton, Houston and Shafran, 1998, Heiman, Esquilin and Pallitto, 1998) but whilst claims are made as to what is common and uncommon they do not offer definitive answers.

Normal and not normal in adolescence is more complex as this group of individuals are 'allowed' to be sexual. It is influenced significantly by contextual factors.

Adolescents are perceived as more alike to adults with their behaviours being linked to sexual desire and meaning (Chaffin et al 2002). The older the adolescent the more they are seen as being closer to adult understanding. They are also constructed as exhibiting more risky behaviours (Tolman and McClelland 2011). When showing SHB, adolescents become judged against some adult standards e.g. in law, yet the dichotomy remains that they require support through child protection systems and in intervention as children, not adults. (Smith, et al, 2014).

- *Gender*

Normal sexuality is constructed through discourses of gender. Narratives of normal are influenced by the society we are part of and the discourses which are available to us. As an adult, there are narratives of protection of daughters, sexualisation of society and risk-taking behaviour of adolescents. Teenagers are often seen as in need of support to make the correct decisions. They need to be protected from the excesses of modern society e.g. pornography and social media, which can encourage behaviours considered not to be suitable (Department for Education, 2011). Gender plays a role in how young people are perceived in cultural contexts (Kehily 2012).

The agreement of what is normal for males and females is not determined through a strict developmental understanding but through agreed collective understanding of what is acceptable for each gender. I recognise that being female has a range of discourses which are intertwined in relation to sex, sexuality and gender which measures and regulates sexual behaviour. There is little distinction made between girls and boys in terms of normal in the SHB literature. However the research of SHB girls are constructed as a sub group possibly needing a specific response. (Taylor 2003, Hickey, McCrory, Farmer and Vizard, 2008). It may be that future research will offer more insight. Explorations of SHB through feminist or deconstructionist perspectives in the research are not available.

- *Influence of adults' social, cultural, familial and temporal contexts*

Sexuality and sex have a private and public narrative. Context influences what is accepted as normal. Children do not regularly show sexual behaviour overtly and as it is not a public event, understanding of what is normal is compromised (Ryan, 2000a). Friedrich et al (1998) found that many overt sexual behaviours decrease after the age of five possibly because of socialisation and context. Blaise (2013), in trying to uncover some of the silences around sexuality and childhood, suggested that traditional understanding of childhood innocence and adult knowing masks children's actual curiosity and experience.

Sexual behaviour in younger children is reported more at home than in day care possibly due to the day care setting's normative influences and the expectations about sexuality of the adults in the settings (Larsson and Svedin, 2002). It is uncommon for adults other than parents to speak to children about sexual issues unless initiated by the children. 'Normal' is defined by social, cultural, familial and temporal contexts (Heiman, Leiblum, Esquilin and Pallitto, 1998), which are the constructions of adults and research relies on adult observations or adult perspectives.

Research suggests that decisions of normal for professionals are influenced by personal beliefs (Vosmer, Hackett and Callanan, 2009), professional roles and gender (Heiman et al, 1998). Many studies which attempt to define normal childhood sexual behaviours have sought data from professionals who work in the area of child abuse or with children with sexual behaviour problems. There are few studies in which the voice of the young person or child is accessed and where they express what sexuality means for them. The subjects of sexuality i.e. children are often mute as adults are the subjects who talk about their sexuality in childhood or research is through observation by adults. Often the focus is narrow as child protection not sexuality is the driver (Ryan 2000b).

In summary, professionals who work in the field showed little consensus on normal and inappropriate sexual behaviours for young children (Vosmer et al 2009). Much of

the growing research into this area is in response to child abuse and protection (Ryan 2000a, Horner 2004, Thanasui 2004) producing methodological issues as normal developing behaviour is defined narrowly and seen through the lens of vulnerability and child protection.

2.2.2 Discourses about the young person

Much of the research focuses on the young person and identification of characteristics such as features of the young person, their experiences and their levels of understanding. This section will explore the research about the individual and in doing so share the discourses about the young person which lead to early identification and intervention practices.

The research available agrees that young people who show SHB are a heterogeneous group (e.g. Almond Cantor and Salfati 2006) and suggests that although there may be subgroups there is no all-encompassing set of typologies. The exploration of subgroups seeks themes, generalisable patterns and identifying characteristics, to gain understanding of the causes and aetiological factors of the behaviour, the risk and likelihood the behaviour will continue and the most effective way of addressing the problem. All are aimed at improving identification, prevention and intervention. The following characteristics of the young person, the context, the victims and behaviours are referred to.

Males are overwhelmingly represented as the majority in offending groups (Manocha and Mezey, 1998, Taylor, 2003, Hutton and Whyte 2006) and the age of offending behaviour is primarily early teens. There are cases found in all age groups and in both males and female (Silovsky and Niec, 2001). Data from criminal justice sources identify teenage years as the most prevalent for offending (Ministry of Justice 2015). The onset of puberty is a peak time for the development of these behaviours in adolescents (Hackett 2004) though it may be that SHB is underreported in earlier ages. This may be because of a lack of understanding for younger children about what is normal and not normal (Vizard 2006), partly due to changing societal norms and ethical study issues, and/or anxiety around stigmatising a young child with labelling

(Hackett 2004). Children pre-adolescence are described in less stigmatising language and even the typology of their behaviours uses more subjective language.

Methodological and ethical issues within the research result in difficulties gaining participants for studies. Often young people are identified through access to treatment programmes and have been subject to the criminal justice system. Age is not equivalent to developmental understanding of sexuality (Hackett 2004) and age also occupies a different position in terms of criminal responsibility/justice. This leads to research at the extreme end of the continuum, biasing modal age (Vizard et al, 2007).

Background e.g. abuse and individual characteristics e.g. personality, individual deficits are heavily referenced. Although agreed that this is a heterogeneous group the research attempts to identify sub-groups, to provide unifying information from which to plan support. Within child factors such as personality and specific difficulties are identified within a cognitive model of explanation assuming fixed characteristics. Background and individual histories consider home characteristics and environment as influencing the behaviour.

Almond et al (2006) identify in their study three principal areas which occur;

1. A background of abuse
2. Impairments
3. Delinquency.

These areas are found in other articles, though termed differently, and alongside other contextual factors. Whilst I am not comfortable with the terms this reflects other research so I will use Almond et al (2006) categorisation to share the research available in this area.

1. A background of abuse

Abuse has been recognised as a feature for some young people who show SHB. There is wide variation within studies as to the prevalence of sexual abuse in this

group of young people. Although some studies show that adolescents who sexually harm report a high rate of sexual abuse e.g. 71%, Vizard, et al (2007), many report a higher rate than national averages but not at a significant level e.g. 19% in Scotland, (Hutton and Whyte, 2006) and 39% in North America, (Ryan, Miyoshi, Metzner, Krugman and Fryer, 1996). Almond et al (2006) found experiences of physical and sexual abuse occurred at a higher frequency. Vizard et al (2007) found three quarters of the sample had been removed from home due to abuse, neglect or family breakdown, whilst Hutton and Whyte (2006) reported a range of abuse experiences including suspected sexual abuse (31%) emotional abuse (50%), physical abuse (37%) and neglect (45%).

It would be incorrect to conclude that those who are sexually abused are more likely to sexually harm others. Information about the numbers who are sexually abused and who do not develop SHB would suggest it is not a sufficient aetiology (Hackett 2004). Gray, Pithers, Busconi and Houchens (1999) conclude that it is not sexual abuse per se that contributes to problematic behaviour but rather exposure to trauma.

Family background in terms of adverse life experience is stated in many studies as a characteristic. Hutton and Whyte (2006) report that of the 192 case studies almost half of young people were not in the care of their family, 68% of the cases reported insecure care giving and the majority of clients had experienced multiple forms of 'negative life experiences'. Lambie and Seymour (2006) state that many young people have witnessed domestic violence. Hawkes' (2011) study reports a number of home features for young people who had shown early onset of SHB including:

- Caregivers' unresolved trauma in childhood
- Hostile helpless caregiving
- Early and comprehensive trauma neglect and maltreatment in the family context
- Insecure attachment in infancy and subsequent poor caregiving attachment strategies.

This gives further weight to interventions which recognise exposure to trauma has significant influence and opens up the narrative to more than just abuse but also to trauma and negative life experiences (Creeden 2009, Banks and Ward 2014). Other studies agree of the importance of context specifically identifying family characteristics such as family dysfunction and violence (e.g. Vizard 2006), aggressive socialisation and inappropriate sexualisation in the home (e.g. Vizard et al 2007) and lack of positive emotional development and care (Araji 1997).

2. Individual needs – Defined as impairments by Almond et al (2006)

Research identifies that some young people who show SHB have social and psychosocial needs. Almond et al (2006) report psychological and social impairments including low self-esteem, behavioural problems and poor social skills. They also include social isolation and being bullied as impairments, constructs which I would argue are environmental or systemic. Chaffin et al (2002) reported lower levels of social competency and increased levels of social withdrawal. Outsem, Beckett, Bulens, Vermeiven, van Horn and Doreleijers (2006) used a range of criteria to create an analysis tool for SHB which included self-esteem, social desirability, empathy, aggression, impulsivity and emotional loneliness. In relation to sexual knowledge there is some suggestion that adolescent sexual offenders have less sexual knowledge and less victim empathy (Whittaker, Brown, Beckett and Gerhold, 2006).

Significant educational difficulties or developmental needs are cited in a number of studies (Dolan et al 1996, Vizard 2006, Almond, Canter and Salfati, 2006).

Educational needs will be discussed in a later section. However within the narrative of individual needs there are significant number of young people of whom the research suggests have learning difficulties, intellectual difficulties or emotional and behavioural problems, (e.g. Manocha and Mezey, 1998, Taylor 2003, Hackett 2004, Almond et al 2006, Vizard et al 2007). Young people with learning disabilities are significantly overrepresented within this group (Almond and Giles 2008) and research identifies them as a group to consider separately. The exact nature of the learning difficulties is not always available for interrogation within the research which leads to assumptions being made. There is some limited research into SHB in special schools (Fyson, 2009)

and a drive to adapt models of intervention to those with 'intellectual difficulties' (e.g. West 2007). Research has identified neurological diagnoses such as ADHD or conduct disorder as a factor within this population (Hutton and Whyte 2006, Vizard et al 2007) but it is not commented upon in comparison to the general population.

The research terms do not give sufficient information to draw further conclusions, but once again this area of research lacks clarity in terminologies as some difficulties are self-reported, some reported on conviction and some reported from school data. The nature of the difficulties is not clear nor can we conclude that each study denotes the same thing.

3. Delinquency e.g. Anti-social or Offending Behaviours

Many studies recognise that young people who sexually offend often engage in other offending or anti-social behaviours. In a community study, Taylor (2003) found that 42% of the cohort had a history of non-sexual offending. Almond et al (2006) found 23% of the population studied had previous offences against property and 7% of offences against a person. Vizard et al (2007) found the majority of their sample showed anti-social behaviour (91%) with 19% having a criminal conviction. Almond et al (2006) use the term delinquency to group not only offending and anti-social behaviours but also factors such as school attendance, drug abuse and self-harm alongside attachment disorder and previous sexual experience. Vizard (2006) suggests that anti-social and offending behaviour can be subsumed under the DSM-IV categorisation of conduct disorder (p3) and this categorisation is found in a number of research articles (e.g. Hutton and Whyte 2006, Almond et al 2006, Vizard et al. 2007) .

The interesting aspect of this categorisation is that much of the research suggests that the issues faced by young people who show SHB are similar to other groups of young people who experience persistent difficulties or show other offending behaviours. They share many similar characteristics (Vizard et al, 2007). Hackett (2004) suggests the use of intervention which is successful with young people who have other behavioural, social and emotional needs should be offered alongside offence specific work.

Almond et al (2006) include exclusion from school, not in full time education and self-harm as indicators of delinquency. Other characteristics include a history of being removed from the home and parents' alcohol and drug abuse. Hackett (2004) suggests that the responses following identification of sexually abusive behaviour can place young people in greater vulnerability by isolating them and further denying them opportunities. This increases the risk factors which contribute to the behaviour developing in the first place. (p37) an interesting concept if one attributes these as within child characteristics.

2.2.3 Discourses within Professional Practices

Assessment, risk and intervention are presented within this section as discourses of professional practice. The practices produced are formed from the dominant understandings of SHB within the professional sphere. Hackett (2004) frames assessment as helping to ensure young people are treated equitably, that the behaviour is understood and that specific needs are identified. It allows professionals to quantify and manage risk. These areas of professional practice will be discussed in terms of the discourses professionals used and theories which underpin practice.

Assessment and risk

Originally assessments and their subsequent interventions drew upon adult models such as cycles of abuse, and prioritised factors such as recidivism. Later evidence suggested that for the adolescent population these factors are not always reliable predictors for success of intervention. It has been widely accepted that there is a need for models of assessment and intervention directly aimed at this age group (Calder, 1999) and that factors used in assessment needed to be re-explored.

A goal in assessment for many professionals is the risk of recidivism. The NCH report (1992) suggested greater targeted intervention is needed to reduce recidivism. Subsequent research has contradicted this view, (Worling and Curwen 2000, Taylor 2003) and recognises that for most young people harmful sexual behaviour desists

over time (Smith et al 2014 p273). Studies show that it is only a specific high risk group who have high recidivism rates (Worling and Curwen 2000). However young people who show SHB are as likely as their counterparts who show non-sexual offending behaviour to continue to offend without intervention (Fortune and Lambie 2006). Many young people who sexually harm share characteristics with non-sexual offenders with 'troubled backgrounds'.(Rutter, Giller and Hagell 1999). Whilst a high proportion of practitioners in the field agree with this (Hackett, 2005) it is less well known by non-specialists (Masson and Hackett 2003) and it has not always been noted in national literature e.g. Working Together to Safeguard Children (Department of Health, 1999). There remains the call in the literature for further research into understanding factors which increase rates of recidivism (Gerhold, Browne and Beckett, 2007).

Risk assessment has adopted a range of approaches including actuarial and clinical models. The purpose and type of assessment has been debated by professionals within the field. Actuarial models attempt to predict risk but are not used consistently within the field and not always as intended. Often risk assessment is undertaken by a single agency and there are few holistic multi-agency assessments (Criminal Justice Joint Inspection, 2013). At times they are used as a tool to identify and classify behaviour rather than 'a holistic exercise that contributes to decision making' (Smith et al 2014 p. 276).

The purpose of assessment needs further exploration. When assessments are used to predict and manage risk it may be that risk is overestimated. In assessment of normal sexual behaviour (e.g. Heiman, Leiblum and Esquilin, 1998) practitioner judgements are influenced by context and differ in outcome. Chaffin et al (2002) report that practitioners persistently over estimate risk which is a concern raised in other reports (Hackett 2004) leading to costly and inappropriate intervention being put into place (Taylor and Hackett, 2008).

Assessing risk and recidivism rates may demand from professionals a different type of assessment from those which consider the young person's needs.

'Children who display sexually harmful behaviour are first and foremost children and should not be regarded as mini-adult sex offenders'

(Hackett, Masson and Phillips, 2006)

The above quote is drawn from a Delphi study in which 98% of the respondents agreed. If that is the case then assessment needs to recognise the holistic needs of the individuals.

Henniker, Print and Morrison (2002) suggest that there is need for a graduated response linked clearly to a holistic assessment of risk and need. Concepts of strengths and resilience have been used to develop assessment models which recognise the individual needs of young people e.g. Gilgun 1999, CASPARS. One example, Aim2 (Griffin, Beech, Print, Bradshaw and Quayle 2008) assesses both static and dynamic risk factors. Static factors are fixed e.g. gender, and dynamic factors are those which are open to change e.g. self-esteem. Dynamic factors such as problem-solving skills, ability to reflect, communication skills, motivation to engage are all part of the construct of the child and can be assessed within a range rather than being present or absent. The assessment exists to inform intervention, recognising more than within child domains i.e. offence specific factors, and includes developmental, family and environmental factors.

The Aim2 assessment model has attracted very little critique. However, Myers (2007) offers a social constructionist perspective in which he locates assessment models within temporal, cultural and spatial location i.e. western science. He recognises the privileging of scientific discourse and empirically obtained evidence and describes how knowledge is applied to people losing sight of the individual and instead strengthening the voice of professionals. Myers (2007) proceeds to highlight terms within the assessment e.g. conduct disorder and high level of trauma and dysfunction, which within a critical framework cannot be seen as blanket constructs with generalisable influence. He suggests young people who come from poverty and adversity are subject to powerful forces beyond their control and that many of these people are '*structurally disadvantaged*' (Myers 2007, p374). An interesting response from Beech,

Print, Henniker and Griffin (2008) offered some agreements, but defended an empirical truth. They suggested that their original position ensures protection of children and victims and the deconstructionist stance is eschewed in favour of knowing and expertise.

Children and young people who show sexual behaviour in any form raises concern in schools and a response to the sexual behaviour is expected though not always warranted. As there are a diverse range of needs present within this heterogeneous population, individual assessment is needed to ensure the intervention is tailored to the young person's needs (Lambie and Seymour 2006) and that intervention is offered at the appropriate level (Hackett 2004, Smith et al 2014).

Intervention

The goals of intervention are key. Hackett, Masson and Phillips (2006) in a study of interventions found a consensus amongst practitioners about the main goals of intervention. These are:

- To help young people understand and take responsibility for their behaviour
- To promote emotional, social and sexual well being
- To ensure community safety
- For carers and family to acknowledge what the child has done and support change

They listed the goals of intervention in terms of essential, desirable, additional and not indicated. Although some goals of intervention naturally include the protection of other children, there are many which recognise educational context and factors held within ecological resilience. The essential components included:

- Improving support within the systems young people live in
- Promoting healthy relationships and sexuality
- Increasing emotional awareness and skills
- Improving relationships/attachments to significant figures
- Increasing self-awareness and confidence

- Empowering the young person to make appropriate life choices.

Interventions for young people who show SHB range from cognitive behavioural approaches, family systems therapy, psychodynamic approaches and a combination of *ad hoc* approaches. Although there are competing demands in the focus of work between risk, education and meetings the needs of the young person, the goals favour a holistic approach.

Lambie and Seymour (2006) describe a need to move away from the 'one size fits all model' (p175) and to consider all the needs of an individual. They suggest that trends towards community programmes, family and cultural support and treating non-sexual offending problems is equally needed. Although they attempt to broadly group characteristics it is apparent that the focus has shifted over the last two decades to offer a range of interventions. If there is a holistic tailored approach then the role of schools to support these interventions could be reconsidered, a sentiment agreed by others (Gray et al, 1999).

Traditional models of therapeutic support e.g. cognitive behavioural therapy have had some tentative success, however the highest empirical standard of scientific evidence has not always been reached (Letourneau and Borduin, 2008). Hackett's (2004) analysis of the research of interventions concluded with a set of key messages:

- Interventions should respond to young people's holistic needs and be developmentally aware.
- Young people who show SHB are not fundamentally different from other young people who have a wide range of problems.
- Approaches need to be part of multi modal approaches.
- Attention should be given towards how a programme is delivered.

It is these contexts that schools could consider in determining their role.

Intervention and the theories which underpin them

A range of psychological theories are used to underpin interventions. Approaches such as multi-systemic therapy (MST) engage in the theoretical understandings of systems theory and social ecology e.g. Bronfenbrenner (1979) and have strong government and clinical support (Borduin, Henggeler, Blaske and Stein, 1990). MST has some evidentiary base for success in reducing recidivism with young people who show SHB (Borduin et al 1990), with randomised clinical trials being available to compare to a control group. Criticism arises in terms of sample sizes. but there is strong national support for this approach. As MST assesses developmental needs within an ecological approach, attempts to engage actively with broader social ecological systems i.e. schools, are a possibility and the opportunity for schools to support intervention targets are plenty.

Cognitive behavioural approaches remain popular working with young people with SHB though as previously stated Hackett (2004) reports in his overview of the area that CBT which focusses only on the sexualised behaviour is limited in value. Theories of attachment and early trauma have emerged as useful frameworks for future practice (e.g. Creeden 2009). Considering attachment theory as an underpinning for certain approaches has developed from the recognition that there are some young people who show SHB who have also experienced trauma in their early lives. Several studies make reference to attachment theory as an underpinning including Banks and Ward (2014), Hawkes (2011) and Lightfoot and Evans (2000). Although they consider neurobiological, cognitive and psychodynamics factors respectively each brings an understanding that early life experiences have impact. It may be then that using attachment theories can offer a perspective which would be helpful in supporting young people as part of multi modal approaches (Banks and Ward 2014).

Alongside the theory of attachment, resilience is referred to. Resilience is the concept used to describe the ability to 'bounce back' from adversity. Dent and Cameron (2003) describe resilient individuals to have insight, empathy and experience achievement. Rutter (1985) talks of resilient individuals having self-esteem, confidence, social

problem-solving skills and a sense of self efficacy. These are reflected in the assessments of SHB e.g. AIM 2 and interventions such as Signs of Safety (Turnell and Edwards, 1999), with resilience formulating understanding of the young person's needs and decision making for intervention.

Strengths models are becoming increasingly popular alongside theories of positive psychology, resilience, narrative and solution focussed practices. They allow an opportunity to consider all aspects of the individual whilst not discarding the aspects of risk. One intervention, the Good Lives Model (Ward and Gannon 2006), has been successfully adapted for adolescents including those with described 'intellectual difficulties' (Ayland and West 2007). 'Good Lives' uses narratives and externalisation from narrative therapy in conjunction with solution focused approaches to encourage existing strengths and building of new skills. The Good Way model (a related approach) uses the person's own language to seek meaning with them, not for them (West 2007 p261). This avoids some of the complications of more confrontational models used with adults and avoids stigmatising language. 'Good Lives' is seen as a way for young people to have agency rather than a within child deficit to be changed.

Signs of Safety (Turnell and Edwards 1999) is an approach based on solution focused brief theory originally developed by (De Shazer, 1988). At the centre is a social constructionist underpinning where the client has the knowledge of themselves and the resources within to find solutions. Language supports solution focused thinking and understanding about possibilities is privileged. Using the Signs of Safety method, Milner (2008) describes the approach as identifying children's potential for controlling their own behaviour rather than relying on parents and others to control them (p.43). It values respect towards children and families. The aim of assessment is to actively seek opportunities for change rather than collect information about the occurrence and uses approaches from narrative e.g. externalisation (White and Epston, 1990) . It appears that examples of narrative and solution focussed work are increasing.(e.g. Myers McLaughlin and Warwick, 2003).

Context and individual experience of the young person is not considered in all interventions. Myers (2005) recognises the importance of local and specific knowledge of the young person in developing change and states that in many models this local knowledge is 'marginalised'. Mentioned previously, Myers (2002) describes how language was key to one project which changed its underpinnings and how the project grew using a new set of assumptions. The use of language in naming the problem can produce dominant images of the young person which are reflected in the structures and technologies employed in the project (Myers 2002, p335). Previous terms used identified the young person with the individual pathology and the label concentrated focus on the deficits as if it reflects an inner truth about that young person.

The project renamed the problem to destigmatise the work. The attention to language places the child at the centre of the intervention and resists applying the general constructs of the problem onto the child (Myers 2002, p339). The work with young people is underpinned by postmodernist thinking, positioning the child as the expert in their own lives, not seeking objective knowledge. Relationships are viewed as a key component of intervention and power influences are considered. By critically engaging with theoretical positions the Junction Project explored language and discourse in the field of intervention and challenged some of the dominant assumptions and methods. Narratives about the young person traditionally created by experts/ professionals who work with the young person are examined and shared. In their approach SHB is not an intrinsic part of the self but only one facet. The young person is a holder of their own expertise and central to their process.

'By freeing the workers from a narrow expert oriented diagnostic and treatment paradigm it has allowed the recognition of uniqueness in the children and young people and the potential to assist them in seeking real, personal answers that have meaning for them.'

(Myers 2002 p343)

Support for professionals

One aspect of professional discourse is the support practitioners require to work with individuals. Hatfield (2014) found that front line practitioners recognise a team structure to offer support as important. They identified specialist supervision, training and support for the impact on self as vital. Evidence of support or training for school staff working daily with young people in education settings is unavailable.

Preventative work in schools is often identified (Ryan 2000, Hall 2006) including, more explicit curriculums, encouraging a culture of talking/intervention at an earlier age and further training across agencies (Hall 2006, Hackett, Carpenter, Patsios and Szilassy 2013). However, the support school staff would require has not been researched.

2.2.4 Discourses from young people

Whilst there is some research into professionals' views of services (e.g. Hall 2006) there remain very few studies into the voice or views of young people who show SHB. Ethical and practical issues are significant and although it is recognised as a gap in literature it remains a difficult area to impact.

The limited research available suggests young people value the relationships they have with their workers particularly when they feel the adults are reliable and trustworthy individuals (Masson and Hackett, 2006). In this survey the young people felt that some workers really understood them and worked with them in a respectful way. Ayland and West (2007) found the language used enabled young people to access the model and young people reported they could use the language purposefully in discussions. One project offered examples of how it attempts to empower young people in the change process (Myers 2002) and places the young person as central in meetings. One of the prime outcomes of these initial meetings is for the young person to establish their 'helping team'. It remains that more research is needed with young people into their experiences.

2.2.5 Summary

Young people who show SHB are a heterogeneous group (Hackett 2004). Whilst there are some indications that some sub groups may be more at risk of recidivism or more likely to have experienced sexual abuse, there are no single explanations which are true for the majority of this group. The young people require an individual approach, not a 'one size fits all' model (Lambie and Seymour 2006) and it is accepted that as adolescents they require a developmentally appropriate approach and one that considers their holistic needs. In spite of this research continues to explore the diverse nature of this population and to consider sub groups of young people and their particular needs e.g. girls (Vizard, et al 2007) or young people with learning disabilities (Almond and Giles 2008). I would suggest the search for characteristics remains an impractical one and practitioners prefer to seek evidence informed by theory and clinical practice. Assessment and intervention is designed and evaluated with this in mind, but currently the role of education and school is absent. The following section will consider the role of school and research which relates to the school context.

2.3 The role of school and education

Schools are the largest universal service for children and young people and the potential for educational settings to support work with those who show a range of behavioural issues is extensive. Educational philosophers share different perspectives as to what the role of education should be and what should be included and excluded. What is taught in our educational institutions is questioned in the political, social and educational arena. What is the realm of school and what is the realm of the family and how do we make these decisions? It is consequently one of the main battlegrounds in the philosophy of education. Questions of the rationale for education, its aims and how it operates in society are key but often driven by political aims (Freire 1970, p53) and socially accepted norms. If one adopts a perspective where schools are to develop the whole individual then the opportunities for growth in all areas increase. If one takes a perspective in terms of academic learning and assessment of said learning within a classroom, then the scope narrows.

Inclusion has been a tenet of education for many years and inherent in EP practice (MacKay 2000). Whilst many agree that moral, cultural, emotional and social development is essential, e.g. Goleman (2004), the measurement of schools and comparison against each other often means that their focus remains on standards together with a greater awareness on safeguarding. Children who show SHB fall into the category of safeguarding, but like many young people who also have issues with attendance and show other behavioural needs they are not necessarily the pupils who improve attainment figures.

One of the reasons young people who show SHB are viewed differently from adult populations is that not only are they at a different position developmentally, but there are still significant influences available in the systems in which they reside (Hackett 2004) i.e. school. This section will explore the role of education for a young person relating to SHB. I will discuss universal and targeted support within the previously identified areas of social and emotional health and well-being, safeguarding and child protection and lastly the school context and SHB.

2.3.1 Supporting emotional health and well-being

There is an increased drive that mental and emotional health is given priority in schools, government and health services (Future in Mind, Department of Health 2015). The Social Exclusion Report (Social Exclusion Unit, 2004) states that education plays an important role in promoting health and emotional wellbeing for children, especially for those who are socially and economically disadvantaged.

Mentally healthy children have the ability to;

“develop psychologically, emotionally, intellectually and spiritually; to initiate develop and sustain satisfying personal relationships, use and enjoy solitude, become aware of others and empathise with them; play and learn, develop a sense of right and wrong; and resolve setbacks and learn from them.”

(The Mental Health Foundation 1999 p6)

Evidence supports that the development of emotional health and well-being is not only important in terms of social emotional and behavioural outcomes but also in terms of educational success (Weare and Gray 2003, Department of Education 2015). All schools employ both an explicit and implicit curriculum. The explicit curriculum is that which is taught, the implicit that which is part of the interaction of the day, the unwritten expression of values within the system. There has been an increase in focus on explicit social and emotional curricula over the last 25 years possibly since the introduction of the national curriculum. The school is a system to support development of emotional well-being. The more there are emotionally competent people, 'the easier it will be to help those with acute problems' (Weare 2004, p.57). Weare goes on to state a backdrop of universal provision allows for targeting of the most specific issues which are present for young people who need a more bespoke response from schools and specialist services.

The explicit curriculum in school

The two main related curriculums in schools are personal social and emotional health usually within Personal Social, Health and Economic Education (PSHE) and Sex and Relationship Education (SRE). In many primary and secondary schools the promotion of emotional health and well-being has meant the use of whole school curriculum and targeted interventions e.g. Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning or SEAL (Department for Children Schools and Families 2007). In secondary schools the implementation of secondary SEAL was less widespread than primary schools (70% as opposed to 90%) and empirically supported impact on outcomes was not achieved (Humphrey, Lendrum and Wigelsworth, 2010). Implementation issues were considered to be crucial. The flexibility of the programme led to confusion of practice and lack of will and skill in teachers was an issue. However the importance of a whole school ethos remains of high profile (NICHE ,2009).

Regardless of some difficulties with implementation of programmes there remains considerable evidence for the effectiveness of emotional health and well-being curriculums in schools. There also appears to be an increase in literature and focus

on mental health within schools, e.g. Children and Families Act (2014), Mental Health and Behaviour in schools (2014) and Counselling in Schools (2015).

Secondary schools have further developed the personal and social curriculum informed by previous government initiatives e.g. Healthy School Standards (1999), NIHCE Social and Emotional Well-being in Secondary Schools (2009) and most recently Promoting Children and Young People's Emotional Health and Wellbeing (2015). PSHE is the formal route for this curriculum area in schools. It is non-statutory and therefore centralised production of programmes of study or curriculum guidance are not given.

SRE is statutory in all maintained secondary schools and all schools must have a policy and provide SRE to pupils. Guidance from the Department for Education and Employment (2000) describes the need to develop a curriculum to support development of physical, moral and emotional understanding. The content is decided by each school and its governors, in the light of the local need and context.

Discussions about sex, sexuality or sexual bullying may be more likely to occur within curriculum but the role of schools is not clear beyond teaching the practical nature of sex and relationships. The Department of Health (2013) report primary prevention methods for SHB should include effective work in schools such as safe dating programmes. Relevant issues that can be addressed through the National Curriculum include consent and coercion. Ofsted in May 2013 published findings that SRE in secondary schools is '*not yet good enough*' (p1). Too much emphasis is placed on the mechanics of reproduction and too little on relationships and sexuality, and the influences on understanding of healthy sexual relationships, dealing with emotions and staying safe. A gap remains between what is taught and what young people are doing (Elley 2013).

The Implicit Curriculum

The implicit curriculum is that which expresses the values of the system. Many of these aspects are crucial for emotional health and well-being e.g. warm and empathic relationships and pupil participation (Weare 2000). Much of the implicit curriculum occurs through daily interactions where values and identity are shaped and implicitly constructed. The role of these interactions through relationships will be considered further when discussing the possible role of schools.

2.3.2 Safeguarding and child protection

Enshrined in articles of the UNHCR Conventions on the Rights of the Child (UNICEF 1989) are the right to education, to protection and care for his/her own well-being and the right to have protective measures to provide support for child from neglect, violence, injury and abuse. Following the Laming Report (2003) and the subsequent Children's Act (2004), safeguarding became a higher priority with clear directives to ensure children and young people are safeguarded, cared for and that protective measures are put into place. It detailed the expectation of statutory agencies to develop services which implemented Every Child Matters (HM Government, 2003) outcomes. These include the development of integrated governance, strategy, processes and accountability. Also included was workforce reform, common core skills and knowledge for the children's workforce.

The local authority role in safeguarding and protection of children increased alongside that of schools. Safeguarding and the welfare of the child became the shared responsibility of all those who work with children and this continues to be a high focus for schools and professionals who work in them.

What is safeguarding?

The framework that describes effective safeguarding given in Working Together to Safeguard Children (Department for Education, 2013) describes it as:

- protecting children from maltreatment;
- preventing impairment of children's health or development;
- ensuring that children grow up in circumstances consistent with the provision of safe and effective care; and
- taking action to enable all children to have the best outcomes.

These principles are underpinned by a coordinated child-centered approach based on a clear understanding of the needs and views of children.

In 2011 Ofsted published the features of good practice which outstanding schools demonstrate with regard to safeguarding. These include a curriculum that is flexible, relevant and engages pupils' interest and which is used to promote safeguarding. This should be through teaching pupils how to stay safe, how to protect themselves from harm and how to take responsibility for their own and others' safety. It identifies ensuring safety, good risk assessments, clear policies and well thought out arrangements to promote safety and well-being.

The role of school is identified clearly for those who are 'vulnerable' (DfE 2013). Systems such as the Common Assessment Framework, now Early Help, (HM Government 2013) have been implemented to deliver a joined-up approach of services and early intervention, becoming a vital link between targeted services. Woods, Bond, Farrell, Humphrey and Tyldesley (2011) undertook an international literature review and then UK research to explore the school psychologist's (SP) role in relation to child protection and safeguarding. At least a quarter of school psychology services has a senior psychologist with a responsibility for safeguarding. The range of work includes direct work and training, e.g. on attachment and resilience, identification of abuse, involvement in review groups and work on behalf of vulnerable groups. The potential for expansion of the school psychologist role was equally recognised in the study in cross agency supervision, training and intervention, therapeutic work in children homes and 'interventions with sexually harmful young people' .

'The range of SP child protection and safeguarding work is seen to span universal, targeted, and specialized levels of service delivery, to include both preventative and reactive strands and to be focused at individual, group, and organizational levels.'

(Woods et al 2011, p367).

For children and young people who show SHB their vulnerability should be considered (Smith et al 2014). Whether a child is deemed 'vulnerable' may not always be clearly recognised and it may be that the label of vulnerable is saved for those who are 'victims' or recipients of behaviour. In Working Together to Safeguard Children (DfE, 2013) the government supports the need to safeguard all children by stating;

'work with children and young people who abuse others, including those who sexually abuse/offend, should recognise that such children are likely to have considerable needs themselves, and that they may pose a significant risk of harm to other children.'

(DfE, 2013,p.303).

2.3.3 The school context and sexually harmful behaviour

Young people who show SHB attend a range of settings but the majority attend mainstream schools (Hutton and Whyte, 2006). How schools 'manage' SHB or support young people who show these behaviours is often anecdotal drawing from individual practice. Agencies offer training to schools e.g. Lucy Faithful Foundation and links are made with the expected agencies of social care, Youth Offending Teams and the police. However, there is no national strategy which looks at the delivery of services to this group of young people and each local context has responded with a variety of approaches within education.

There are references in the literature to educational factors and factors which support emotional health and well-being. However, the actual reference to schools, the role of teachers in assessment or supporting holistic intervention is slight and research wholly

within this context is negligible. The following section will consider what is known about SHB, education and possible intervention in schools.

Education

Educational difficulties are regularly highlighted as a key characteristic for young people who show SHB. Several UK studies share the findings that a significant number of young people are reported to have difficulties at school (Dolan et al 1996, Taylor 2003, Vizard et al , 2007). The types of difficulties vary. Almond et al (2006) found that of their participants, 40% were not in full time education with exclusions being a regular feature of this and other studies (e.g. Vizard 2007). In a study of adolescents aged 10-18, Ryan et al (1996) found that 60% of the participants had problems with non-attendance, learning and/or general problems at school. Vizard et al (2007) reported a high proportion of participants in their study as exhibiting significant difficulties at school, with 71% showing disruptive behaviour and 42% with exclusions. 58% were reported to be isolated from peers and 15% rejected by them. Over 59% had some sort of additional support showing that additional strategies and support is being accessed within the school offer.

Further studies conclude that some of the young people have a descriptor of learning needs. This ranges from a third in one study being described as poor academic achievers (Manocha and Mezey 1998) to nearly 20 % with a formal diagnosis of a learning disability (Gray et al 1999). The description of educational difficulties includes learning difficulties and disabilities, poor achievement, non-attendance, truancy issues and behavioural problems. Manocha and Mezey (1998) reported much lower truancy rates than comparative studies. Ryan (1999) found some young people have had no reports in school of difficulties with conduct. The lack of consistency between how the categories are agreed, what is defined as a characteristic and whether they represent an educational difficulty in terms of learning or institutional failure is not recorded. The discrepancies between studies and the range of what is considered an educational difficulty further supports the fact that this group is not a homogenous cohort.

What is observed is often the young people are 'known to' specialist services within education. Taylor (2003) reports that in a study sample of 227 subjects, 36% have a statement of special educational needs for learning behavioural or emotional needs and 44 % have been referred to specialist services. Dolan et al (1996) found 57% of their cohort have been assessed by an educational psychologist. Whilst labels such as 'learning difficulty' and 'engagement of a psychology service' are not markers of the same needs, they do show that these young people are highlighted within their educational settings as needing more than universal provision to meet their needs.

Educational issues are frequently cited for young people who show challenging behaviour within schools and it would be reasonable to reflect on the fact that many, though not all, of these pupils show other forms of behavioural difficulties which schools regularly encounter. Ryan et al's (1996) study finds that non sexual offending delinquents produces similar educational characteristics to those who show SHB which could suggest that solutions for these pupils can be sought within established practices.

Intervention in schools

Many goals of intervention for young people who show SHB aim to develop healthy relationships, emotional intelligence, self-awareness and confidence. Young people who show SHB have needs which include experiences of loss, difficulties with social relationships and isolation. Schools and teachers have skills and experience in supporting young people within this range of needs and interventions in school commonly address this (Weare 2015). Factors identified in the assessment of SHB which are of relevance in a school environment include impulsive behaviours, strengths, positive leisure activities, intelligence, positive attitude from significant adults in the young person life, an emotional confidante, positive evaluations from educational staff and positive relationships.

Hackett and Taylor (2008) lament the lack of research into educational needs of children and young people who show SHB and into the needs of the schools in

managing them. Although there is limited literature about the role of school, Hackett and Taylor (2008) further conclude that schools are in a good position to contribute significantly to positive outcomes for these young people and *'also that in many cases maintaining young people in schools can contribute significantly to decreasing the overall risk'*. (p99). They state that given that difficulty in school is often an identified component, schools should be considered to play a greater part in early identification and support for young people. They detail a school's possible role in assessment and intervention and suggest a tiered response including a strengthened role for schools, and the role of inclusive practices in this context to support positive outcomes. The Department for Schools, Children and Education state, *'Even when sexualised behaviour is identified and a pupil is on a treatment programme, they still have to be educated and managed in a school or FE college setting.'* (DCSF, 2010 p91). These young people need access to the opportunities which all young people need i.e. to build relationships and connect with other young people (Hackett and Taylor 2008).

One study offered a direct role for school in intervention. Judith Milner (2008) shared insight into a project for young people who show SHB. She describes an approach which creates a safe and consistent environment, specifically, *'bringing foster carers and teachers together to agree on a consistent approach to ensuring the safety of other children'* (Milner 2008 p44). She identifies some basic practice in schools i.e. rewards using a child's interest but highlights the need for rewards to be given for socially acceptable behaviour in relation to sexual behaviour. Working with school around dealing with aggressive behaviour and help to gain more control over emotions is identified and several suggestions of strategies are described within this case study.

Multi-agency working

Multi-agency working has been part of the education and social agenda following serious case reviews (Laming 2003). Recent reviews of educational psychologists in multi-agency teams identified the delivery of improved services for children and evidence of effective contributions. (Farrell, Woods, Lewis, Rooney, Squires, O'Connor, 2006). HM Government guidance (2010) restates the need for multi-agency assessment and approaches and acknowledges specifically children who

abuse and professionals from education and educational psychologists, who could support, a position which the latest review of practice confirms (Smith et al 2014).

Approaches to intervention for young people who show SHB have moved towards holistic solutions. Hall (2006) identified 4 main themes of working holistically with this group of young people, two of the areas being a multi-agency partnership approach and considering the young person as a whole. He further describes the need for a wider systems and preventative approach with a broad view of the young person's strengths, positives, needs and individuality. Schools are in a strong position to offer this as they can offer information about the young person's access to school life and learning, perception of others and self, emotional skills in a context, engagement in the community and relationships with peers. The involvement of schools, supported by a multi-agency approach, appears to be an essential but often missing part.

2.4 Conclusion

Research into SHB is found in a range of academic and professional disciplines, with diverse aims. Much of the research searches for ways to describe and classify characteristics of these young people in order to identify effective intervention. Some seeks clinical practice guidance and some offers insight into current programmes on offer. The research concludes that this is a heterogeneous group, who need an approach which is developmentally appropriate and fits their specific holistic needs. There remains a strong presence of positivist methodologies and evidence bases but with an emerging interest in case studies and discourse based approaches.

There is acknowledgement of the significant time spent in educational contexts for these young people but this has not translated into research in schools. Schools support children and young people with different needs and behaviours. The role of school and educational practitioners is often highlighted in the research around young people who show SHB but there is little research with teachers to explore their understanding. Research continues to be aimed at the specialists and how they can intervene and support effectively.

I aim to explore how this phenomenon is storied and how I could engage with it as a practitioner researcher in a manner which would open possibilities for different types of work and different types of stories. This study aims to explore how a group of adults in a school talk about young people who show SHB. The research questions are:

1. How do teachers talk about young people who show sexually harmful behaviour?
2. How do teachers construct the role of school for young people who show sexually harmful behaviour?

This research employs a qualitative interpretive approach which differs from many of the approaches found in the critical literature review. The following chapter explores the underpinnings for the research, the methodological decisions made in relation to this research and the knowledge I aim to produce. It aims to offer opportunity to discuss this phenomenon using narrative inquiry methods and to consider narratives available to teachers.

Chapter Three

Methodology

The literature review shows that young people who show SHB are a heterogeneous group with a diverse range of needs. Despite there being a wealth of research to identify needs, improve assessment and develop intervention there is an absence of research into the school context and how schools and teachers can support young people who show SHB. Much of the research presents quantitative data to explore the subject area. Qualitative research into the meanings people construct for themselves about SHB is limited.

This research explores meaning within an educational context and asks questions of discourse first offered by Billington (1996) of how do teachers talk about young people and how do teachers talk about themselves when they talk about young people? This chapter will discuss methodological issues and decisions made within this research. The first section discusses the assumptions which underpin the research and guide the approaches taken, the questions asked and the methods adopted. Social constructionism and its ontological and epistemological assumptions will be explored to frame the literature review and the research's theoretical position. The second section will explore the narrative approach I adopt, the role of reflexivity, the use of focus groups and thematic analysis of the narratives within a social constructionist epistemological position. The final sections explore ethical issues alongside the position of the researcher and discuss how the knowledge is produced in this study in relation to other studies. Lastly I will share a criteria from which to consider qualitative research and how quality can be judged within a relativist framework.

Research Questions:

This research asks what narratives are available to talk about young people who show sexually harmful behaviour? Specifically, it asks:

1. How do teachers talk about young people who show sexually harmful behaviour?

2. How do teachers construct the role of school for young people who show sexually harmful behaviour?

3.1 Assumptions of the research

Social constructionism is the paradigm within which many EPs frame their work. It is an approach which shares common assumptions about the knowledge produced and has an impact on how we approach understanding of taken for granted knowledge and truth. Originally presented by Berger and Luckman (1966), Kenneth Gergen (1985) reintroduced the social constructionist orientation to challenge mainstream psychological thinking.

‘Social constructionist inquiry is concerned with explicating the processes by which people come to describe explain or otherwise account for the world (including themselves) in which they live.’

(Gergen 1985 p. 266)

Social constructionism has become an increasingly influential approach for applied psychologists and is the mainstay of much EP practice today. Work with children, young people and their families adopt practices such as solution focused approaches, narrative and consultation, and centres on language and interaction. It is the underpinning of my practice and it influences how I relate to my role within the professional world. I practice, read, write and reflect within understandings positioned in a social constructionist paradigm. It promotes me to critically reflect on my experiences and the approaches I take and on the power held by me as a professional.

Whilst social constructionist understandings may underpin much current EP practice and research, within the field of SHB and its related literature, this is not the case. The epistemological and ontological assumptions of this research are based often within other paradigms and this jars against approaches used by EPs. The knowledge

produced within the field of SHB is used to produce facts about intervention and its outcomes and to seek early identification of those 'at risk' of sexually harming. Research is situated in scientific discourses which seek to generalise knowledge.

Research from interpretivist paradigms are emerging especially within case studies but the balance between methodologies is heavily weighted towards positivism. This research seeks to add to understandings from this paradigm as an alternative to that which is found in much of the literature review. Therefore it is necessary to consider the ontology and epistemological approach I have taken and the subsequent methodological decisions made.

3.1.1 Ontology and epistemology

Language is often thought of as a means through which one expresses one's interpretation of the world. This 'common sense' approach is challenged by the social constructionist position. Language does not describe reality; instead meaning exists through the situated use of language (Burr 2003), and subjects and phenomena are created within. Ontological and epistemological assumptions explain how reality is considered within this paradigm and how knowledge is constructed.

3.1.2 Ontological and epistemological assumptions

Ontology is the philosophical study of existence or being. It asks what is there to know? (Willig, 2008). Two main ontological perspectives are realism and relativism. Realist ontologies have the common belief that a true world exists to be discovered. Realism states there is being and existence and that research will uncover the 'truth' that exists independently. This aligns with beliefs of 'scientific' method and often is the lay persons' understanding of evidence and research. In contrast relativist ontologies reject this view of the world where objects and phenomenon exist to be discovered. Instead relativism claims multiple truths and emphasises the role of language and culture. Philosophers such as Derrida and Foucault explore within relativist thinking how language creates reality. Whilst not wholly denying the existence of objects, they

propose that as soon as an object is recognised in language it becomes discourse and therefore subject to perspective and multiplicity of truth. Willig (2008) states relativism emphasises the plurality of the interpretivist stance and the role language has within it. Derrida (1976) claimed there is nothing outside of text. Even if a reality outside of text is accepted it is not accessible to us (Burr 2003). How can one start to examine, describe and explore a phenomenon separated from the language which constructs it?

The idea that these are two coherent arguments in clearly defined camps is misleading (Burr 2003). Some relativists accept that there might be existence of objects and some realists recognise the role language plays in communication or construction of phenomenon. It would be safe to say most realists would not hold tightly to a purest form of this ontological argument but the search for truth continues. However, they bring different approaches to research and the focus of what is being explored. This research holds relativist ontological assumptions. SHB exists in language and discourse, not as an independent reality waiting to be discovered. Whether it is behaviour or sexual or harmful or a problem or intimate or accepted, are all constructed through language. Before language constructed the phenomenon, it was not behaviour, sexual or harmful. One cannot denote constructs of sexuality outside of language. The language refers to itself and those using the language bring sexual into being. Whilst not denying there may be the existence of a material reality, we cannot know it as an independent existence.

Epistemology is the theory of knowledge which asks how, and what, can we know? (Willig 2008). Two epistemologies are positivism and interpretivism. Positivism claims a direct relationship between the world and our perception of it (Willig 2008). The goal of positivist research is to gain knowledge which can be generalised and applied, which is impartial and objective. Interpretivism instead seeks to explore the construction of meaning in discourse and makes no claims to objective knowledge. Gergen (2009) states that whatever exists, exists. However, 'it' exists in a relational quality. 'In the process of co-action whatever there is takes shape as something for

us' (Gergen 2009, p 37). It is not the existence which is being denied but how we 'know'? Again, these binary descriptors are poles along a spectrum of approaches.

Sexual behaviour is a social phenomenon and norms are constructed within social processes and are dependent on social systems. Sexual exists in relation to non-sexual and harmful behaviour exists in relation to non-harmful behaviour. The norms are constructed within context, culture and through language and interaction. The truth of what is sexual differs within and between societies, within history and in relation to context. Sex and sexuality is a moral issue, a physical issue, a societal issue, a cultural issue, a gender issue, a generational issue, an intimate issue.

The terms child and adolescent are not fixed and are constructed by context. Today's childhood exists differently to childhood one hundred years ago. It is not a different state of being but a recognition of the way the person is constructed. The terminology '*young person*' is gaining popularity and used instead of adolescent. When used in conjunction with SHB it is subtly different from using the term child. The discussion presented shows however briefly the influence of language and the constructions in situ.

Sexually harmful is designated by many aspects including our personal understandings of harmful, an individual understanding of normal and the professional view of harmful. Discourse constructs the phenomenon and the individual. Hollway and Jefferson (2000) state '*what we know is mediated through language ... the world is represented subjectively not neutrally.*'(p14) It brings the person and the phenomenon into existence. Who constructs SHB and how it is constructed has implications for those who are labelled and for the response. Gergen (1985) states concepts become a matter of analytical interest if we deny their existence in a realistic perspective. '*Professional agreements become suspect; normalised beliefs become targets of demystification.*' (Gergen 1985 p 271). If one accepts this stance then exploring how the world is represented through language allows a critical lens on how a phenomenon and young person are talked about.

This research recognises the relative nature of SHB how it is interpreted differently by different people, in culture and time. It is underpinned by a relativist interpretivist epistemological position and as such adopts practices which seek meaning not fact.

3.1.3 What type of knowledge I want to produce

Truth is bound in the conditions in which the knowledge is produced and the position from which the researcher is exploring the phenomenon from.

(Parker 2005 p16)

This research proposes that reality does not exist to be discovered but instead meaning is constructed through persons in their interactions, though the language and discourse available. This research seeks meaning in context and rather than mourn the loss of a single truth celebrates the multiple truths available to us (Gergen 1985 stated in Burr 2003, p93). By recognising the plurality of truth uncertainty is introduced. Uncertainty is a key to possible 'truths' for professionals to reflect upon (Mercieca, 2011).

The knowledge produced here is not claimed to be the same in all schools nor a pattern of teachers' beliefs. Truth is a finite subjective experience (Denzin and Lincoln 2005) and does not exist independently. I recognise the position of the researcher within the interpretation. 'The researcher is part of the process and influential in its outcomes' (Billington (2012) p323). In designing the research, I aim to explore teachers' narratives of the phenomenon and the meanings these teachers construct as a reflection of possible narratives. As Spector-Mersel (2010) states, interpretivist research focuses on the particular in order to expand understanding of the phenomenon (p209).

I chose a qualitative research design to collect data about the narratives and to seek meaning in the narratives told. The research perspectives are implicit in the research questions which are of meanings and interpretation. This research considers how

young people who show these behaviours are talked about, the meanings that adults in schools make and how teachers consider their roles. Discourse is inherently inconsistent (Potter and Wetherall 1987). The research is not looking for a truth but to explore within a novel context. To use other methodologies would not allow questions of meaning and possibility to be reflected upon.

In this research I seek to explore the construction of meaning during the process of interaction within a group and share my interpretations of the discourse that exists. The knowledge that I am part of constructing is collaborative; it is a group construction of sexually harmful behaviour in a school in 2014. I adopt an interpretivist epistemology specifically a social constructionist one.

3.2 Social constructionism - an overview

The social constructionist movement is the inquiry into how people describe, explain and understand themselves and the world in which they live (Gergen 1985). It forms a 'significant challenge to conventional understandings' (Gergen 1985 p266). The nuanced differences between paradigms (Edley, 2001) leaves social constructionism being difficult to define. Gergen's (1985) paper, 'The Social Constructionist Movement in Psychology', summarised by Burr (2003) offers four main commonalities as a way to understand the approaches and theories which are social constructionist.

1. A critical stance towards what is accepted as truth or knowledge

Social constructionism invites one to question what is offered as truth and to consider how this truth has been arrived at. The traditional view is that scientific theory reflects reality and that we observe reality in a direct and de-contextualised manner. However if all distinctions, categories or divisions are reliant on and mediated by language, to suggest that distinctions are real, observed and discovered comes into question. Gergen (1985) asks one to show 'radical doubt in the taken for granted world' (p.267). What is 'out there', if agreed is collusive and if observed is represented through language. Knowledge therefore is not fixed and can be explored, shared, deconstructed, challenged or exposed.

2. Historical and cultural specificity of knowledge

Knowledge is time and culturally bound and cannot be accepted as truth which will be relevant and meaningful across times and cultures. Understanding is a product of, and dependent on, the specific culture and period of history that we live in. The forms of knowledge in our culture become artefacts of it. What is normal at one time or in one culture is not normal for another and therefore not a discourse in another. Burr (2003) offers the example of sexuality as having historical and cultural specificity. Our current understanding or truth differs from that of a hundred years ago, from other cultures and even within our own local groupings.

Hall (2001) in an introduction to Foucault's work states discourse, representation, knowledge and truth are radically historicised. Discourse constructs and is constructed by rules with which we talk about an object and ourselves. Subjects become objects of the discourse and power relations within support practices and offer resistances. Foucault's writing into madness, sexuality and disease explore how discourses of their time constructed the object and actions. Hall (2001) surmises Foucault's position that one knowledge will not exist forever as an essential quality of that subject or phenomenon but instead is supplanted by new knowledges.

3. Knowledge is sustained by social processes

Knowledge is constructed through interaction in relationship (Gergen, 1985). Social processes e.g. communication, negotiation and rhetoric, constructs and sustains knowledge. These social processes include language and other forms of discourse. Many psychologists agree with the influence of language e.g. Vygotsky (1986). Gergen (2009) suggests the term co-action as the process through which understanding takes shape. No longer is meaning bound within individuals but in the relational space in which meaning is formed. Interactions sustain knowledge and by their nature open knowledge to question and change.

4. Knowledge and social action go together

The knowledge constructed in social interaction invites action; either action to sustain or action to exclude. Discourses of the world sustain processes and patterns of social action. Sustaining some actions excludes others and it is through this action that power relations are embedded.

These four tenets recognise that knowledge is anti-essentialist and question realism offered by positivist approaches. Whilst traditional psychology focuses on structures, social constructionism focuses on the processes and how knowledge is constructed together (Burr 2003). It focuses on interaction, social practices and language.

Burr (2003) discusses two broad approaches within social constructionism, that of micro and macro social constructionism i.e. the focus on those aspects within interaction and those within greater structure. Micro social constructionism can often be used to explain the construction which occurs between individuals and through the interactions. Macro social constructionism is related to social structures, relations and institutionalised practices and discourse which extends into a wider sphere. It considers how power is employed and sustained. If language is open to change, as post-structuralists suggest, then it follows on that the place to challenge constructions should be within language and interaction.

This research explores the construction of a social phenomenon. The study recognises the specificity of the local context of a school and offers a space to consider the young person, their behaviour and to explore and challenge narratives. It reflects on the knowledge available and its meaning within a group. The descriptions highlight practices employed within the context. Social constructionism affords a perspective which allows me as a researcher to consider not only the method used but to critically appraise the knowledge produced. It offers exploration into a process which can be applied in my daily practice and opportunity to consider how EP practice can support schools where this phenomenon is present. One cannot inhabit 'no position'. Social constructionist thinking agrees that complete impartiality as wished for by scientific research is impossible. Facts are products of particular questions deriving

from assumptions (Burr 2003). This means that a critical lens can be applied and alternative narratives focussed upon.

Currently there is no research in this area and therefore it is appropriate to start with an empirical approach to consider what is spoken about which also focuses on meanings made. As SHB is a social phenomenon, social constructionism is relevant not only to support the underpinnings of pluralistic knowledge but inherent in the research questions. They ask of what is talked about and how teachers talk of themselves and their context. Language constructs the phenomena and the subjects of whom we speak and of those engaged within the interaction. This leads to briefly considering the self.

3.2.2 Construction of the self

In social constructionism, self and identity are constructed from different viewpoints. Traditional psychology explores the traits, personalities and characteristics of individuals as if they exist in isolation, ready to be discovered. Social constructionist perspectives consider language and interaction to be the site of construction of the subject. Although we categorise the object in everyday usage, if we apply social constructionist assumptions then we as subjects are constructed through language, discourse and interaction. Identity is used to refer to the self. Identity suggests formation of understanding of the self rather than a pre-existing aspect of being human.

The two forms of social constructionism, micro and macro, position the self differently in terms of agency within the debate. In micro social constructionism the subject comes into being in the relational process (Gergen 1985). One is not bound to a particular personality type, way of behaving or typology. Self is constructed in interaction, in how you are positioned and how you respond. We experience ourselves as a concrete set of truths, but we are only what is brought into being through discourse. Macro social constructionism is particularly influenced by Foucault. In this, identity is constructed in time and space and within the discourses, including

the resistances or alternative discourses, available to us. In macro social constructionism we are only able to locate ourselves within positions available to us. The discourses of identity are those which are available within the culture and time. The implication of macro social constructionism is that 'individual persons have no capacity to bring about change' (Burr 2003). This leads to discussion of agency which maps clearly onto micro and macro social constructionism (Burr 2003). However both agree that language is the site of construction of the person and it is a social phenomenon (Burr 2003).

One can draw on particular discourses to locate ourselves in positions of power or to influence. Identity is not a fixed entity and instead is fragmented with multiple possibilities (Burr 2003). It can change across time and culture but also across context. Within a society, a particular discourse may be prevalent. Being a woman and a professional has different discourses but they have implications for each other and for the discourses which can be drawn upon (Foucault 1979). It may be that there remains a limited number of discourses one can use to position oneself within or that one can be positioned within by societal norms, structures and by others (Burr 2003).

In micro social constructionism we position not just ourselves but others and they are positioning us as well. It offers more agency for the self, yet goes beyond personal interaction as material conditions and social practices are bound within these discourses. Gergen (1985) suggests that positions are subject to relational processes being borne out of interaction and social tools.

This study adopts a social constructionist position to explore a social phenomenon. It recognises that the approaches taken construct not only the phenomenon but also the subject. It recognises that cultures have dominant discourses and alternative discourses (White and Epston 1990) relevant to the phenomenon and the subjects who speak about it. Alternative discourses can form resistance and claiming alternative discourses often leads to one being positioned in relation to other dominant discourses. This study asks what narratives are available to the subjects about SHB.

It does not make a judgement of whether the narratives are structured for us or of how much agency there is within. It is interested in the themes which are available in this context. The study uses narrative approaches which will be explored in the following section.

3.4 Narrative Approaches

Whilst discourse is the situated use of language, spoken and written texts and 'incorporates not just language but practice' (Burr 2003 p63), narrative is the stories told or expressed. Burr (2003) states discourses 'refer to a set of meanings, metaphors, representations, images, stories, statements and so on that in some way produce a particular version of events.' (p64). Narrative are the stories told, how individual selves are performed (Parker 2005 p71). They serve different purposes and tell stories of how people see themselves and others (Kohler Reissman 2008).

The following section will discuss what is narrative, narrative inquiry and its relation to this research. Reflexivity and the position of the researcher will be explored.

3.4.1 What is narrative?

The term narrative has become more popular in everyday usage. It is heard frequently in political and social arenas and in the media. It is a psychological term, a method of inquiry and a therapeutic approach. In all interpretations narratives are fundamentally stories. They are the manner of telling about our lives to others; the story of experience. Bruner (1991) proposed that narrative is the way humans experience phenomena and it is how the memory of these events is stored. Narrative interprets experience and are also interpreted. They are not representations of reality, but selective and partial. Narrative is fluid and changes within the context. White and Epston (1990) propose narrative is a representation of a lived experience that cannot hold and express the full picture. It is the parts which have been selected to make meaning. 'Narrative truth involves a constructed account of experience not a factual record of what really happened.' (Josselson, 2011, p225). It is through narrative that dominant stories are shared and alternative stories are situated though not always attended to (White and Epston 1990, Morgan 2000). We link events, recognising

some as more important to ourselves and others and make sense of them in terms of how we live our lives (Morgan 2000).

Narratives are about meaning in context. Bruner (1991) writes of ten narrative features which include particularity, hermeneutic composability and intentional state entailment. Particularity is where stories have a generic sense, an understanding which is embedded in a genre. People understand a narrative in light of the whole or 'hermeneutic' properties. This means that understanding of the partial, is achieved in reference to the whole. Bruner identifies intentional state entailment where although an intentional state can be perceived such as the persons beliefs character etc. there is some measure of agency. There is little link in narrative between intentional state and action. 'Narrative accounts cannot provide causal interpretations' (Bruner 1991 p6) but instead is the 'basis for interpreting why a character acted'. (Bruner 1991, p7).

Narratives serve purposes within culture. Cultural knowledge is transmitted by narratives and through narratives. Narratives make sense of experience, within context, culture and interactions. Bruner (1991) suggests that narratives accrue and by doing so they create cultural norms or traditions. Institutions create traditions which become privileged and continue into the future. They hold a cultural relevance and draw from and feed into culture. By recognising norms narratives also expose breaches or confusions.

Narratives construct meaning and identity. Narratives shape self and others (Goodley 2011). Gergen (1985) writes of relational beings suggesting that meaning is not bound in the person but in the relational space between i.e. the narrative. It is how the speaker wants to be known (Riessman 2008). Therefore interaction constructs identity of those who are talked about and those who are talking. Narratives construct identity but also have a life beyond the individual. Narrative constructs identity in groups and as individuals (Riessman 2008). It serves a function in the relationship e.g. strategic, functional or purposeful. As individual identities are constructed so are group identities shaped (Riessman 2008, Andrews 2011) through co-construction and interaction.

3.4.2 Narrative inquiry

The 'narrative turn' has found approaches which are both flexible and diverse. Narrative inquiry has many ways of being defined (Andrews, Squire, Tamboukou 2008) most recently connected with relativist paradigms. To consider narrative as solely a method to analyse denies its full potential (Riessman, 2008). Spector-Mersel (2010) suggests that narrative should be considered as a paradigm and as a family of methods for interpreting texts.

Stories are told and language mediates the story, its telling and receiving. These narratives or stories are constrained by mastery of skills and by social surroundings. *'If social reality is a narrative reality then narratives are the natural channel for studying it.'* (Spector–Mersel, 2010 p213). It offers a methodological framework which recognises relational construction of knowledge and the inherent place of social processes, factors which are highly relevant to this research. Its diverse approaches may be lost should too tight a definition be imposed (Josselson 2004, Andrews, et al, 2008). One of the possible issues for a new researcher is that with a growth in popularity, narrative is often quoted as having few overall rules for investigation (Andrews, et al, 2008). However narrative still offers a humane text (Goodley, 2011) recognising the representation of self in the narrative.

Goodley (2011) suggests narratives are a cultural artefact and narrative inquiry is a tool for , to question the cultural discourses available. Narratives are rooted in the present, in social, cultural and meta contexts and do not contain the whole (Spector Mersel, 2010). The realities of norms are created and agreed in social spaces. We are merely co- authors in context. They reveal cultural narratives which function as a background to stories. To collate narratives from a group process may offer a way of considering the context and culture alongside narrative themes. Narrative recognises that stories are common to a group that we belong to (Spector Mersel 2010 p 208). This particularly relevant to this research when exploring the possible narratives within a group of teachers, recognising the school context and the cultural background of education in western societies.

Riessman (2008 p21.) states 'the researcher does not find narratives but participates in their creation'. Narrative recognises the role of the researcher. It is not a passive role but one in which the questions, and prior planning is recognised in shaping the discourse. There is not just the researcher as co-creator, but an imagined audience and this too is recognised as part of the construction of meaning. Narrative inquiry offers a legitimate position to be an active participant and jointly construct the narrative

Implications for this research

Narrative inquiry offers approaches which can explore meaning but which does not hold one meaning as more valid than another. Previous research in SHB often seeks meaning through quantifiable responses and seeks opportunities to generalise. Many research articles seek collective truths about a group which is already identified as heterogeneous (Hackett 2003) and uses approaches which can neglect the individual as a complex and unique case (Elliot 2005). The questions asked in this research are not of why the behaviour occurs but how is it discussed and what meanings are made. This is particularly suited to narrative approaches therefore achieving a methodological coherence. In this study neither truth nor agreement is being sought. The research does not ask about a reality but what is 'known' about SHB. It assumes the narratives are not all the same in all schools for all staff or that the words that are being said necessarily hold the same meaning for each participant. Narrative inquiry offers opportunity to explore constructs within this context without privileging some over others. The use of a transparent model of inquiry attempts to include and make known the narrative model to participants and for them to choose narratives they want to share. Their narratives are accepted as partial, an understanding of the sense they have made of the events in their professional lives.

The narrative approach is particularly relevant to how knowledge is constructed as a group. Narrative inquiry embraces co-construction and recognises that the process of exploring narratives in a group constructs the participants and the researcher. Stories are told for the researcher and the narratives are embedded in their interaction (Spector-Mersel, 2010).

Child, parent and teacher narratives are missing from the research literature. Identities of the young people are mostly read through the accounts of professionals who meet them through identification of SHB. There is little or no evidence of how adults in schools construct the young person or their own identities in working with this issue. In seeking narratives in this context, the self is also constructed and therefore this approach allows me to reflect on how the teachers perceive their role and themselves.

Some studies have emerged which take a theoretically similar approach e.g. Good Way Model (Ayland and West 2007) and there are a few which survey client perspectives (Masson and Hackett 2006). However research which considers narratives or meaning are rare and those emerging have not considered the school context. With much of the research considered through the analysis of data and case studies there is limited research which considers the meanings made with participants and how dominant discourses are told, retold or resisted.

Narrative research in a group replicates many experiences of EPs working in schools. The use of a narrative approach recognises the social aspects of working in schools and its 'fit' with school structures. Walther and Fox (2012) state that school is a significant community where a person's identity is storied and through informal discussions in social and public spaces, identities are constructed and sustained. This includes problem identities. Accessing narratives within a group of teachers who work together is a pragmatic approach which links strongly with future practices. Narrative inquiry allows exploration of possible narratives rather than offer a single account of an individual or problem. The group session offers a discursive space for a range of stories to be shared without binding it with complex methods. Narrative does not claim truth but possibilities. The context has not previously been studied, but is a system in which all young people are expected to engage.

There are some difficulties using narrative inquiry. Within the group it may be difficult to say that narratives are open to all to explore, change and create. There are

considerations as to whether the language and structures available to us allows an agency or whether the resistances available are inherent in the available discourse. However, it does offer a method which is underpinned by a social constructionist paradigm, with a natural link to practice. It considers how some narratives can be marginalised and opportunity to consider more than the dominant influences of the problem.

3.4.3 Thematic analysis of narratives

Thematic analysis is a widely used tool within qualitative research (Braun and Clarke 2006). The key to any analysis is held within the epistemological underpinnings and decisions made prior to and during the research need to hold central to the paradigmatic approach taken (Braun and Clarke 2006). This research is interpretive and asks questions of what meanings are made in a social context. Thematic analysis is used in this research to analyse the data as it is important the analysis reflects the questions asked and offers space to explore possibilities.

Braun and Clarke (2006) describe thematic analysis as 'a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data' (p.79). As an often-used approach they suggest thematic analysis should be considered as a method in its own right. Thematic analysis previously suffered from a lack of clear agreement about its use and the process undertaken (Boyatzis, 1998). In response to this methodological criticism, Braun and Clarke (2006) provide a description of the method and process with which the approach can be evaluated alongside suggestions of decisions to be made prior to conducting the research.

Thematic analysis is compatible with a range of qualitative approaches and provides opportunity for sharing rich and detailed data. It is used across a range of theoretical approaches, realist and constructionist, and is a method of identifying themes within both quantitative and qualitative research. It has been described as a method which allows 'communication with a broad audience' (Boyatzis 1998 p5) and with authors who use other approaches. In this research with much of the evidence base situated in a

more positivist stance the use of a method which can communicate meaning within other theoretical positions is attractive.

The epistemological assumptions underpinning this analysis are constructionist and need to be explicitly stated (Braun and Clark, 2006). This analysis examines how the experiences and meanings are constructed within a group, explicitly sharing with the group that the research is exploring narratives, not truth. It examines the meanings made and the themes I interpreted within the group context.

Thematic analysis is chosen as the tool for analysis for this research for a number of reasons. Firstly the data produced comes from an under researched area and narratives of the participants are not 'known'. Braun and Clarke (2006) suggest that to offer a rich overall description is particularly useful in these circumstances, offering the opportunity to explore the data set in its entirety. Secondly it is applicable to constructionist approaches used in practice. As a practitioner researcher, to use a framework which allows narrative to be explored but the freedom to interpret, is attractive and practical for future work and offers a level of flexibility. Narratives which are of interest but not necessarily frequently stated can be explored. It is not necessarily the frequently stated that opens opportunity for change and capturing something important is allowed (Clarke and Kitzinger, 2004). Thirdly as much of the current literature is based within more positivist frameworks it offers a methodological structure which has a theoretical basis but is also grounded within the given epistemology.

According to Braun and Clark (2006) themes can be identified primarily in two ways, inductive or deductive. An inductive approach is coding without fitting into a pre-existing framework. A deductive approach is driven by previous interest of the researcher. This research takes an inductive approach and analyses the entire data. Whilst the researcher has some prior knowledge of research the aim of the research is to explore the constructs which are available within the group. The focus group

process asks some direct questions to elicit responses but to share more than the narratives of a pre-decided theme.

A further decision according to Braun and Clark (2006) is analysis of semantic or latent themes. The semantic level seeks meaning in what the participant has said and does not seek further than what is written. The latent level seeks patterns and meaning beyond the semantic level examining ideas beyond what has been said and considering possible assumptions and underpinnings to the surface meaning. According to Braun and Clarke (2006) 'assumptions, structures and/or meanings are theorised as underpinning what is actually articulated in the data' (p85) and is aligned to constructionist paradigms. This research considers both as direct themes are discussed but also the ideas about what have been said are exposed. Thematic analysis which interprets the parts and not consider the whole interaction risks missing some of the nuances of group processes. The latent approach adopted attempts to seek meaning within the data. Engaging and discussing latent themes allows consideration of the research questions within the stories told and recognises the hermeneutic composability of Bruner (1991). In agreement with this premise Josselson (2011) argues that narrative tries to explore the whole account rather than fragment into smaller units.

It is important in this research that the analysis takes account of the role of the researcher and this is explicitly referred to in construction of the themes. I offered my thoughts and reflections with the other participants in the second session. The analysis of themes are highlighted by this researcher and it is recognised that others may attend to different aspects of the text/ talk as would the participants. Data is developed in 'light of thematics developed by the researcher' (Riessman 2008, p54). The interpretive process occurs prior to and during interaction (Riessman, 2008). It is neither an act which follows a conversation nor one which is listened to passively. This fits with the interpretivist position of the research. As the interpretive context takes into account the position of myself I will share considerations about reflexivity alongside a reflection of how I understand myself.

3.5 Reflexivity

Reflexivity is a way of paying attention to the institutional and personal aspects of research (Parker 2005). It is through reflexivity and reflecting on the positions of the researcher and their values that we come to understand the influences on choices made. It is 'an awareness of the researcher's contributions to the construction of meaning.' (Willig, 2008 p10). '

'No research is value free' (Goodley and Smailes, 2011 p38). The position of the researcher in interpretivist research can offer insight into not only the meaning made by her but also how the research and its limits are defined. Reflexivity offers attention to the process and the positions that participants and subjects hold (Parker 2005). It allows the reflection on the construction of subjects as well as reflection on the position of the researcher and is part of the collective activity that takes place.

How we experience ourselves as the subject and how others' subjectivity is experienced in research is opened to critical analysis. In constructing the identity of the subject, the self is constructed. Billington (2000) talks of how the professional self is constructed when they write of children and that if we attempt to separate ourselves from our activity we may also separate children from their own stories. We construct identity as individuals and as a group in relation to others. Professional accounts construct the other in their writing (Billington 2000) and in doing so construct themselves.

Reflexivity allows a critical stance to be taken about the research. As a plurality of knowledges is accepted, it is necessary to recognise that the researcher has shaped the direction of the knowledge. The role is not purely an observer or facilitator. Reflexivity is part of the collective process (Burr 2003) and whilst individuals are important, the reflexivity continues as a group and within the context of the construction. Narratives develop as participants in a group interact and the audience is each other. Narrative inquiry recognises that the stories are temporally located

(Parker 2005) and narratives are created for a purpose. In research stories are told for the researcher in the interview (Spector-Mersel 2010) and therefore within a group they are also told for each other. The influence of the researcher in this study is held centrally and not attempted to be reduced. Instead the context and temporal nature is explicitly recognised.

This research co-constructs the knowledge with participants to offer a dialogical relationship and greater communicative equality (Riessman, 2008, p26). I am not so naive to suggest that power differences are eradicated. The methods I choose attempt to reflect the methodological values, to actively participate in a group construction of narrative and to recognise that the researcher is part of the research narrative (Riessman 2008). Narratives are not discovered in the text by the researcher, but co-constructed. I am an active participant and my position is not denied but acknowledged. Reflexivity offers opportunity to identify and consider my own background, values, understanding and prior meanings in a deliberate and transparent manner (Spector-Mersel 2010).

This reflexivity not only extends its influence to the narrative offered but also to the words you are reading. When narratives are collected, the researcher influences what is analysed through the selective nature of the analysis and by the manner in which the stories are interpreted and then retold in reports. Whilst narrative gives a rich picture of details of a specific context and time, it allows the reader to consider interpretations in light of their own understandings. It prompts the reader to think (Spector-Mersel 2010) and therefore enables different contradictory meanings (Squire, Andrews and Tamboukou 2008).

My Position

I am political, woman, feminist, colleague, professional, mother, partner, adult, friend; among other selves. I identify with all aspects of these discourses in ways which I feel bonded to and in ways which I resist. I identify at different times with a differing

strength of feeling. In practice and in research the questions asked and the interests I have are shaped by me and meanings I interpret.

As an applied psychologist I try to practice with an awareness of myself and others. I do not claim the status of expert and feel uncomfortable being positioned in that role although I recognise my expertise. I acknowledge the position I hold has power to be able to direct others to a collaborative mode of engagement and that my hopes of equal power relations are not necessarily achievable. I recognise as well that as a professional I am positioned by others. Reflections on my practice offer insight into why I engage in qualitative research and practice based in language and interaction.

As a practising psychologist I engage regularly with children and young people who are described and labelled in deterministic ways, in which their qualities are described in such fixed terms that they are bonded to the pathology. SHB is a descriptor which evokes strong emotion whether anxiety, disgust or empathy. In the experiences I have had, it is spoken of in extremes and rarely considers the holistic needs of the child first. At times I have felt uncomfortable with the role of EP in these cases. As a strong believer in inclusion I identify with a passion the need to offer possibilities and hope for the young person. I attempt to offer space to develop and explore meanings. Listening within conversations I seek other perspectives, to reveal routes to possibilities rather than routes to fixed answers. However some of the cases are upsetting and horrific in the description of acts. I feel at times guilty when engaging positively for young people when the victim of the action is so traumatised and affected. To advocate for a young person following an act which is abhorrent brings conflict and tension.

Yet I know people to be uncertain entities, especially children and young people, who are part of a group to be supported and protected. As a feminist I stand as a political being, one who is aware of the inequalities of society. I feel strongly bonded to individual rights, equality and the disgrace of the voice of some being subjugated by those of dominance. Children are a minority who are not listened to. When we ask for children's voice we really mean view. They are a minority and marginalised and I

believe often measures and processes are applied to them without their consent. And so I am a multitude of possibilities which I identify with and which others identify me as.

3.7 Ethics

All research raises ethical issues. It is how ethical issues are engaged with that is of importance (Burman and Whelan 2011). This research attempts to address some of the ethical issues but recognises that at times research is unpredictable.

Ethical research aims to 'preserve their (participants) psychological well-being and dignity' (Willig 2008, p19). I first considered working not with teachers but with young people directly. There is already a recognised lack of young people's voice within the research literature. Whilst those working within programmes and interventions have started to offer research including feedback from young people (e.g. Hall 2006, Lambie and Price, 2015), these are still relatively few in number and have significant implications in terms of power within professional relationships.

Parker (2005) suggests that one should work with those who have potential to impact. In this research I feel that teachers are in that position. To seek narratives from young people from within a school setting would be saturated with ethical issues. Although direct work with young people should be considered for the future, the difficulties that have been reported for those in school suggest that for me to seek their engagement with research may not be in their best interests. Adults who young people trust would be in a better position than I to approach and offer that opportunity within a trusting relationship. The lack of young person's voice may be one of the causalities of the current practice towards risk aversion (Burman and Whelan 2011). However it is also an area in which the rights of the young person should be paramount, rendering informed consent in research difficult to achieve. Weighing up the ethical dilemmas, the need to protect participants from harm (Willig 2008), I chose to explore discourses with those working with young people, to seek ways of working in the future and consider how the EP might have access to these discourses. I felt that to explore

dominant and alternative narratives would open more possibilities for change. I also recognise that this again could perpetuate the secrecy and shame surrounding sexualised behaviour. It also prevents those who show SHB from having a voice.

Parker (2005) states that we should identify the moral-political rationale within research. He suggests that researchers should not start with assumptions about the nature of human beings, but that we should resist their pathologies. We should recognise and explore the particular and the impossible to resist categories of subjects and recognise that communities are not homogenous. These epistemological assumptions are closely linked to this research's underpinnings. Although seeking narratives which were available I decided prior to the session that I would model language which implies a separation of behaviour and person. I would use terminology which I recognised as appropriate. I chose to ensure the language does not perpetuate the narrative of the subject as abuser. The circulation of narratives which are potentially harmful does not protect the participant (Hyden 2008) or the young person. Hackett (2004) identifies the use of language appropriate to adolescents as a factor within ethical research. I decided that as a strategy to limit harm (Burman and Whelan 2011) the ethical imperative would be to intervene if the narrative abuses or re victimises the young person and whilst I recognise that this is not always achieved it is an ethical aim.

I aimed to remain ethically attuned throughout recognising that ethical dilemmas arise as the research progresses e.g.in sensitive topics (Hyden 2008) It is important to consider the discursive space, how ethical practice is supported within the space and the considerations within the method. The discursive space was set up with the following points in mind:

- Participants all gave consent and confidentiality was explained. It is difficult to ensure consent is fully informed when working within a narrative model of inquiry. Meanings made and shared within the group cannot be predicted prior to them happening. The researcher is not responsible for creating meanings (Burman and Whelan, 2011) but needs to be alert to manage possible sensitivities and issues which

may arise. Parker (2005) states that as the aim is to discover and share something new, anonymity is a more accurate term. In this study, I aimed to protect the anonymity of those discussed. A drawback is that by providing anonymity the participants cannot challenge the interpretations (Parker 2005). In narrative research the analysis is my interpretations and this is explicitly stated. The full transcripts are available for all to read and to concur or deny my understandings. However, I recognise this as my narrative of which I am not seeking objective verification.

- Within all research are issues of power. It is not a linear force but a set of multiple, complex relationships that modulate and shift during the research process (Burman and Whelan, 2011). Within the space I hoped to offer some transparency by explaining the narrative approach, the aims and the process. Whilst I attempted to lessen some of those power imbalances, I am aware that power operates at micro and macro levels and it is not a force that is purely operated by researcher to participants or within my control. By adopting an open model of discussion with few pre-planned questions and sharing narrative assumptions with the participants, I attempted to offer an open space where participants discussed and queried other narratives. The space is offered through the relationship of the participants with the researcher and each other.

3.8 Quality of research

This section will briefly critique the methodologies of the literature review on SHB and then how quality can be considered for this research.

3.8.1 Methodologies of the critical literature review

Within the literature review the ontological debate is absent and although assumptions can be made of the epistemologies it is through the reader's judgements of the methods used rather than positions being explicitly stated. The research available adopts perspectives which aim for empirical evidence to generalise and which support implementation of specific practice. Many methodologies in the literature review adopt

an empirical or realist perspective to uncover aspects of the subject not known and find effective approaches to use with that person. They seek causal relationships and ways of intervening effectively with the majority of the young people. However, research agrees that this group of children and young people are not a homogenous group (Hackett 2004). To aim to find commonalities through positivist methodologies is difficult to achieve and the limitations of research are viewed through traditional 'scientific' criteria.

These paradigms of 'good evidence' are common in certain fields of work and academia but can lack the same relevance for EPs working in schools. Rich description and stories of young people, parent and carers which recognise meanings are common in EP practice but rarely found in the research. The notion of objectivity, central to the scientific discourse, is considered by many in the research field as being desirable (Myers 2007) but alternative paradigms could offer greater insight for practitioners.

There is tension offering research from a position which is significantly different from the majority methodologies. Debate is needed which explores the methodological divide and links research to real world practice (Miller and Todd 2002). I recognise that much of the research is pragmatically undertaken for experts within the field. It seeks to offer perspectives which protect not persecute children and young people. The significant impact of harmful behaviour should not be lost or trivialised in theoretical discussion of existence, being and knowledge. There is recognition within the literature for more exploration into the young person's view as well as research into interventions which have developed out of social constructionist underpinnings. As an applied psychologist, thinking within social construction frameworks offers more possibilities for my practice, to support teachers and their thinking and to engage the young people themselves. This results in the need to explicitly state the criteria by which qualitative research can be judged.

3.8.2 Criteria for qualitative studies

Adopting an interpretivist epistemology means quality needs to be judged by different criteria from positivist research. Qualitative methodologies allow an exploration into the meanings made and reflection on its usefulness to participants and the researcher in practice. They are aimed to minimise data reduction (Willig 2008) and study people in context within systems which are not fixed, but changing as we engage.

These epistemological underpinnings do not seek reliability and validity as in traditional models of science. Traditional criterion based approaches for quantitative research has been widely considered unsuitable when assessing how 'knowledge' is positioned within constructionist paradigms. (Miller and Todd, 2002). Others have found deficits in terms of application from traditional evidence based approaches (Biesta, 2010). As such criteria other than traditional judgements of reliability and generalisability need to be considered.

Hammersley (2007) suggests that different paradigms can agree about aspects of importance if values and assumptions are shared. Potter (1996) suggests that what is good science is constructed within the scientific community. 'A broad set of norms will ensure the production of 'true knowledge' (Potter 1996 p34). The fewer values shared the less likely it is that the work will be viewed as having value. Findings are more likely to be accepted if they fit within the established body of knowledge and when there is controversy the community is persuaded using evidence and argument i.e. rhetorical devices. Scientific inquiry is a process and credibility is built or doubted through a range of agreed criteria and rhetorical devices. In light of the majority of works stemming from quantitative research methods I need to offer a framework through which one can evaluate this research.

Yardley (2000) states that all research implicitly claims an aspect of authority. Working in the field of health she suggests that qualitative methods are more akin to traditional clinical practice and pays attention to meaning, context and culture. As much of the research available stems from similar perspectives to those found in health, the model

she offers is particularly pertinent. Yardley (2000) suggests a framework to judge qualitative research. She presents:

- sensitivity to context,
- commitment, rigour, transparency and coherence
- impact and importance.

These address issues of validity, reliability and generalisability respectively and are not rigid rules but criteria which render the research meaningful to the people for whom it is intended.

- Sensitivity to Context

Yardley (2000) describes sensitivity to context as considering theoretical context, literature and empirical data alongside the sociocultural setting, participants' perspectives and ethical issues. Sensitivity suggests a validity within the theoretical understanding of the epistemology and one that is aware of the narratives of the subject area. Quality is judged on the modes of inquiry and how this moves from data to theoretical formulation (Riessman 2008).

I have explored and explicitly shared the assumptions of the research and the modes of inquiry. This research is social constructionist in its assumptions and as such draws from theoretical writings of childhood, sexuality and morality alongside the SHB research literature. It is empirical whilst recognising meaning made by individuals as a gap in the research literature. The narratives are told from a particular perspective within a school context. The sessions are co-constructed with the group, and it is recognised that the meanings are created within context and then interpreted by myself. A different narrative or interpretation could have been offered at a different time. The knowledge is offered as meaning constructed 'within the situated positions and traditions that frame it' (Riessman 2008 p185) and is research to be considered by others in light of their practice.

The role of the researcher is recognised and reflexivity is central to the research. My experience is reflected in the subject I choose to study and the interpretations I make. I made decisions to not just ask questions but also to offer my thoughts. I shared with the group the narrative approach and that I knew I would influence the discussion. Meaning was constructed within context and understandings were explored. The assumptions of social constructionism have been explicitly stated so the reader is able to interpret within the author's assumptions but also to query within their own.

Yardley (2008) suggests it is essential to understand the socio-cultural setting of the study. The work of the educational psychologist is often within groups of teachers discussing topics of tension and debate. The process mirrors common practice and therefore could be opportunity for both EPs and participants to engage in a familiar process. This is also relevant to impact and importance for teachers as known processes can offer more access to future change. Theoretical considerations of the epistemology have been considered throughout the research and recognition of reflexivity is held within the writing.

- Commitment, rigour, transparency and coherence

Interpretive research risks being dismissed as being literature or of adopting analysis methods so rigid they resemble a positivist stance on meaning. Burman and Whelan (2011) warned of the convolution of over analysis or the risk of just repeating summaries. Within the analysis I chose a thematic analytical approach which offers structure to the discussion, a framework to consider the themes but also allows interpretation rather than mere reporting. The lack of previous literature on the narratives in schools suggested that thematic analysis of meanings is an appropriate and useful tool to frame initial discussions

This research seeks narratives which are available and the meanings are as interpreted by me. Change is happening all the time and this research recognises that the phenomenon is being constructed as it happens before and after. Rigour, transparency and commitment (Yardley 2008) offer a way to recognise the methods used, and their consistency with epistemologies. Transcripts are included in the

appendix and excerpts are shared within analysis so readers can consider my interpretations and by doing this also offer the possibility of an alternative interpretation. Narrative is open to others' interpretations (Polkinghorne, 1988). However by selecting the excerpts I recognise I have guided the focus.

Participants were offered information about the approach and the role of the researcher so they were aware of the research process. This aim was shared with the participants. However on reflection I felt the power differences between me and the group was influential. Setting the tone of professional reflection meant some narratives may be more prevalent.

Once again recognition of the reflexive and subjective nature of the research commits to the transparency of the construction, not suggesting objectivity. The researcher always takes a stance (Parker 2005). By explicitly stating within the research the position of the researcher and sharing the methods directly with the group I attempted to find a way to make transparent the process and practices. I am positioned centrally not only in the decisions I made which directed the research, but also in the interpretation. I hope that the reflexive nature of the writing offers space to reflect on the subjectivity within.

- Impact and importance

It is necessary to add value and to offer research which has no use to others is indulgent. Yardley (2000) suggests importance and impact as useful criteria and for me this is the rationale behind the need for generalisability. There is little research within this paradigm but intervention using constructionist practices are widely accepted. This research adds to the emerging qualitative research. The findings are not offered as ones which can be replicated exactly. However, Willig (2008) suggests that if discourses are available in one context then they are discourses available to others. Spector Mersel (2010) states 'interpretive research focuses on the particular seeking to expand understanding of a phenomenon through the individual case' (p.209). This research offers practitioners insight into possible discourses in schools

and possibilities for practice. The research can hopefully complement existing research using qualitative research and offer a context for influence.

3.9 Conclusion

There is very little research into narratives about SHB so this research offers a rich picture of the available thinking within a group. I have shared the ontological and epistemological assumptions which underpin the research, a brief overview of its social constructionist perspective and the narrative approach adopted.

Narratives are the stories told through which we understand events. Narratives are not discovered within texts and the researcher does not listen passively. Instead I am part of the identity of the group. The selection of narratives and themes is discussed as is the position of the researcher.

Thematic analysis is presented as the approach to explore meaning. It offers the rich and detailed picture from which to analyse, whilst recognising the subjective perspective in how the researcher makes sense of the themes. This research positions the researcher as active. I decided the field of inquiry, what to study, who to ask and then what to include in the final analysis. Burman and Whelan (2011) suggest that interpretation and analysis needs to effect analysis which offers insight and perspective whilst not losing what was originally spoken. In this analysis I have offered an interpretation of the narrative themes hopefully capturing the overall tone.

This research methodology is constructed to ask:

1. How do teachers talk about young people who show sexually harmful behaviour?
2. How do teachers construct the role of school for young people who show sexually harmful behaviour?

The subsequent chapter will explore the specific methods used to collect data.

Chapter Four

Method

Six adults working in a secondary school participated in the study. Group interviews and reflective logs are used to explore the narratives of young people who show SHB. The participants were involved in two sessions and had the option to use reflective logs to record any thoughts in between sessions. The research is based upon narrative principles used in a nurture group evaluation (Billington, 2012). This section will discuss the methods used to explore SHB, how participants were chosen and informed during the process, how group narratives are explored using a focus group approach and how the data is analysed.

4.1 Choosing the participants

Participation was sought via a secondary schools' senior leadership forum. I contacted four schools who had recent experience of working with pupils who show SHB (as identified by the local authority Sexually Harmful Behaviour Coordinator). A senior leader shared the study in this school's staff forum and six staff members identified themselves as having been involved supporting pupils who show SHB and being interested in participating. As a result, I decided the study would be within this one setting. Willig (2008) considers this preferably for focus groups as it means connections and relationship between participants are already established. The teachers also work with and know the same cohort of pupils discussed and there is possibility for action following the study. The ethical aim is not just to guard against harm but also offer positive benefits for participants (Brinkman and Kvale, 2008).

The school is in an inner-city area and has fewer pupils on roll than an average sized secondary school. It has a higher than average free school meals demographic and higher ratio of SEN pupils than schools of similar and of larger size. Pupils come from a wide range of minority ethnic backgrounds and the school has a rising number of pupils attending from Roma and traveller backgrounds and from families newly arrived in the country.

The following section shares details of the organisational aspects and timeline of engaging the participants. All documents can be found in the appendix:

- Ethical consent granted (Appendix One)
- Initial letter shared with Secondary Senior leaders' forum and then sent to school staff (Appendix two).
- Outline of research shared with school (Appendix three).
- An information gathering sheet (Appendix Four) was completed by all participants and the consent form was shared (Appendix Five) alongside outline of research.
- Signed consent was obtained again prior to participants engaging in the focus group.
- The location and timing of the focus group arranged with the Deputy Head teacher of the host school.

Decisions made reflect the ethical considerations referred to earlier. Formal consent was gained from all the participants who engaged in the study. The consent forms gave information of the study on a separate sheet and details of engagement and withdrawal. Hollway and Jefferson (2000) consider that consent should really be seen in the wider picture of preventing harm. They state that a conscious decision prior to an interview is not actual consent. Therefore within the context of the group interview consent needed to be revisited within the sessions.

To provide safety from harm and meet some of the concerns about consent, the information shared the research's aims and outcomes, how confidentiality is offered and how to access support following the session. Information about the research was shared three times, twice in writing and once verbally. The research was described in each session and the participants signed understanding in the first session that they were aware of the right to withdraw, participate or to listen within the group experience. There was a discussion about the techniques I would be using and asking them to consider.

The approach I chose aims to offer a space to share what is being storied by the participants. It is important to ensure a safe space is created, with the researcher paying attention to the context, the flow of the narrative and guarding against harm for the participants. The premise of me remaining ethically attuned throughout (Brinkmann and Kvale 2008) was of high priority. Following the sessions, it was within their professional judgement to contact me after should they want to follow up any aspect we had discussed.

The ethical considerations need to understand how possible sensitive issues are considered prior to the research and how to support the discursive space. This area could be considered a sensitive topic though this should not be either assumed or ignored. It is an area which is not spoken of frequently, yet that does not necessarily make it sensitive to speak about. Sensitive topics are defined through personal characteristics, culture and power relations (Hyden 2008). It is the manner with which individuals relate to the topic in context and through experience rather than the topic itself. Meanings made are individual and the researcher needs to consider these possibilities within sensitive research areas. In addition to being ethically attuned a number of measures were considered prior to the research with regards to sensitive topics.

The participants are teachers and pastoral leaders and are talking about SHB in school. The sensitive nature of the discussion is possibly, but not necessarily, reduced by the participants being school staff and by the events not having immediately occurred. It is important to recognise that asking them to think differently may have an impact on their current understandings which may leave them feeling uncomfortable. Flick (2007) describes this as disturbances to meanings and whilst this can be beneficial it can also be an irritation to participants. Access to supervision or consultation with me following the sessions was offered and the school leadership offered support to staff also if needed.

Confidentiality or anonymity is an aspect of participant research. I wanted to offer an openness for participants and not restrict their contributions which might happen if they could be identified. Confidentiality was discussed such as not naming school or participants and the roles of individuals. These are not recorded against the coding of their speech. Names and details of participants are omitted in transcripts as are references to the pupils who are being discussed. When young people are discussed their names and identity are not recorded, as direct consent has not been given.

The term teacher or participants is used throughout the research. All participants are part of the educational setting and work directly teaching or as part of the pastoral team. They have roles in the SEN department, school leadership and mainstream teaching staff. I have used the word teacher to identify their role in relation to the children. I aim to use language which reflects the perspective of the research and the values underpinning it i.e. that the participant is not a subject to be explored, but rather part of a construction of roles and identities. The role of the researcher is included both as a participant and as a researcher. As the research is bedded in language it is important that the writing reflects the underpinnings.

4.2 Exploring Group Narratives

Meaning is not developed in isolation as already discussed but in interaction. It is relational. Meaning is constructed through interaction with pupils, between pupils and between staff members. Groups are a natural site for construction and co-construction. Groups allow participants to 'respond to and comment on one another's contributions' (Willig 2008, p31.) and are a useful way of researching as they mirror a social context in which the participants are active. As participants query, qualify and extend their thinking a rich data is produced (Willig 2008).

Groups use stories 'to mobilise others, and to foster a sense of belonging' (Riessman 2008, p8). The purpose of narratives is seen within group discussions and although not necessarily a part of this study I want a contextually aware method of exploring

this social construct. I hope to explore a phenomenon which is not often discussed and produce an opportunity not readily available prior to the research. It will offer insight for participants into the stories that others are constructing about individuals and alongside the researcher they can consider dominant and alternative narratives.

4.3 Focus Groups

Interviews are a popular method used in qualitative research and produce an abundance of rich data for analysis. (Runswick Cole 2011). They are also the most frequently used tool in narrative studies (Spector Mersel, 2010). This method will not only gain an insight into the range of narratives but also recognises the social nature of building knowledge.

I found no research on narratives available in the school context. A group approach offers an economical and efficient approach to data collection which grounds the construction of reality in a social space. Focus groups have been used extensively in research to explore other narratives and perceptions for example, understanding teaching assistants' self-efficacy (Higgins and Gulliford 2014), staff perception of wellbeing interventions (Sharrocks 2014) and sexuality (Frith 2000). Developed originally in social sciences and used extensively in market research this method is versatile and is compatible with the assumptions of qualitative research (Vaughn, Schumm and Sinagub, 2013) and with narrative approaches.

Focus groups or group interviews recognise that participants jointly construct meaning. They do not aim to reach an agreement, the goal being to hear from a range of voices about a topic of the researcher's interest (Morgan 2012). Paraphrasing Hess (1968) Vaughn et al (2013) identify the strengths in the social nature of the focus group. Group discussion can produce a wide bank of data which in an under researched area is of significant interest. Participants can extend and clarify other narratives heard and add 'depth and dimension to the knowledge gained.' (Vaughn et al 2013, p14). Collecting data in a group offers a collaborative space, opportunity for narratives to be shared

and a 'collective domain where more radical things tend to happen' (Parker 2005, p60).

SHB may be a sensitive topic area. To use a method in which individuals can participate at the level which feels comfortable is a strength of focus groups. According to Vaughn et al (2013) focus groups encourage openness and candour. Questions and reflections are posed to the whole group not to individuals which Hyden (2008) suggests is less intrusive than an individual interview. The focus group offers opportunity to discuss with less individual pressure and opens a space which allows the issues important to the teachers to surface. Frith (2000) reports specifically in relation to research on sexuality that focus groups provide conditions in which people feel comfortable, which encourages talk.

4.3 Narrative principles within group sessions

In a recent evaluation of nurture groups Billington (2012) used narrative principles within group sessions. He posed five 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)

These epistemological questions are particularly relevant when talking of young people whose label creates a strong meaning about them. The questions provide a 'critical framework for exploring the issues of meaning and experience' (Billington 2012, p.319). Working in a group and explicitly sharing narrative approaches offers a method for resistance. It 'capture(s) private troubles whilst exposing public issues' (Goodley 2011, p 130) prompting 'dialogues of difference' (p131) and allowing space

to consider marginalised narratives. The decision to research in a group was reflective of the nature of a social phenomenon.

The narrative approach mirrors how the subjects and phenomenon are constructed in informal situations through conversations and between individuals. Groups allow an individual to profit from the group experience but also consider their role and position in the group (Bion, 1948). Methods are used which this researcher feels useful to apply to the current research but also in the future.

This research uses a semi structured focus group. Originally considered by me to be unstructured on reflection I would dispute if any interview is completely unstructured as I already had decided on the focus and had some prior knowledge of the subject area (Runswick Cole 2011). The two focus groups are connected and started with an explicit discussion of narrative processes and the role of the researcher in the group. This was termed a narrative session by Billington (2012) and adopted in this study. I chose following this not to prepare questions apart from the initial statement "Tell me what your experience is of SHB." and in the second session to ask participants to review the previous session. This less structured approach means teachers and researcher can contribute and query each other and be part of a shared process. A space is created where questions asked are in response to the narratives emerging and where the researcher is part of the construction.

The role of the researcher is to facilitate the narrative and allow the participants to share their stories. Unlike an interview the researcher has an opportunity to be explicit about the approaches used and reflect with the group on emerging themes.

The Two Session Model

This is a study based on narrative principles utilising a focus group method. A three session model was originally planned but adapted to two sessions to meet the specific needs of the participants and timing of the sessions. A further session has been

offered but is not included in the results of this study. The two sessions were carried out with four weeks in between.

The first session involved information sharing regarding narrative methods and discussion of the issues of sexually harmful behaviour within a school environment. I drew from Billington's (2012) research to share basic principles of narrative work with the group. The following principles were shared:

- The participants are the experts in their own narratives
- Staff can make choices about the narratives they engage in
- Staff can develop confidence articulating preferred narratives about young people who show sexually harmful behaviour.

(Billington 2012, p323)

I discussed narrative approaches, dominant and alternative stories, how individuals can influence and be influenced by the problem and how people can choose narratives they want to attend to. The overview of narrative shared is included in the appendix (Appendix Six). At the end of the first session participants were encouraged but not obliged to keep a reflective log, to details any reflections in between the group sessions.

At the start of the second session I recapped the use of narrative methods to explore emerging themes and then asked participants to share any thoughts. All participants including the researcher were asked to share their reflections of the narratives they felt were poignant and what they had considered between sessions. The second session then focused on the main themes which had emerged, the influence of the problem and how teachers perceived the role of school. At the end of this session a further session for individuals was offered to discuss future work.

The use of more than one session meant that the participants could reflect in the group and bring back their own thoughts and reflections. Knowing that the

researcher was returning gave space to reflect in between session and recognised the influence of all interaction not as an end point but an aspect of a process.

Reflective Logs

Reflective logs were given to participants as a possible method to capture information between sessions. Participants were asked to keep thoughts of any persistent recollections e.g. key events in shaping your views, reasons for participating, observations, feelings evoked or responses (Billington, 2006. p.17). Willig (2008) states that when successful, reflective logs can offer data which is otherwise difficult to obtain, however she recognises that this method is highly dependent on motivation and has high 'drop out' rates. It was recognised that this may not offer significant quantities of data.

4.4 Analysis /Interpretation

I familiarised myself with the data by listening to the tapes as I transcribed them and reading the transcripts several times. I transcribed using the conventions described by Edwards and Mercer (1987) but added one additional symbol from Jefferson (2004) to show latched speech as this happened regularly within the discussion and it was useful to recognise how participants interrupted and constructed ideas with each other. The full transcription codes are listed in appendix seven. I transcribed the sessions and checked them for accuracy against the audio recordings. The analysis of themes started during the focus groups and further occurred whilst transcribing. Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach and Zilbar (1998) state that a 'static' text that is interpreted at the end is an illusion. Through the process of discussion as a group, describing, understanding and explaining in writing, interpretation is constantly occurring. I made notes for myself following each session and whilst transcribing.

I then carried out an initial thematic analysis using the process suggested by Braun and Clarke (1986):

- Phase one: Familiarise myself with the data. I listened to the recordings three times each and transcribed them myself. I then read and reread the transcripts, noting at the end of each session my thoughts.
- Phase two: General initial codes. I identified ideas which interested me and used codes to describe them. The codes were prompted by frequency but also by aspects which resonated with me. I worked systematically through both data sets, reading and rereading the parts within the whole context.
- Phase three: I grouped the codes together in general themes.
- Phase four: Reviewing themes - I reread the transcripts to listen for these narratives within the stories. Considering the themes, I checked each with the original recordings and transcripts and my notes from the interviews.
- Phase five: Defining and naming themes - I created the story of each theme and started to write about them using extracts from the transcript to support my interpretation.

Lieblich et al (1998) further suggest an interpretive level, that whilst some narrative interpretation is through more explicit means such as thematic analysis, a theoretical interpretation is present from the reflexivity of the researcher and this is unknown to the other participants. They state 'each reader is inevitably bringing her culture, language, experience and expectations into her interactions.' (p76). I will present findings which are interpreted at different levels as the interpretive process is not one of fixed analysis. I offer my overall interpretations within the themes. These are at a hermeneutic level which recognises the subjectivity of the researcher and the theoretical perspectives which I bring. Interpretations are linked to the form of the research and questions of the focus groups but also reflect how the discussion developed and how the group shaped the direction of the narrative.

I feel that to write only in separate themes does not reflect the circular nature of the discussion nor the interpretive elements of the researcher sufficiently. Whilst I offer the themes in their general form I do not want to lose the 'gestalt' of the discussion. (Josselson 2011). The thematic analysis is used to guide my interpretations but the themes discussed are those which resonated with me and are also interpreted within the overall characteristics of the narrative, therefore shared in a less fragmented

format. Braun and Clarke (1996) identify phase six as 'refining the overall story the analysis tells' (p87) and relating this to the research questions. It is this that enables me to share the narratives using the thematic analysis as a structure which explores rather than restricts interpretation.

Within the following chapters I share the narrative themes constructed in the group. Three narratives which I interpreted within the transcripts. Though they are presented separately for the reader to consider and interpret further, the themes within the narratives overlap and are present within each other. Braun and Clarke (1986) suggest discrete themes yet I feel the analysis is more authentic if I recognise that themes at times overlap. In the complex and often circular discussions the themes can be recognised in each other.

Interpretation of the focus groups discussion and written data provided by the participants will then be used to answer the research questions and:

- Inform an understanding of the narratives that exist in school about young people who show sexually harmful behaviour,
- Inform possible understanding of the role of schools
- Consider implications for the role of Educational Psychologists when working with schools

Chapter Five

Data Analysis and Interpretation

In this chapter the analysis and interpretation of the narratives is shared. The sections reflect on the narratives which teachers draw upon when talking about SHB, how young people who show SHB are constructed by teachers and how teachers view themselves within this context. The narratives answer questions posed within the research and share three themes interpreted through thematic analysis. The analysis presented includes direct passages of speech so readers can consider the themes and interpret them further. The full transcripts are included in the appendix (appendix eight) so the reader can read the selected passages within context.

The analysis and interpretation are explored within three themes:

- Understanding normal and not normal
- Understanding identity of the young person
- The professional and personal voice

A narrative thread of uncertainty and dilemma ran through each theme and although is discussed within the personal voice it is inherent in all the three main themes. As such it will be referred to separately within the analysis and then more fully in the discussion. The narratives are presented as separate themes but they overlap. Each one needs to be read with the others in mind.

The following sections will share the three themes which were analysed through the thematic analysis. Some sub themes occur more frequently than others. This analysis is not offered as a reflection of their frequency but as interpretation of themes which were highlighted by me in the analysis.

5.1 Theme one: Normal and not normal

Theme one explores normal and not normal. Detailed in table one are the initial themes and sub themes within the main narrative of normal and not normal interpreted in the analysis.

Table 1. Narrative of normal and not normal

Main theme	Sub Themes	Initial themes
Narrative of Normal and not normal	Developing normal and not normal	Factors in SH/PB Seeking explanations Uncertainty of explanations
	Influencing understanding of normal and not normal	Factors which influence Context and Culture Norms and their social context
	Perceptions of normal and not normal	Language and terminology Different perceptions between adults, adults and children. Perception influenced by social interaction Inappropriate and appropriate sexual behaviour
	Learning normal	Context and culture Social learning and Norms Uncertainty

Developing normal and not normal

When talking about SHB the initial discussion by the teachers looks for factors in SHB, seeking explanations and recognising the uncertainty within. It is the immediate and most frequent focus of the talk. Causes of why the young person shows the behaviour are explored, even though I did not ask the question specifically. It is not surprising as the why, also offers space for why not and what could I do?

The group explore and return to the theme several times seeking explanations for how SHB develops. I wondered as they talked if they thought there was an answer or if they had already accepted the indefinite nature of the topic. Themes emerged that I expected including how sexuality, misunderstanding, trauma or significant experiences are possibilities in the development of the problem.

The teachers tell the story of individuals and look for holistic answers.

S1: he was actually / quite [low level. (&)

S4: [yeah

S1: (&) low ability. *I have always felt and I could be totally wrong as I've got no evidence about this, but something happened during that summer before he moved into year nine because when he came back after that six week holiday =*

S4: = *he was angry*

S2: *he was angry [and that's (&)*

S4: *[angry yeah*

S2: (&) *when we saw this change in his behaviour. And for nearly three years he was actually placed in the learning support unit in school because/ it was difficult for him to go into lessons. Because/ he couldn't sort of control himself really could he. So although we've got and I mean social care were involved. And they had the same feelings that we did that something happened (&)*

S4: ()

S2: (&) *we don't know what that is, what it even looks like but there was a massive/ change. So whether or not it was something to do with his sexuality or something happened to him and/ he came back in year nine a different boy.*

(G1: 425-444)

The teachers asked questions and although several credible themes arise there is no suggestion of teachers having only one main understanding. Across both sessions, the discussion of possibility is present. Teachers consider within child factors such as levels of learning and other difficult behaviours alongside environmental factors, i.e. home background, parenting; lack of understanding about relationships and needs of pupils such as control or attention. I interpreted this to mean that teachers recognise SHB as a complex and multi layered construct. Interestingly the teachers return to the within child factors to distinguish between why one child with similar needs, environment and experiences would show the behaviour and another would not.

S3: *I just/ I get confused about how does it work? How do those people get to that point? You're saying it's to do with relationships [but*

S6 : *[Oh but (&)*

S6: (&) I think that's a part of it I'm not saying it's 50:50 but I also think/ but no-one's ever going to know but I think sadly some people/ will just do that. That's just in their/ sort of psychology as a person really

(G2: 240-245)

A level of uncertainty frames the discussion about how the problem develops. I interpreted the uncertainty as enabling, a part of the professional debate. The space uncertainty creates can offer opportunity to reflect purposefully and consider a range of possible factors. I felt the discussion held expresses a sense of wanting to understand more but recognises the unknown. When one factor is highlighted other factors are offered as alternatives. This expresses the need not to be simplistic. However, uncertainty also leads to confusion illustrated also in the previous quote.

Whilst the teachers share a range of narratives they are not simplistic or purely causal. However they do not allow for the SHB to be part of a 'normal' narrative. There is resistance to considering that a factor such as lack of understanding about relationships alone might be enough to produce the behaviour.

S6: I think I think sadly in city schools lots of issues going on I think there's lots of kids that fall into the sort of low literacy not much support from home but I suppose /that's it's probably my opinion that if they've got that bit of sort of deviant do you know what I mean sexual/behaviour going on that the difference they probably /act on that because they haven't got positive peer relations. I don't think they're /exclusive to the point of they create each other

(G2: 210 - 216)

This suggests teachers return to within person factors, a significant event or negative background as the decisive factor to distinguish between why one young person would show the behaviour and another would not.

Influencing understanding of normal and not normal

Several possible factors are considered to influence understanding of 'normal' and 'not normal'. Normal is recognised as contextual, with norms being part of cultural, societal and local understandings. A range of influencing norms are identified below by the group.

Heritage culture is mentioned in relation to norms, expectations and perceptions and diversity plays a significant role in this setting. The teachers recognise that for some groups of young people, perspective differs significantly from a primarily western European one. Some young people are newly arrived in the country and are learning western societal norms. Teachers share stories of young people from Afghanistan, Roma backgrounds and Muslim faith backgrounds. The discussion demonstrates how aware the teachers are of different understandings of sexuality, sexual behaviour and gender norms within other cultures. This narrative appreciates that norms may differ significantly from a primarily western perspective.

One story of a young person newly arrived to the country describes his identity:

S6: he had two identities. He had his kind of he/ was you know Muslim non English speaking / strict you know that was very very strict and suddenly I'm in a western school and there's girls that are wear/ I think a few /there was a few and again this is opinions I've heard so I can't say obviously is true... of suddenly there's girls that are wearing things that to him would probably seem really provocative/ and I don't think he really knew how to socialise

(G1:694-700)

Cultural heritage is a factor not originally considered by me but one that held a high priority in this setting. Teachers are aware of their own cultural backgrounds and the influence on their perceptions.

S4: [Brought up in a (&)

S4: (&) a very strict black family. Hell no. I didn't see my sister's body my father's body. Nothing. Strict as hell. Cover yourself up. That's the way I was brought up. The Muslim girls same thing.

(G1: 810-813)

This expresses the significance of culture in how behaviour is perceived. The story above illustrates a feeling in the group that there needs to be consideration of different identities for different contexts. It recognises the plurality of perceptions without accepting these values.

S3: they shouldn't be treated in that way. // But sometimes is that not coming from a cultural background as well the way they perceive women not on the high scale.

(G2: 132-135)

If culture is the behaviours, beliefs, values, accepted by a group of people then we should consider culture also within a family. One story tells of a home culture which is described as macho.

S1:.... he comes from a very macho kind of home background it was a bit like I don't know a badge [of honour/ I don't know / yeah

(G1: 251-252)

S5: (&) how do you change that mind set [if they're (&)

S2: [I think

S5: (&) are all sat round, his friends egging him on

(G1: 548-550)

I interpreted this as understanding of culture at a societal level and at a local level and that not all cultural or contextual beliefs are accepted.

Sexuality as a frequent sub theme, especially how normal is interpreted in school, home and peer culture. Within the school culture sexuality is spoken of as 'understood and accepted.' Within the school environment genders are to be treated equally and the values of equality are referred to implicitly. I interpreted the teachers' narratives to be liberal and they agree that homosexuality is accepted as normal in their context. It is recognised that this is not so in all heritage backgrounds. Teachers state that sexuality and gender roles are cultural norms not accepted by all their schools' heritages. The impact on the young person of not being accepted within cultural norms is described as significant. When talking about homosexuality one teacher said:

S5: [You're just ostracised. You lose your (&)]

S5: (&) you lose your entire community you lose everything.

(G2: 555-556)

The teachers recognise that whilst the adults in school accept homosexuality, peer groups may find this difficult:

S6: = And then there is the whole issue of homosexuality with young teenage boys anyway which is an added. you know that makes it even more difficult to deal with.

(G1: 290-292)

My interpretation of the narrative is that the teachers accepted implicitly that the young people are sexual beings. They do not offer an explicit moral perspective. They recognise that some young people may consider a limited range of sexualities to be normal at this time in their life. The narrative is one of teachers holding a more liberal attitude and suggests that young people can be less accepting. Acceptable is a judgement of an individual or group and it is commented that groups have differing levels of acceptance. Developing an understanding of sexuality and normal can include an additional difficulty for young people of understanding and openly accepting homosexuality.

The role of women is viewed through a lens of how gender is perceived and acted upon within culture. Perceiving women as less equal is suggested as a possible influence in some homes. I felt the teachers spoke respectfully about culture but recognise that there are inequalities for women in some of the cultural backgrounds of the young people. Reflections of the school peer group culture is also referred to in relation to gender. One of the group felt that young girls accept a peer culture where they are talked to in a negative manner. How girls are treated by some of their peers is identified as unacceptable by one participant stating, 'they should not stand for it'.

The culture and norms of a school are highlighted as influential in understanding normal and not normal. One teacher felt that relevant discourses around sexual behaviour are not explicitly available within school. Teachers address homophobic language directly but identify that the adult culture does not openly talk about sexual behaviour and that more openness in the school culture would possibly be beneficial to the students.

S5: Don't you think though that schools // really we don't talk about this. We certainly don't have an open culture from what I've seen. You know /we talk like you say we challenge homophobic bullying and use of homophobic words and things but it's the culture of the school one where this sort of thing is you're able to discuss it quite normally and openly. That all staff feel that they can be clear about where the boundaries are and what to do.

(G2:703-709)

The group state that not all teachers feel comfortable about discussing sex

S6: (&) just can't help but be embarrassed about that stuff

(G2: 719)

I interpreted this to mean that teachers feel school culture could offer the availability of relevant discourses but not all the adults in the school are confident to do so.

There is a sense of loss about changes in the school culture. Teachers describe a range of strategies and supports in school which previously made up the identity of the school.

S2: we should be having circle time even though we are a high school we should be having these conversations within school, open discussions, opportunities for kids to you know voice their opinions have debates

(G2: 935-938)

S2: (&) so they feel quite safe talking to them and knowing that actually if they do disclose and sort of say this person is going to help me then [I think we've lost that a little bit

*S3: [And that's one of the
Yeah (&)*

S3: (&) And that's one of the key aspects

(G2:896-900)

I feel the overall narrative is of change within the school culture, where competing priorities mean that open discussions about relationships are not as frequent or relevant.

Perceptions of normal and not normal

This theme interprets how normal is perceived by adults and young people and their perceptions within social interactions. It recognises the difference in perceptions between groups and within groups. This section will first discuss the use of language and how normal and not normal is referred to and then share different perceptions of normal.

Normal, appropriate and acceptable are terms used to identify behaviours which are within accepted norms. Appropriate is a term used frequently in schools to denote

norms of behaviour in this context. Problematic, inappropriate and harmful are used to describe what is not normal and appear to be used interchangeably. Different words are used to refer to sexual behaviours which are socially defined as acceptable and not acceptable. Differentiation of behaviour i.e. when it becomes problematic or harmful is not clear. I interpret this to mean that nuanced distinction is less important to the teachers. For the behaviours which are a problem within school, signifying through a word is enough. The participants are possibly referring to the same phenomena.

S6: when does that turn into actually something that's /you know =

S5: = sexual [and then (&)

S6: [And yeah

S5: (&) inappropriately sexual.

S6: And is that hinting towards something that they might want to do in the future. It's hard isn't it? Cos/

(G2:166 - 172)

The subtleties of the use of words may be purely theoretical as the actual words denote what the adults consider to be an issue. The word appropriate is used within systems as a marker for what is expected behaviour. Heavily reliant on a subjective understanding, and for sexual behaviour not agreed in an open forum, inappropriate may become another misnomer for a behaviour which is a problem within the context as opposed to a problem for the child or young person. Some behaviour is easily categorised as harmful e.g. a stranger rape, but much of the discussion talks about sexualised behaviour which ranges between inappropriate, problematic and harmful and which includes behaviour which may be considered by some as normal. The breadth of the discussion was vast. At times the whole aspect of sexuality and sexual relationships is discussed. Imprecise use of language may indicate subtle difference in perceptions or refer to context or be the same act viewed through their own experience and culture, a factor identified by the group themselves.

Normal is perceived as fluid not fixed, understood differently by different people and influenced by personal circumstances. Therefore, normal is difficult to define exactly.

The group express that definition and perception contribute to constructing the behaviour as a problem or not. I interpreted this theme to reflect how behaviours in school are subject to differing interpretations.

Teachers recognise that constructs of normal differ between adults, and are influenced by perception of the event and by their subjective experiences.

S5: *[Do you think (&)*

S5: *(&) the other staff do as well though ? Do they
[perceive other (&)*

S2: *[Yeah I was going to say*

S5: *(&) things differently? =*

S5: *= Probably cos I know that the Asian lad you're talking about I know I've had quite a lot of staff come and say that they are very very concerned about the way that he's been acting, what he's done/ whereas I it's not so much.*

(G1: 218 - 226)

Staff openly question their perceptions, how they differ and which factors contribute to this. Many of the behaviours in school are spoken about as subject to perspective whether explicitly or implicitly stated.

S5: *What's just acting out and what's inappropriate? And cos you see ...I mean how many pupils do you see in a clinch? Yeah Around the school. It's like. That I mean It's not appropriate here but it's appropriate so, is that something that as a school stop*

(G2: 598 - 602)

This expresses the group's narrative that normal is difficult to identify and agrees that behaviours have different meanings for different people.

The theme of being unsure when behaviour becomes a problem is evident. This also demonstrates the belief that it is difficult to have a shared understanding.

S5: there's there's some staff that go absolutely no that's absolutely not acceptable you must not do that that's inappropriate / It's [very clear and very serious (&)

S4: [Straight to the point

S5: (&) And then there's other staff that are just kind of like ' Oh they're playing a game and it's just a laugh it's you know and I think staff do treat it [differently

S3: [differently

(G1: 771 - 777)

Teachers here recognise problematic is a complex and difficult distinction to agree.

Normal is considered specifically in relation to adolescence. It is interpreted in terms of age and development.

S6: I do think yeah I do think there are / differences really. /Even just from you know you know hormones and /feelings (G2: 317 - 319)

Teachers recognise that in defining normal one should consider the young person's age rather than view the behaviour as if acted by adults.

A narrative of difference between adult and young peoples' perceptions is explored.

S4: But then my generation my parent's generation and now we've got a new generation that's so open about sex and I'm, thinking oh my god

(G1: 813 – 815)

I interpreted that teachers feel young peoples' differing perception of normal is part of the problem not just a different understanding. One teacher expresses his sadness at the views of the girls.

S6: [Its hard is /

S3: (&) Because// over the past years I'm forever getting upset. I'll be out in the playground and then I'll hear the boys the way they talk to the girls and I'm saying to the girls 'Do not stand for that '. But it's like it's acceptable. The way they speak to them. With foul language and all how/ what they call the girls.

(G1: 862 -866)

I feel as if this conveys a narrative of young people having incorrect perceptions. Not acceptable is used when talking about how boys speak to girls. It adds an additional moral tone and one which places the girls as sharing a responsibility for the behaviour. To further explore normal from a young person's perspective could offer insight into alternative narratives which hold more relevance and authenticity to young people themselves.

It seems that the multiplicity of voice is understood when discussing teachers but not as readily spoken about as truth for young people. A range of perceptions are accepted when discussing adult perceptions but not as readily spoken about as truth for young people. Normal for young people is presented in a more homogeneous form. When talking about young people the discussion is about 'them' as a group. This was not reflected back to the group within the session and if it had been, there may have been more discussion as to whether this is a general view of how young people perceive sexual behaviour or if it is more varied. As the focus is SHB the teachers may have wanted to record known themes or perceptions which would be relevant.

Perception is influenced by social interaction and normal is perceived through the reaction of others. The teachers express that whether a pupil looks uncomfortable or not influences how they react to the behaviour. It is not a judgement of normal but a judgement of whether a behaviour is accepted or not. A story is told of a young person who shows 'problematic' behaviour. He is described as a 'sad and weak character'. Young people's response to him is in response to his identity within the school and peers respond to his behaviour based on this identity.

I interpreted SHB to be constructed as part of interaction. Teachers express that the peer group reaction is stronger for some than for others.

S2: He's copying that behaviour but the children take real offence at him and actually find/ it =

S4: =Weird yeah.

(G1: 212 - 214)

A child who is already seen as 'sad' is then considered 'weird' by their sexual behaviour. Narratives draw on pre-existing narratives of identity not the action.

S1: (&) there's another boy an Asian boy who does the same kind of things whose got a lot of learning needs. And it's exactly the same as you've said people are in uproar if he does it

(G1: 202 - 204)

I also interpreted this to mean that for a young person seen as having learning needs narratives of sexuality may be restricted. The interpretation is that sexualised behaviour is considered by peers to be acceptable from individuals who have a more favourable identity, i.e. those who are popular. Constructs of fitting in and popularity are suggested as factors in how behaviour and interactions are perceived.

S6: Cool or quite popular and sort of quite good looking I think sometimes it kind of sort of normalises the behaviour

(G1: 188 – 190)

I originally considered the narrative of popularity influencing 'acceptable' to be a narrative of how identity influences young people, one which is only relevant to teenagers. Using the term cool or popular suggests factors that teenagers are influenced by, which adults would not be.

Whilst not part of the thematic analysis I interpreted young people (particularly young women) to be constructed as passive in this narrative, using words such as 'allowing'

and 'accepted'. The response seems to not be an active or positive decision on behalf of the young person to be sexual. The response may not only be about identity but may be about attraction. Sexuality is about the choice to engage intimately. To perceive it in terms of acceptance and fitting in does not seem to recognise young people at this age as knowingly sexual and possibly making choices to engage in a manner which adult norms would view as inappropriate. It may be that they are making choices to engage. However in both the behaviour is interpreted in a gendered manner considering the female role as accepting/receiving. The narrative of sexuality is framed within these dominant male interpretations and lacks a feminist lens.

Adolescence is being perceived as a time when understandings are not complete or are underdeveloped. Teachers are not naïve enough to suggest that the behaviour of young people always represents a 'true' feeling. They suggest that the responses given indicate acceptance of the intimate behaviour not their thoughts or feelings. This relates to other comments about how young people react to situations and that their behaviour, language and explicit statements cannot always be accepted as communication of their thoughts or their narratives. It may be them fitting in with what is accepted in a peer group situation but the teachers recognise there may be different motivations for this.

S6: it might be that they're using it to be try and be kind of cool but it could be because actually they're [sexually abused (&]

(G1: 855 -857)

However the narratives of the adults are mostly that young people have different perceptions and lack a full understanding. They reflect the narrative that some young people's perceptions are not accepted norms. I interpreted the teachers' narrative to be of concern or protection for some young people rather than being their reflection of how all young people think.

Learning Normal

This section will present general themes about developing and learning about normal which apply to all young people. I interpreted the general themes for learning normal as factors also in how SHB develops.

The group identify factors which contribute to how young people develop an understanding of normal. One teacher states that understanding grows from practice. Good relationships support good social skills and an understanding of 'appropriate'.

S6: 'I think that's how you learn. I think you first practice of a relationship is your peer do you know?

(G2:230 -231)

This is a useful reflection on understanding how normal develops. However the response from others mean this idea is qualified immediately so that developing normal is quickly separated from those who go on to show more harmful behaviours. Quoted previously this recognises how others can provoke an explanation of thinking:

S3: I just/ I get confused about how does it work? How do those people get to that point? You're saying it's to do with relationships [but

S6 : [Oh but (&

S6: (&) I think that's a part of it I'm not saying it's 50:50 but I also think/ but no-ones ever going to know but I think sadly some people/ will just do that. That's just in their/ sort of psychology as a person

(G1: 240 -245)

To offer such a 'usual' response would be to accept that any young person could develop that behaviour. Understandings solely relying on normal development of behaviour are not accepted as an explanation for problematic behaviour developing.

Learning normal is considered part of social response and of adolescence.

S6: Yeah. It's hard I suppose isn't it when teenagers going through puberty and start to fancy people and things like that and its quite I suppose normal when you see groups of people and they might like sort of chase each other round and like grab each other and stuff like that and they're all sort of joking and I suppose it's really hard sort of to determine when that turns- you know what I mean or even a boy or a girl going up to someone and grabbing her from behind in like a hug and going oh get off and it's all a bit jokey. Like when does that turn into actually something that's you know -

S5: = Yeah sexual and then inappropriately sexual.

(G2: 159 - 170)

The uncertainty for young people is not recognised directly. I feel that the teachers empathise with young people recognising the difficulties experienced 'growing up' and learning what is normal and appropriate. The emotional impact of this uncertainty for young people is absent from the discussion.

Teachers thought young people could learn normal directly from others, through the responses of others and how sexuality is talked about.

S6: Because if you're a pupil that's thinking it's OK to do something that clearly isn't OK you sort of hope then if they then hear a lot of their peers saying no that's absolutely not OK they might start to recognise in themselves that some of their feelings what they're doing is/ is an issue

(G2:575 -579)

Peer interaction is presented as an area of possible intervention. Interaction with peers offers general feedback about what their peer group consider normal. PSHCE lessons and general classroom experiences are identified as opportunities to learn what is normal from each other. This interestingly conflicts with the previous theme that young people do not know normal. Instead it suggests that some young people understand social norms. Teachers feel that relationships offer a space for developing understanding and normalising and that this is important for all pupils especially those who show SHB.

Learning normal is described as part of the home and school context and within wider influences i.e. the media. A narrative of difference between home, peers and school is expressed.

S4: if it's appropriate at home /and parents are saying yes it's OK, we say no it's not/ what does the child believe ? The parents or us?

(G1: 604-606)

When talking about the influence of TV and newspapers one teacher comments:

S1: That they can identify with cos they're in similar situation as them and so it's knowable That's what people do.

(G2:157- 158)

Summary

Normal and not normal are social norms, learned through interaction and influenced by experience. Norms differ between cultures, between contexts and between groups of people. There are many influences which play a role in learning normal including peer groups, previous experience and response in interaction. The narrative of plurality and contradiction when talking about SHB is evident. The group forum allows the teachers to question each other's ideas. I interpreted that the teachers want to understand all the young person's needs as when talking about the young person the narratives are often holistic. However to identify factors which lead to this behaviour is perceived as unachievable for them. The teachers mostly draw from narratives which are within understandings of influence and change. When uncertain they return to within child deficit models, a risk of models which seek to categorise and classify.

In the absence of being offered confirmation of the complex picture they do not trust in the uncertainty of complexity returning to these causal links. Whether teachers believe that a young person with no additional issues could show this behaviour is not explored fully. It feel as if the action is at times beyond understanding not because

they cannot share thoughts on factors but that many young people have the same circumstances but do not develop these harmful behaviours.

5.2 Theme two- Developing identity

Within this theme the young person is described in terms of adolescence, how identity is influenced by SHB and relationships. The themes are grouped as an overarching theme of developing identity. The teachers offer a range of contexts in which identity is developed and describe factors essential for development and growth. In writing of the young person's identity teachers offer a role for themselves within the active construction of a positive identity.

Table 2: Developing Identity

Main theme	Sub Theme	Initial theme
Developing Identity	Adolescence	Distinct period of development Different perspectives Needs and rights – freedom, privacy. Sexual identity Conditions for development Popularity and fitting in Uncertainty
	Influence of the problem/Impact of SHB	Stigma, Labels and language Loss of rights and freedoms Risk and protection Protective factors
	Relationships	Relationships with adults Relationships with peers Exclusion and isolation

Adolescence

This theme describes adolescence as a distinct phase of understanding where identity, including sexual identity, is developing. Adolescence is described considering adult and peer perspectives and in terms of the young person needs. Interest is paid to conditions for development e.g. opportunities needed, popularity and fitting in.

The teachers express adolescence as a separate and distinct phase between adulthood and childhood. They use the terms *teenagers* and *young people* alongside *kids* and *children*. They state that young people and adults might be judged by different criteria.

S6: I think that's how I would see it with old people really. But with young people going through puberty and things. I don't know if it is slightly different.

(G2:299 - 302)

This separates adolescence as a distinct phase where different criteria apply.

S6: it's not going to be all sort of young people but yeah I do think there are differences really. Even just from you know you know hormones and feelings I'm just thinking if there was a kid that felt like they had no power, they were shot down at home they were in bottom sets you know failing at school you know they weren't popular all of this. I don't.... If that then coincides with puberty and sexual urges and power and then I think often it's an opportunity that presents itself. You know if you started all of these thoughts are going on in your head and you're testing the water you know a touch here a touch there and then an opportunity presents itself when you can take it further.

(G2:316 -326)

This narrative recognises factors which are regularly storied about adolescents i.e. influence of hormones and puberty. Adolescents were spoken of as having new experiences and then learning through these experiences.

Young people are constructed as making decisions not always in a fully informed manner. I interpreted this as expected in adolescence. Young people accept behaviour that an adult would not accept or are storied as not recognising what is appropriate. The participants define young people as a group in which normal is not yet known.

S4: 'They don't know what abuse is cos they hear it that often that its normality.'

(G1: 868 - 869)

S3: the way the boys speak to them and they don't do anything about it and they think it's normal and I say it's not normal.

(G2:130 - 131)

Young people's normal is spoken about as different. Adult norms are applied and the young people's norms are not valued by adults nor agreed upon. It is recognised that young people have a different perception of normal from adults and I interpreted that it is not just different but not acceptable/not normal in the adults' opinions.

S6: But I find like when I'm teaching it and when we do lessons on like you know what's appropriate and what's inappropriate in terms of like touching and things like that and oh my - the difference it is it's just bonkers like and sometimes you're like Are you kidding me? You actually think that's acceptable.

(G1: 801 - 805)

The teachers identify that the young people are not making decisions based on socially accepted norms but on peer norms. This suggests that they are making decisions which are not generally accepted or that these choices would not be acceptable in the wider population.

Throughout the narrative the specific needs and features of adolescence are emphasised. In all areas, young people are learning and I interpreted this learning and growth to be perceived as a key feature of adolescence. Themes such as learning relationships, developing understanding of peer relationships and social interactions and negotiating normal is found within other themes. These all contribute to the narrative of the adolescent learning about being an adult. By considering all influences, such as puberty, the influence of home, not being fully developed and learning about sexuality I feel the group are expressing that adolescence has additional criteria which should be considered when talking about young people who show SHB.

Young people who show SHB are considered as adolescents and therefore to need the same opportunities as all teenagers. Privacy and freedom are identified as key for teenagers and their developing identity.

S6: especially when they're growing up. You know teenagers need a huge amount of privacy. They need to figure out who they are.

(G2:414-416)

SHB has consequences which reduces opportunities. For young people who show SHB the teachers recognise that privacy is lost:

S5: It /it curtails your freedom as well. It puts you in a gold fish bowl. You've got no privacy. I think especially when they're growing up. You know teenagers need a huge amount of privacy. They need to figure out who they are. And if somebody's constantly like 'what are you doing?' And then it's almost like as you say there's that expectation / well you know he can't get any worse so// But I do think that loss of privacy must be awful /You know.

(G2:399 - 401)

Adult monitoring in school means opportunities, such as rewards trip, would not be open to these young people. Teachers empathise with the loss and impact of this. The need to monitor and keep safe takes a high priority but one teacher expresses her discomfort with the personal consequences for the young person.

S5: I mean if you're constantly monitored. You can't just go out in the playground and have a normal conversation or a kick about with a football. And those normal normal relationship don't develop.

(G2:398 - 404)

Positive identity and self-esteem are important for young people. Teachers describe an intervention in school, offering a positive narrative of change in behaviour by focusing on building self-esteem.

S2: We have just done something with a student in year seven. And that was quite interesting wasn't it? The staff did say what are the positives about him and

some of them he did actually say himself but I think it really did him the power of good really.

(G2:969 - 972)

They recognise their influence in building positive identity.

Developing sexual identity is an often-shared narrative. It is perceived as normal for young people to be sexual beings. Uncertainty for some young people is also seen as normal.

S6: I'm not at all / obviously linking homosexuality with sexual sexually deviant behaviour, but I do think as well for some pupils that are having/ that might be having issues with their sexuality on top of having stuff that's going on.

(G2:537 - 541)

It is accepted that young people need to try out new relationships. Intimate relationships emerge and young people are allowed to be sexual and to test out the 'adult' aspects of life. Young people are developing an understanding of sexuality, acceptable norms and what expectations they have of themselves, and peers are influential at this time.

S6: I think so I think that's how you learn. I think your first practice of a relationship is your peer do you know like I remember being a kid and your best friend targeted on being your best friend anymore and you'd cry and it's really upsetting. In my head that's the equivalent of when you get your first boyfriend or girlfriend.

(G1:230 - 234)

It is of interest that developing understanding of new relationships and understanding sexuality appears as a facet of adolescence not one of sexuality. As such it is possibly constructed as something which becomes fixed as one reaches adulthood.

Sexuality, specifically same sex attraction, appears as a feature of stories of young people who show SHB. In these stories, the theme of being uncertain reoccurs to the point where one teacher says:

S1: you might not believe this that the big boy they thought he had issues with his sexuality as well.

(G1: 584 - 585)

It is the frequency of the occurrence in relation to SHB that is recognised by this teacher. Sexuality is named as a possible factor in almost all the known instances of SHB in this school. The teachers are keen to reinforce that they are not equating a specific sexual identity with SHB.

Stories consider why homosexuality causes tension with understanding and accepting self. Some traditional views in communities are cited as another possible area of conflict. The ramifications of being isolated from a community due to unaccepted sexuality are expressed.

S6: just be like No. do you know what I mean if you come from a family, I can't even imagine, but if you come from a family and your you know got questions on your sexuality and your parents aren't willing to / accept they might have a son or daughter [who's gay it must be an absolute nightmare.

(G2: 544 – 549)

Some SHB is considered as a possible act of resistance to issues of sexuality.

S1: dad's is a very macho kind of a man. And I wondered whether he'd done that to kind of prove to his dad that he wasn't..

(G2:329 - 330)

I interpreted that identifying as homosexual is a struggle, an identity which is difficult for some communities to accept, some families to accept and at times for peer groups and young people to accept. Adolescence is constructed as a time in which the latter may be more difficult.

S6: = And then there is the whole issue of homosexuality with young teenage boys anyway which is an added.. you know that makes it even more difficult to deal with. And that's when you've got the problematic sexual behaviours in he's clearly making the other boys just as it would the other girls uncomfortable but then it sometimes the double whammy of how that's probably I'm sure going back into himself and his own .. you know trying to deal deal with it himself rea- do you know it's almost like a a sort of double cos you know you know its difficult sort of going both ways really.

(G1:290 – 299)

Popularity and fitting in have been mentioned when discussing how normal is perceived. It is also viewed as part of identity. Fitting in is a narrative of being part of a group, self being understood as a member of a group. Self is constructed in terms of sexuality and in terms of what is normal for the group and fitting in. Young people are described explicitly in terms of how they are perceived by others in the interaction. A narrative of being part of a group is shared. Being popular is described as leading to acceptance of behaviours or of being judged more favourably.

S5: the peer group view things of how sinister they are as to how popular someone is, and how /how sort of cool they are or if they're/ a bit strange really.

(G1: 731 - 733)

S5: They're fitting in. so they're trying to fit in they're trying to be popular so do they/they do it because that's how you fit in

(G2: 140-142)

For some young people who show SHB, fitting in is difficult. One young person who showed harmful behaviour wants to fit in with his family. Another is perceived as trying to copy behaviours to fit in but are instead of being accepted, they are seen as 'weird'.

S2: (&) That he sees on the corridors or you know the changeover of lessons really. He's copying that behaviour

(G1: 211 - 212)

I interpreted this to mean that belonging to a group and being valued is important to young people. Some behaviours are attempts to fit in but are not approved of by adults. These include some sexualised language and exhibiting or accepting some sexual behaviour. Whilst teachers express how they could not understand pupil's actions, being popular is described as leading to acceptance of behaviours or of being judged more favourable. Being popular is viewed as an important feature for young people.

Teachers make the distinction between child and adolescent identities in terms of sexuality. One young person is described as not being aware of his actions. He is constructed as a child i.e. not a sexual being.

S4: He can't separate being a child and being a teenager adult either. those feelings in between he's still doing it like a child

(G1: 184 - 185)

As a child, his actions are described as copying, not knowing and unaware of how he is affecting others.

S2: he has touched touched bottoms in class/ and he can't understand why girls would be uncomfortable with that.

S3: When he's run up to them and just/ hugged them or tried to pick them up and stuff like that /and he thinks he's just being very friendly

(G1 179-183)

I felt the term 'child' emphasises the difference between adult and child understanding, knowing and not knowing. I interpreted the child as not being intentionally sexual. Having some adult knowledge, positions the young person in an 'in between' phase. Being a child suggests a position of lack of understanding around sexuality. Sexuality and awareness of it seems to be the defining feature of adolescence in this narrative.

Influence of the problem/Impact of SHB

This subtheme identified the impact that showing SHB has on the young person's identity. It includes stigma, labels and language; risk and protective factors and the importance of relationships in identity.

Stigma and labels are identified as negative. The group discuss labels, their impact and how they can be dealt with. One teacher suggests the label of SHB could create a problem which is difficult to reach past. It can become the defining aspect of the young person and create difficulties in how relationships are formed and maintained. A label is perceived as being able to change the way a young person is considered. Some labels that are given by other professional are accepted. These are not recognised as labels which are detrimental. One teacher describes a label offered by an outside professional.

S1: the Youth Offending Service have said well that one of in particularly, is one of the most dangerous young people that they've kind of come across.

(G1: 580 - 582)

This label is accepted by many in the group although another teacher reflected on the paradoxes within the label of a child being dangerous. However the label is defended:

S1: I suppose they're thinking more long term. Though aren't they. They are thinking [about (&)

[(...)

S1: (&) not the here and now [but what (&)

S3: [(...)

S1: (&) obviously they've got experience have the/of where somebody has been and what they've gone to [do (&)

(G1 611-617)

Professional status of specialists in this quote privileges their narrative over a teacher narrative which expresses doubts or concerns.

Within school, labelling is mostly described as having a negative effect. In the case of one young person a teacher comments that staff reacted to him in a different way. The teacher suggests that knowing about a young person's SHB could influence reactions.

S6: sometimes if you know too much for some teachers it could have a negative impact on perhaps how they were with the child maybe...

(G2: 47 - 49)

These labels identify a level of risk, which we will discuss more fully in the dilemmas posed between the professional and personal voice. Teachers identified factors such as risk to others and talked about risk assessments.

S1: The bigger boy /there was a risk assessment done with him and he was actually escorted to and from all his lessons and had support in all his lessons.

(G1:486 - 488)

S2: protects both the victim and or/you know, the student who/ is displaying that behaviour but also the other children

(G1: 515 -517)

Whilst teachers identified risk as a factor it was not a priority as they feel the risk is managed within the school environment. Issues and concerns from the teachers of young people being a significant risk are not found in the discussions.

In terms of their own agency the teachers thought they could tailor their lessons to support the young person if they knew more. It is unclear if this is for all young people who show SHB. Teachers discuss how to minimise the stigma by peers of accessing support in school.

R: What would you like it to be?

S4: Dealt with outside. So the kids not targeted inside with other pupils.

R: So separate. So you feel like having that outside it feels that the label doesn't get stuck onto the child too much.

S4: Yeah. Cos once its labelled you can't take it off.

(G1: 681 - 683)

This is seen as a method to protect the relationship with teachers and to have a space in school which is not affected by the label.

S2: I think if they're labelled as well they think well I've been labelled with it, I might just as well continue to do it .

S3: Rum yeah sort of stigma.

S2: Kick back again. Against everything you try and put in place to support them.

(G2:392 - 396)

I do not feel as if this is seriously expressed that young people would just carry on, but I interpreted that teachers are expressing that to label is not positive for the child and if it is a known feature of a relationship it may create unnecessary tension.

Stigmatising labels such as perpetrator and offender are rarely used and the language used by the group has few emotive features. However during one story a young person had been convicted of a stranger rape.

S6: what makes it quite ooh gosh / [shocked (&)

S4 : [Scary

S6: (&) a few people because obviously there was something underlying where there was the need and it was very much a premediated from the CCTV waiting around [to find someone. (&)

S4: [Hunted . Hunting them down

S6: (&) you know [it wasn't (&)

S4: [Their prey

S6: (&) *someone that they knew and things got out of hand.*

(G1: 643 -653)

The use here of hunted and prey are the only times when the young person is talked about in descriptive or emotive language. Another time when 'victim' is used, the young person is termed 'pupil' rather than the opposite of 'perpetrator'. I interpreted this as a professional response in the role of the teacher. Young people are not perpetrators in school but pupils. It is when describing judicial proceedings that alternative descriptions are used.

I found one story particularly interesting as the teachers' narrative of negative stigma is not shared by the young person or his family. The teachers report that this pupil had bragged about what had happened. They feel his parents encouraged this and they did not know how to respond. There is no moral agreement between home and school. In fact there are opposing moral frameworks. The young person and adults in his home life offer different moral constructs for sexual behaviour, ones where the behaviour is not considered wrong. The teachers do not directly express that they want the parents to show regret and discomfort at their son's behaviour but they find it difficult to understand why they do not. Instead they draw on negative aspects of the home life to explain the behaviour. These include an overbearing father, a macho lifestyle and possible domestic violence. I interpreted their response as a sense of helplessness and confusion, possibly as the morality of the behaviour is not agreed or influenced. The behaviour is described as rape and as such an agreed version of events and responses is understood by society in general. This positions parents as colluding in the behaviour and not agreeing with perceived universal social norms.

Relationships are viewed as part of forming identity. Relationships include those with adults in school, with parents as well as with peers. The importance of relationships overlaps into other themes including perceptions of normal and the professional and personal voice. It is perceived as an important part of developing positive identity.

Relationships with adults in school are constructed as offering a guide to normal and appropriate, for them to offer support and guidance. The relationship created between some teachers and pupils is one where young people are understood as adolescents and where discussions of sexuality can take place. The interactions are constructed as being safe spaces. Relationships with young people are seen as crucial and teachers view themselves as offering positive constructs of identity especially sexuality and as a source of support for uncertainties and discussion of issues.

S6: if you've got someone else that's / got a lot going for them they can speak about their problems perhaps they can be/ you know persuaded not to take that route

(G2: 223 - 226)

Relationships with adults are perceived as more fragile when SHB is a factor. Teachers construct a change in some relationships with the young people who show SHB.

S1: It was really difficult for us to deal with because you know normally you wouldn't discuss anything like this in front of any other kids but it was him that was telling (everyone).

(G1: 256 - 258)

Teachers describe parents who are not supportive. One parent had an extreme response, describing their son as 'sick'. Another response previously mentioned from a was to support their son's behaviour:

S4: [His parents (&)]

S4: (&) his parents kind of liked that kind [of thing].

S1: [But they then (&)]

S4: (&) were the same as well really in a way weren't they. They were kind of proud [of it].

(G1: 259 – 263)

Relationships with peers are discussed in terms of fitting in and popularity (as earlier described). Those more popular young people do not lose friendships through inappropriate behaviour. Instead the behaviour is accepted by peers and the response of peers means that this is also more likely not to be challenged by some adults.

Two young people who show SHB are constructed as having few or no friendships. One is described as having difficult relationships with peers and teachers and one comment '*nobody liked him*' is made. The second young person is described by peers as '*a weak and sad character really*' (G1: 182). Interestingly there is little empathy expressed when discussing a young person who no-one liked. This appears to be contra to all the narratives of concern which are shared when teachers discuss theoretically.

S4: He wasn't liked anyway. (Laugh)

S1: No he wasn't like at all and he was working only in a very small, very small group. So/

S4: He had no friends

S1: No he had no friends and he wasn't he was what shall we say a very difficult young man anyway so he wasn't liked by =

S4: =Anybody.

(G1: 352 - 358)

The perception of having no friends is expressed as a loss of opportunity to connect to others to develop a range of skills and relationships. Interestingly the loss of a friendship for a young person who shows SHB occurred following an incident of harmful behaviour with two young people involved. The young person who was accused of rape lost a friendship as during the incident the two boys blamed each other. I was interested that this is not considered a loss, not spoken of in such terms but just as a matter of fact response to the situation. The narrative of loss may be protected for the loss of relationships constructed as positive by society.

Summary

Identity of adolescents is seen in terms of developing understanding and of young people needing specific considerations during adolescence. It is a time of developing sexuality and sometimes of uncertainty. The influence of the problem is interpreted as significant for the individual with labels and stigma impacting negatively. Relationships are identified as key with adults and with peers. The relationship with adults in school is spoken of as normalising with some adult relationships at home seen as not understanding the problem.

5.3 Theme three: The professional voice and personal voice

The following tables three and four identify the sub themes within professional voice and personal voice. The terms professional voice and personal voice are used to describe the difference between the professional response in the role of teacher and the emotional response as adults. Professional in this sense will include how the teachers view their professional role, the agency that teachers expressed within the school systems and some of the changes which teachers expressed as needing to occur for all young people. The personal voice will include when teachers expressed how they feel and the impact on themselves. The personal responses reflect some alternative narratives. I am not suggesting that within professional voice there is no personal or emotional response or that this is ignored. These are not discrete or opposite constructs but overlap.

Professional Voice

Table 3: Professional voice

Main theme	Sub Theme	Initial theme
Professional voice	Teacher influence	Support and intervention <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Positive influence• Influence in the classroom• Recognition of needs• Making a difference• Social and emotional, SRE curriculum Relationships as key –Changing behaviour Failure to Impact

	Systems	School processes and systems Critique of provision Changing Relationships Factors in support, CPD needs School culture External agencies Protection of children Professional Concerns
	Coping Mechanisms	Role of others Staff responses to emotional stresses

The professional response or voice is interpreted as narratives of the teachers' roles school systems and coping mechanisms. It considers personal influence in terms of agency, practical support that can be offered and influence within the context of school.

Teacher influence

Teachers view themselves as having a positive influence, both in terms of classroom practices and relationships.

Support and intervention by teachers are regularly referenced as an area of influence. Teachers report offering early intervention alongside responsive support in a holistic manner.

S5: you can identify it as well and put the intervention in before / and not just that specific piece of intervention. It's that whole picture of the child. It's like what else is happening so you can look at intervening in terms of socialisation before /it gets to be a problem.

(G2:776 - 778)

Intervention available at an early stage is perceived as supporting all development as well as in response to SHB.

S2: =I think you have to put intervention and strategies in place to try and help them change their behaviour so we've had quite a few other agencies that could

come into school / to actually talk through / relationships, / what's appropriate touching , what's inappropriate sort of going back to /going right back to basics really.

(G2:464 - 468)

The group construct stories of recognising the young person's needs and offering opportunities to normalise the child's experience of school. S6 states that she would cater her lessons around a young person with SHB; S5 talks about seating plans and the need to consider the space a young person was in. In both suggestions, there is agreement that it is the rationale behind the planning that is important. I interpreted this to mean that the young person and his/her needs underpin the offer of opportunities for a 'normal' experience and access to support within a school environment.

S5:[You've got this (&)

S6: [Yeah that's it

S5: (&) problem and I will be able to help by /trying to normalise the relationships, having you in the class and just [and just (&)

S6: []

S5: (&) sat on a table in a group or so you can so. I think different teachers will come at it from different directions.

(G2: 660-666).

The teachers construct their response as supportive not punitive or solely risk management. The ability to influence is seen to be important and the group construct their role as important in a child's life but in particular at times of difficulty.

S2: I think we have to give them opportunities /to be around other children. And we do don't we (name) A lot of the children have not just about SHB but for disruptive behaviour or anger management issues or whatever

(G2:489 – 492)

Making a difference is key. One teacher comments in the reflective log that teachers:

want to find reasons for behaviour because I think almost every member of staff at a school wants to try and change a pupil for the better.

(RL 1 para 1 Line 5-7)

The teachers construct the support of specific interventions as recognising and addressing needs. The teachers speak of successes in increasing self-esteem and identifying strengths. One teacher tells of the impact of a self-esteem intervention and how a young person feels valued afterwards. The story is of adults in the context influencing how a young person feels.

S2: he thinks people do value me. I am respected. And actually what I thought about what that teacher thought of me isn't true. Lots of people said I smile. Lots of people said and I think it really did help him

(G2: 977 -980)

This describes for me a tangible result. I interpreted that it shows influence and supports the teacher's identity as changing behaviour and helping young people.

Curriculum is an opportunity for change. A taught emotional and social curriculum is identified as important. Teachers state specific teaching has influence.

S2: And this is something we've discussed as a pastoral team because you know we should be having circle time even though we are a high school on a regular basis we should be having these conversations within school open discussions opportunities for kids to you know voice their opinions have debates.

(G2: 934 - 938)

Circle time on a regular basis is suggested as needing to be reintroduced as well as offering targeted group support. The teachers identify with the role of supporting at the universal level and increasing the contact with young people in subject areas. They

feel their setting has identified social and emotional curriculum as important whereas some schools do not engage in this area at all.

One teacher shares how the SRE curriculum and other classroom time could offer a space for discussion.

S6: when I'm doing lessons like SRE lessons on/ things you now I've done lessons on inappropriate behaviour or rape and assault and age of consent and different things like that I try to as much as I can get all of the peer group talking about what they think is acceptable and unacceptable

(G2:567 - 571)

She recognises that although this is an area of influence, it has limits.

S6: it's just really hard you know it's one lesson a week you know and you try I think hearing things from their peers.

(G2:584 - 586)

I interpreted that teachers feel they have agency and influence within curriculum, in lessons and by ensuring space to talk.

Challenging homophobia is also considered to be the role of the teacher and an area of influence. The same teacher saw opportunities in the school day which are available to have influence and offer a positive perspective.

S6: if a kid used the word oh that's gay or something else, I would feel confident enough no matter what the lesson was to stop it and say oh that's a strange use of work that what that word that's quite offensive and do all that so I think with some teachers it might be I think they might be see something that they think oh gosh that's a bit / but then they might think cos it's about sex ultimately might feel a bit embarrassed or perhaps=

(G2:622-628)

By suggesting there is a need to offer this narrative I interpreted that the teachers are stating their belief of normal within the school but recognise that not all teachers would feel comfortable in these discussions.

The teachers do not focus on learning and recognise this only briefly within the discussion.

S6: But the fact that they had rubbish home lives and / weren't doing very well at school and things/ pushed them over the edge. Whereas if you've got someone else that's / got a lot going for them they can speak about their problems perhaps they can be/ you know persuaded not to take that route. I mean that's just what I

(G2: 221 - 226)

Doing well at school is framed here as a protective factor. The view of education and learning as a significant factor has little focus in the discussions possibly as teachers see learning as the universal offer and an accepted central role of school and therefore they do not explicitly state this.

The teachers frequently refer to relationships as a key component of what is vital within school. Teachers' relationships have been highlighted in previous themes, influencing understanding of normal and in developing identity. The teachers in the group construct their relationships with young people as being open. The need for 'good' relationships is framed as a professional role. Key individuals, often pastoral staff, offer support and someone to talk to. Teachers feel that they can approach young people about topics which are possibly sensitive, e.g. sexually transmitted infections, and that they have skills which would increase understanding and offer a balanced perspective.

I interpreted these relationships as vital for safeguarding.

S2: somebody to come and build up that relationship

[a little bit more (&)

S6: *[yeah*

S2: *(& so they feel quite safe talking to them and knowing that actually if they do disclose and sort of say this person is going to help me then [I think we've lost that a little bit*

(G2:893 -898)

S3: *And that's one of the key aspects in it. Being a pastoral worker having them talk with the children .Knowing they can come knock at the door anytime and say I just need to talk and probably would let out stuff that you wouldn't under other circumstances feel.*

(G2: 900 -903)

The relationship with the adults is a protective factor and offers a space to reflect, share and be safe for young people. Teachers position themselves as someone to talk to and offer examples where young people have spoken to them about how they feel.

S6: *boys have been saying oh he looks at me in a funny/ or he touches me in a way that makes me feel [uncomfortable*

(G1: 285 - 287)

Whilst there is lots of discussion about influence there are factors where a failure to influence is identified. I will return to this theme within personal voice. However their construction of why it is difficult to influence is underpinned by some rationales.

Teachers speak of professional concerns such as environments outside of their control as having influence. Home background and parent's views have been referred to previously but barriers to influence also included the age of the young person. I

interpreted that the group consider older teens as being less easily influenced than younger teens.

S5: (&) before before it's gone beyond/ a point

S6: yeah

S5: that we can actually influence [and change it.

(G2:844 -846)

It may be that a younger person is perceived as still developing their understanding or being uncertain about sexual behaviours and that this is an area where an adult could have influence. I also wondered if teachers feel that they have less influence in general at that age and that peer influence holds more sway.

Systems

Teachers spoke of school systems and the support and influence it has. Teachers look for ways to improve their understanding of individuals via school systems. The discussion speaks of how their school can improve its recording systems and processes to support their understanding of holistic needs and identification of whole school development needs.

S3: A professional way of looking at it.=

S2: =We've got a couple of kids we discussed last time like Bob Yeah we probably do need to print his behaviour record out from the day [he s (&)

S6: [see yeah

S2: (&) and actually if you highlighted I bet it would tell you a story

(G2:793 - 798)

They critique their systems in terms of curriculum offer, SEAL and PSHCE. The group also consider the systems in place and how information could tell a different story and possibly offer more insight into the experience of the young person. A practical application of early identification is discussed. I interpreted this as an attempt to gain agency but also as a professional response to a difficult construct to understand.

I was interested that teachers consider the inconsistent use of language when describing incidents.

S2: (&) you know assault he's probably called her and been verbally abusive to her or they'll you know they'll say it's physically rather than sexual assault.

(G2:810 - 812)

S2: (&) And I think that's the other thing as well isn't it. It's how people describe it

[and label it (&)]

(G2:815 - 816)

They recognise the variability in language and how this adds to an imprecise system. I interpreted that the school's system is well understood and teachers recognise the possibilities for improved practice within. It feels positive and pragmatic and fits with the teachers understanding of their role as making a difference.

Relationships within this theme focus also on changing aspects of the school system, how relationships support young people and the need to consider relationships within the system.

Relationships in school are constructed as different from primary school.

S2: (&) And it gets lost I think because schools happen so quick so many staff putting things on. Whereas in a primary school maybe year six teacher would have remembered actually you know.

(G2:773 -775)

Through this I interpreted that teachers identify consistency and knowing a child as important.

The relationship with adults is spoken of as a protective factor, and relationships as key has already been mentioned. The group comment on changes in school that have occurred in terms of relationships i.e. having fewer pastoral staff and losing closeness with pupils. Changes in the school context are constructed as a cause of decreased chances to talk. In general teachers perceive the school as having fewer opportunities for talk and less personal contact and connectedness between adults and young people across the school. This impacts all young people including those with more specific needs. They express this as a loss of flexibility in these relationships.

The teachers recognise that there are CPD needs for the whole staff, that not all adults are viewed the same by young people and not all teachers feel comfortable speaking about these issues. One teacher comments on CPD:

S6: I think we could do with I think/ cos it's difficult with us sort of sitting here cos obviously by the very nature of us being here were all quite / comfy do you know what I mean

(G2: 710-712)

The group recognise that some young people feel more comfortable with certain teachers.

S4: =But it's the same with the kids it's who you're comfortable to talk to . Kids will come who they're comfortable to talk to. It's just like staff. Who you're confident in talk to =

S6:=The kids can spot a mile off if [a teacher is you (&)

S4: [yeah yeah

S6: (&) just can't help but be embarrassed about that stuff and that's just intimate

(G2:714 - 720)

These relationships are influenced by individual constructions of sexuality, identity and by the young people's view of the adult. By constructing some teachers as not being adults who young people would like to talk to, I interpreted that the participants are expressing that they are teachers who are approachable. One teacher says that there is a variation in confidence and explains how she would tackle a situation with homophobic language or inappropriate comments. I interpreted her words as a suggestion that having good relationships and being confident offers better outcomes for young people. Within the whole discussion it feels as if the relationship these teachers have is being framed as preferable for the young people and ones which offer insight into developing the skills of all.

The culture of the school is identified as needing to support open conversations and change

S5: Don't you think though that schools . um really we don't talk about this . We certainly don't have an open culture from what I've seen. You know we talk like you say we challenge homophobic bullying and use of homophobic words and things but its the culture of the school one where this sort of thing is you're able to discuss it quite normally and openly. That all staff feel that they can be clear about where the boundaries are and what to do.

(G2:703-709)

At one point a teacher refers to the discourse that is available in school.

S2: And I think maybe as a school we don't done awful lot of sort SEAL activities. /We have assemblies once well once a week isn't it but the content of that sometimes we're not talking about all these=

S3:= Everyday life things/ what's gone on you know we don't talk about this. Stuff it's structured isn't it? It's just

(G2:904 - 908)

Being responsive to young people is seen as providing more than a structured approach to engaging issues.

The teachers express the need for external support from those who know more about SHB. They recognised the possible school role in regard to some problematic behaviour. However I interpreted that the unknown of SHB is considered beyond their professional understanding. There is a willingness to offer support, but I wondered if for those young people who show significantly harmful behaviour the teachers feel more expertise is warranted. The need for a therapeutic approach or expertise is discussed:

S2: Youth offending usually have therapeutic /

S3: [social workers

S2: [counselling (&)

S2: (&) and therapeutic couns / social workers working with the children and with the families/

S3: And they have therapy and everything [don't they

(G1: 557 - 563)

Whilst teachers look to advice from external agencies at times placing them as experts they still question thinking;

S3: (&) How can you give somebody 6 sessions and call it a cure?

(G1 589);

However, the external agency voice is mostly accepted and it is often positioned as offering a therapeutic response.

Risk is mentioned in terms of protection of children and the teachers feel they have a responsibility to protect.

S4: (&) I feel uncomfortable cos the possibility of the of the other children's safety lays in our hands [all the time

(G1: 578)

Whilst the discussion mentions risk the teachers do not seem to overly focus on this and they feel the school environment protects young people from risk.

S1: (&) he was you know he was so closely monitored when he was in school but it's out in the big wide world where /the risk/ is.

(G1:602 - 603)

Instead they recognise the difficulty with the balance between supporting the individual and safety of others.

S2: And I think if you have any sort of behaviour plan or risk assessment in place for a child you have to have some strategies and //interventions running alongside that as well.

(G2:473 - 475)

Professional concern is shown in terms of changes made to educational provision and in terms of impact both current and future impact. This of course holds an element of empathy, which is part of the professional role. Loss and impact is considered in an 'objective' manner looking at practical impacts not emotional impacts on the young person. Narratives of the loss of relationships, loss of rights and access and a loss of future opportunities are offered.

An immediate consequence is a lack of access to 'normal' schooling. One young person lost access to his alternative provision and it is difficult following the incident to place him.

S1: But it is so difficult to find alternative placements for people who been involved in SHB and particularly as I think both of these boys Umm they were both on an alternative curriculum and the incident had happened not at the alternative curriculum but to a girl to different girls that went there so they were very reluctant to have those boys back there . And in fact one of those came back into school on the back of that cos he couldn't go back there cos the girl was there. And we couldn't find anywhere could we that we could place him.

(G1:493 -502)

The young person is placed on a reduced timetable. Education is viewed as a vehicle for change and for growth in western society and the opportunity to access it is restricted or lost for this young person. It is not stated whether that is an acceptable loss or not. There are few comments about the justness or not of this and there is no indication of an emotional response in these statements.

For actions specifically labelled as SHB, impacts are listed in terms of how the young person is perceived and how the label can limit access to aspects of life. Teachers are concerned that the young people would be significantly impacted in the future. This sense of loss already mentioned is significant for the adults. I feel they recognise the judgements made about the young people would define them. One teacher shows concern of the impact on prospects:

S2: That closed a lot of doors before they've even opened as [well (&)

S5: [yeah

S2: (&) just because people might find out before they even meet you. When you're looking at/ college courses or something in the future.

(G2:364 - 367)

S5: we know as adults how hard it is just surviving getting a job and this that and the other and you just think [poor kid..

(G2:1004 - 1005)

Through expressing concern about the young person I feel that the adults focus on the wider perspective. They identify with how the problem, if known about by others, would be significant and possibly life changing.

Coping Mechanisms

The teachers talked about coping mechanisms in relation to SHB. Throughout the discussion is 'professional', even though it is a sensitive topic. I asked directly how making decisions about these young people felt and the response is as follows.

S2: [You detach yourself (&]

S2: (&) really don't you. I definitely do. You have to detach yourself. cause you have to make sure that there's risk assessment in place and that you know we've got a duty of care not to the child whose displayed that sort of behaviour but to everybody else as well. So I think you I have to take my feelings and emotions out of that and just basically / it's on paper . That's what we have to follow.

R: So do you feel...

S2: It's a bit clinical really I suppose.

S6: But I think you have I suppose in your role.

(G2:449 -458)

Having a more detached approach may be equated with being able to do the job and not being effected by emotion. I interpreted this to be how 'professional' should look i.e. objective. It is interesting to me that being detached is justified by the others. At another time the narrative given is again defended by others within the group offering a professional support or endorsement of that position. The professional position is taken by offering a non-emotional response to concerns raised. Whilst few entries in reflective logs are written one participant writes that surprise was her main emotion. She continues to say:

I think the discussion was quite matter of fact really.

Mostly the teachers choose narratives which are balanced. Their understanding of the future consequences expresses an irretrievable loss of other factors of the person. It feels as if there is an overwhelming sense that SHB could define the young person. This may be one possible interpretation of the sense of loss and the need to intervene before it happens.

Personal voice

Personal voice is the term I have used to signify the subjective response. This is not to deny personal as part of the teacher's role, but to recognise the aspects of emotionality as an alternative to objectivity. The personal voice offers an alternative narrative and positions the teacher as concerned adult, connecting to the young person as another person. It allows expressions of uncertainty and doubt, of questions not answered within known and accepted truths. As the group explored a range of possible factors which contribute to SHB it naturally constructs some difficulty in thinking what the role of the adult is. A sense of agency is constructed when talking of the teacher and school role, but there is a lack of agency when focusing on the SHB. Discussion arose about the uncertainties and dilemmas and this brought into the discussion the young person as connected to the adult and their personal connection to the dilemmas. This theme will explore the narrative of the emotional or personal response and then the tensions from uncertainty and dilemmas which have risen.

Table four: Theme three Personal voice

Main theme	Sub Theme	Initial theme
Personal Voice	Emotional responses	Empathy with child Sense of loss Young person's needs Dilemma Reflections on self Personal Coping

	Uncertainty	Influence of SHB on adult Reflection on role Responsibility of risk
	Dilemma	Punitive or supportive change Language – what’s normal not normal Child or adult Opportunity and Protection New relationships

Emotional responses

The professional voice offers containment, of not being overwhelmed by the emotional aspects. The emotional response is less often spoken of. Teachers share a wide perspective, of liberal narratives about sexuality, practical support for the young person and an understanding of the difficult cultural issues for some young people and their families. The lack of emotion spoken about may possibly be as the teachers feel less connected to a story that has been retold several times.

I interpreted an absence of emotional response describing these significant events in this professional context. The young person who had raped a woman is storied as being influenced by his family and peers. There is an implicit understanding that the young person’s actions are wrong and a resigned sense of incredulity that a family would support this.

S5: (&) look at why and where that comes from cos what you’re talking about there is identified is there anyone that can work with them cos what you’re talking about there is a like boy/ that/ has come from a family where/ raping a/ young girl/ raping a/ 14 15 year old is a good thing.

(G1: 540 - 544)

Some emotional responses empathise with the young person. There is for the direct impact that SHB has but for one teacher the emotional response seems more accented.

S5: that loss of privacy must be awful

(G2 :403 -404)

Through the dilemma of rights versus safety of others, this teacher feels that a young person needs privacy and freedom to develop.

S5: It curtails your freedom as well. It puts you in a gold fish bowl. You've got no privacy. I think especially when they're growing up. You know teenagers need a huge amount of privacy. They need to figure out who they are.

(G2:398 - 401)

This freedom and privacy is less available to one who had been identified as showing SHB. This view is not denied by others but heard in the reflective space. The same teacher shows empathy for specific situations and recognises how hard it could be:

S5: I can't even imagine, but if you come from a family and your you know got questions on your sexuality and your parents aren't willing to / accept they might have a son or daughter [whose gay it must be an absolute nightmare.

(G2:545 – 549)

Sexuality and acceptance is a theme that emerged and teachers speak in terms of how difficult this could be.

S6: but then it sometimes the double - how that's probably I'm sure going back into himself and his own/ you know trying to deal deal with it himself do you know it's almost like a/ really a sort of double [laughs] cos you know you know its difficult /sort of going both ways really.

(G1: 295 -299)

Teachers recognise the difficulties young men experience with accepting their own homosexuality. In the sessions it came across as empathy, not only understanding the difficulties that it would represent to their identity alone and in terms of their families and communities, but a feeling of sadness about it.

One young person is talked about in terms of his life history. He came from Afghanistan the teachers tell a story of coming to the UK alone and being treated like and adult. It is spoken again with sadness that a child was housed alone in a flat and there was no support.

S4: (&) And you'd hate to see a child in a flat.

(G1: 709)

Strong feelings are expressed, when talking about possibilities and focussing on the child.

S6: (&) I think it's really upsetting, because just going back to / It's hard because even though they've done things that are just awful awful evil things/ but it you keep going back its just heart-breaking they're kids I can't they're kids and before they've even left school they've gone on to do this and what the hell has happened in their life to get them to that point. And we know as adults how hard it is just surviving getting a job /and this that and the other and you just think [poor kid

(G2:999 - 1005)

I wondered if stronger emotion is evoked when talking about reality and the lives of children and young people they know instead of SHB as a problem?

The teachers reflect on their own role in the young person's life and doubt in their actions. They are concerned that they may not have noticed the young person, that they did not do enough or they contributed to the problem.

S5: I mean its its I know with Bob I must admit that I look back and I reflect and I think was I responsible for pushing at all for moving him down that road. Was there anything I did that you know isolated him a bit more or identified him and

made him be excluded from/ you know his group or/ I mean he's an extreme case but there are others. We have had other cases and I just think well did I make that worse or did I make that better?

(G2: 1008 -1014)

They talk about being worried, upset and uncertain that they had not recognised the needs in the young people and instead had made the problem bigger. Although one teacher recognises it is irrational and that they are not responsible for the behaviour of others, they consider a level of responsibility for a missed opportunity for a different outcome. I interpreted the narratives to mean that the teacher feel responsibility for young people and not being able to influence provokes an emotional response. This uncertainty offers an emotional space where personal agency is reflected upon.

The reflective logs, whilst few, offered privacy to share emotions. One teacher comments:

As a teacher it's really depressing when you realise that pupils will take part in a deviant/inappropriate/risky behaviour even though those issues have been explored in class with you!

(RL1 11-13,)

And:

I always feel a bit pointless. (RL1, 14)

The teacher also used words *frustrated* and *gutted* to describe her feelings wishing he/he could do more to help. This teacher stated:

you feel gutted for everyone involved, the perpetrator, victim and the families.

(RL1:16-17)

This was the only reference to impact on others.

In the other reflective log the teacher talked about getting angry at behaviour. This teacher also shared he/she:

'feel(s) uncomfortable and sometimes embarrassed if they address any comments at me'.

(RL 2, 6-7)

The group forum may have restricted sharing of these comments.

Coping mechanisms have been discussed as part of the professional response. Through discussion of the dilemmas aspects of an emotional response are referred to. When the group is asked how it then feels to monitor a young person an act which denies them certain rights one teacher says:

S5: I don't want to do it. I don't ... But /. You're caught between keeping everybody safe. Because you don't want (the young person)

(G2: 446 -448)

This teacher recognises the personal and professional debate. When a doubt about being clinical is spoken of, the group offer support justifying the lack of emotion as being a necessary part of the role. A doubt or query is responded to and justified in light of the experience of others. In another example a doubt is raised about an outside agency statement. The response is a justification of their judgement as it is based on expert knowledge. I interpreted this that the teachers construct others as having knowledge. Experts offer counselling and therapeutic support outside of school, with the family or child or sometimes not at all.

S4: I don't think we get any support. It's all outside of school that meet with family. It's all outside school not in school.

(G2: 672-673)

I interpreted this lack of support as a frustration with the system.

The balancing of responsibility of risk alongside rights is spoken of as significant and some of the teachers describe this balance as uncomfortable.

S4: I feel uncomfortable cos the possibility of the of the other children's safety lays in our hands [all the time

S1: [Yeah I don't think it's (&

S1: (&) I think it's even more than that. It's the /young person's future and what that young person might do to somebody/ in the future as [well

(G1: 503 - 513)

The teachers describe the level of responsibility they feel being aware of everyone's safety. Having a rationale may ease some of the discomfort. It did not negate it and many dilemmas remain.

Uncertainty and dilemma

Uncertainty and dilemma are posed throughout the narratives, with teachers questioning each other's and their own thoughts. Teachers do not deliver a fully formed narrative of a phenomenon which is understood. This narrative has a dynamic aspect and brings forward a reflective space, posing dilemmas both moral and professional.

Uncertainty is not only used as a negative description. The term may conjure the picture of rendering an individual unable to act. It could describe ambiguity or plurality, a situation where one cannot form one decision or belief. Here the uncertainty described is also one which offers a range of reflections and possibilities on SHB and the role of the teacher. This section will briefly reflect on the uncertainties in previous themes as they have already been highlighted and then consider the directly spoken dilemmas.

Uncertainty of explanations of normal and not normal

The group recognise that normal is difficult to know and define, that it is a fluid construct and that it is influenced by a range of factors. Within the discussion there remains an uncertainty about how SHB develops. There is often no conclusion or agreement and the teachers pose questions of why. The uncertainty is in the consistency between adults and the lack of understanding of the behaviour.

Uncertainties in Identity

Uncertainty in identity of a young person is considered normal. Adolescence is expected to bring with it a lack of knowing and having to experience and 'try things out'. This is part of growing up and developing a sense of self. The uncertainty is in relation to sexuality, understanding relationships and negotiating interactions with peers. Supporting the development of a young person is seen as part of the adult role. Adults and their understanding of normal and acceptable are seen as key, bringing certainty to the teenagers' understanding. This is an interesting aspect of uncertainty as the teachers accept it as a natural part of 'growing up.'

Uncertainty in the professional and personal voice

Uncertainty here is held in the dilemmas posed and the strength of the differing perspectives. The teachers express tension between their emotional/personal responses and the professional roles they position themselves within. I have interpreted these as uncertainties and dilemmas. In using the term dilemma I am not assuming a moral hierarchy but rather decisions of the professional voice which are questioned. The dilemmas highlight the practices of an organisation, how these aspects are implemented and the issues they raise. Throughout the sessions, uncertainties and dilemmas are either posed through alternative narratives to consider or through direct challenge of themselves. Whilst they do not appear with frequency, I interpreted these as alternatives, inconsistencies and juxta posed with some of the more frequently discussed concerns.

Dilemmas

Opportunity versus protection of others

S5: Would you allow that pupil to go and to just be free? In that park when you stand in loco parentis. We have to be sure that that child would be safe.

(G2: 375 - 377)

The teacher expresses a dilemma which I interpreted as intending to highlight rather than judge. Within the classroom there is agreement to offer opportunity to young people to normalise their experiences. Being with others, sitting in the classroom and taking part in whole class lessons are talked about as ways to offer a normal experience. The dilemma is how much normality can the school offer? For the young person who had raped a woman he did not access a mainstream school experience.

S1: =But he he was just in our learning support unit on a very reduced timetable.

(G1: 479 - 480)

For two young people discussed one is not allowed to go back to an alternative provision the other had an adult escort him to lessons. They did not access a normal experience but this choice is not disputed. The will to engage in a theoretical debate is present but I wondered if in a real-life discussion of a pupil the same rights to a normal education would be defended.

Teachers recognise that to restrict a young person has impact.

S5: if somebody's constantly like 'what are you doing?' And then it's almost like as you say there's that expectation / well you know he can't get any worse so//

(G2:401 - 403)

The teachers proceed to share an alternative aspect of individual rights.

S5: But I do think that loss of privacy must be awful /You know. And your loss of freedom. I mean if you're constantly monitored. You can't just go out in the

playground and have a normal conversation or a kick about with a football. And those normal normal relationships don't develop.

(G2 403 - 407)

The teachers raised the dilemma of whether a young person who shows SHB has the right to a relationship.

S6: And if you then go on to get a girlfriend or a boyfriend , can you imagine do you know what I mean if there someone that you knew as a school had this had happened and then/ they were getting romantically close to a pupil then that brings up a whole

S5: Yeah

S6: do you know what I mean then because normally a teacher won't go in and get involved in that because ... but then what would happen in that situation. [I don't know (&)]

(G2: 408 - 415)

The dilemma became whether they should intervene. Theoretically the rights to the opportunity are perceived as essential but when considering a future intimate relationship, the rights become less definite. Teachers talk about normalising experiences. They share that learning about relationships happens in actions and they recognise the right to privacy. I interpreted the dilemma and doubt about a new intimate relationship queried acceptance of some of these rights.

The teachers feel uncomfortable with some of these dilemmas and are uncertain about how theoretical differences or alternatives are put into practice. The narratives of the rights of the individual stated earlier are difficult to implement in real situations. Some teachers in the group offer an emotional response to restricting young people. They explicitly say they do not want to monitor young people and being detached is a response. One teacher says, *'I don't want to do it'*.

Child versus adult

S4: The child might think in age he's a child but in mind he might not be a child.

(G1: 624 - 425)

The phrases child, young person, teenager and adult are used at different times. I wondered as the group member spoke if it is intentional or reflective of the position the teachers were taking. The distinction was made a number of times. A young person was housed in a flat alone. This is constructed as not acceptable for a 'child'. I interpreted the use of child to recognise a protective element and position the child as vulnerable. The uncertainty of when sexuality is accepted uses constructs of child and adult as references.

S4: Those feelings in between/ he's still doing it like a child.

(G1:184 - 185)

There is an uncertainty of this 'in between' stage, the uncertainty of their understanding and consequently how the young person should be judged. The dilemma is, are they a child or not?

Danger versus child

This difficulty with the construct of a child is raised again when described as dangerous.

*S5: but I think it is if someone comes in and says they are a danger or they're are a risk there's sometimes what runs through my head it's like 'They are a child'.
You yeah / Danger / I sometimes find it sometimes really difficult to think about a child being that dangerous.*

(G1: 606 - 610)

This resonated with me when it was spoken. The story of a child versus the dangerous nature of an act is a dichotomy. The story of the young person's home life is understood as linked to the behaviour. The teacher describes a situation where an almost inordinate number of factors within this young person's life could explain his

behaviour. It feels that to describe a child as dangerous is not plausible. There is a possible alternative about how he should be treated considering his circumstances are beyond his control, how the teachers could influence and even more so why one should make even more attempts to support with this child. Or possibly he should not be treated as a child?

Clinical versus personal

Mentioned already is the need to be clinical to protect oneself. Yet it is questioned. Do we need to be 'clinical' as adults when working with young people who have done significantly harmful things?

S5: [At some point]. But then I think you have to moderate that with what you think what you think is going to happen to them

(G2: 461 -463)

This may be an alternative to the professional role as teacher which reflects on the internal dilemma of responding as a teacher but recognises the impact. Not wanting to carry out monitoring is in conflict with being in role of a teacher.

S2: (&) really don't you. I definitely do. You have to detach yourself. cause you have to make sure that there's risk assessment in place and that you know we've got a duty of care not to the child whose displayed that sort of behaviour but to everybody else as well. So I think you I have to take my feelings and emotions out of that and just basically / it's on paper. That's what we have to follow.

(G2:450 -455)

Openness in school versus confidentiality

Teachers question whether they should know about the pupils and their SHB. Raised in the second session, one teacher had also written that she felt she would want to

know so she could be influential. I wonder if the dilemma here is if it is secret then there is little chance to recognise the role of school and the interactions within.

My dilemma – the professional voice of the outsider

I am aware that as the teachers spoke about external agencies supporting them, they place emphasis on their expertise and knowledge being 'greater'. The teachers construct the external professional as being knowledgeable, as having answers for example counselling and sometimes not recognising that they need to be and remain involved.

One teacher spoke of danger:

S2: the Youth Offending Service have said well that one of in particular, is one of the most dangerous young people that they've kind of come across.

(G1: 580 -582)

The dilemma is to openly expose this language or to remain silent. I chose not to comment here. I wonder if the dilemma I felt was evident to me as the impact of the language was significant. Had it been language that I recognised as enabling would I be less aware or less concerned? By setting up a forum to discuss within a doctoral thesis the participants have a perspective of me possibly as an expert. I chose to share at times but not respond when dilemmas were voiced even though I felt strongly about some of the issues. I recognise that I influence the research and hold a position within the research.

Summary

Professional and personal voice offers a liminal space of tension. It is through this tension that there are alternative narratives to the dominant professional role. The dilemmas which are raised are not to be solved but to express alternatives and concern for the holistic needs of the young person. I felt the overwhelming instinct is for the professional voice to hold prominence. Yet the fact that the personal voice is

shared is meaningful and offers a narrative which is less frequently expressed but still available.

5.4 Conclusion

The overall impression of the focus groups is of holistic understandings of young people. Three themes are analysed within the transcripts: of normal and not normal, developing identity and of professional and personal voice. A theme of uncertainty is found within each theme. Uncertainty and dilemmas are discussed between the professional and personal voice.

The following chapter will consider these themes in light of the research questions and critical literature review. Conclusions and implications will follow.

Chapter Six

Discussion and reflections

The aim of the study is to explore how SHB is talked about in the school context. This The final chapter discusses the outcomes and implications of this study and reflects on the implications for working within schools and for EPs supporting schools.

The first part of this chapter focuses on the research questions, reflecting upon the how teachers talk about young people who show SHB and the role of school and considers the analysis alongside the literature review. Whilst three themes emerged I found the theme of the personal and professional voice particularly interesting as it highlighted areas of dilemma and alternative narratives within personal or emotional responses. Narrative research recognises the interpretive nature and the position of the researcher within it (Kohler Riessman 2008). As such I will reflect briefly on this area of interest to me and then discuss implications of the research for individuals and the wider system. I will conclude with limitations and cautions of the research and considerations for future research.

The aim of the study is to explore teachers' narratives of young people who show SHB, if the narratives reflect current research and the dominant and alternative narratives in school. The research questions are:

- 1 How do teachers talk about young people who show sexually harmful behaviour?
- 2 How do teachers construct the role of school for young people who show sexually harmful behaviour?

6.1 Research Questions

6.1.1 How do teachers talk about young people who show SHB? Reflections on the themes

Identifying SHB - normal and not normal

What is harmful and what is problematic can be difficult to distinguish and the discussion about SHB ranged from that which is easily defined as harmful through to behaviours which are problematic and those which are inappropriate within the school

context. What is SHB is intertwined with how normal is interpreted and often harmful is used as a signifier for a problem within the school i.e. something out of the norm. When talking about SHB these teachers talked about the full spectrum of behaviour including sexually inappropriate, problematic and harmful behaviour, and recognised how an individual's behaviour is interpreted alongside existing narratives. SHB was one aspect of the continuum in this discussion.

The narratives of normal understood young people in terms of their behaviour and how they are perceived. They recognise that peers and adults perceive normal and acceptable differently. For peers what is accepted is sometimes seen as not appropriate by adults. There is a strong narrative of support with young people needing guidance and being vulnerable to sexual behaviour judged by adults as inappropriate e.g. inappropriate sexual language. The narrative of sexual language and inappropriate attitudes within the school supports the idea of the oversexualised world (Papadopoulos 2010). These assumptions have a basis in an adult accepted western centric definition of sexuality (James and Prout, 1997). The themes offered some insight into the understanding of young people as sexual. De Bruijn, Burrie and van Wel (2006) found that when exploring sexuality youths risk transgressing boundaries and need to negotiate complex layers of understanding. The question is what is acceptable transgression when one is learning? Young people appeared to accept sexual behaviours from those who are attractive and popular. How is that different to adult behaviour? It may be that this behaviour is seen as risky in teenagers. De Bruin et al (2006) concluded that by engaging in risky behaviours young people can be both victims and perpetrators as they explore their own boundaries and those of others. There were some narratives from teachers which recognised that for one young person it might be a normal but new behaviour and that in its newness mistakes could be made. This an area which would benefit from further exploration including the assumptions which reflect the power differences between adult and adolescent understandings of normal and the positions young people are allowed to adopt.

Defining normal is recognised as difficult. The understanding of normal is dynamic and changes between contexts. The narratives identify different norms for different cultures, communities and groups of people and for identify the family culture as creating understanding of norms i.e. impacted by ethnicity and cultural background. Whilst ethnicity is identified in some research when collecting data about young people who are in the youth justice system and show SHB e.g. Vizard et al (2007), there is little research in the SHB literature which refers to the impact of culture on shaping an understanding of norms and SHB and it is recognised as lacking in general within the SHB research literature.

As part of the narrative of normal, teachers are aware of the influence of their own experiences on their perceptions and that it can lead to inconsistency between adults. Personal factors influence the perception of normal (Vosmer, Hackett and Callanan 2009) and decisions of normal and not normal are based on the professionals' personal beliefs. These are influenced by societal norms and societal values. This will have an impact on the response to behaviours. There is no suggestion that there is a moral overtone in terms of professional views which judges young people and any considerations of moral issues are rarely raised in the SHB literature. However there is a societal expectation that individuals who are part of the criminal justice systems accept some responsibility and some interventions seek 'taking responsibility' as a desirable aim (Hackett 2003).

Normal is storied as a perception that is frail and variable and although societal norms were supported in the school i.e. equality and tolerance of difference, it was stated that at a local or micro level, normal has more variations and is more nuanced. Gergen (1985) suggests that action is recognised within relationships, as part of a relational history and within traditions of constraint. Teacher's recognition of the role of interaction reflects this theoretical position. The teachers construct problematic or normal as understood through perception, influenced by individual experience and interaction. It places the understanding of normal within interaction rather than within the young person's behaviour and therefore understood through experience.

Within professional communities there are a range of terms used to describe and identify this behaviour and the definitions vary (Masson and Hackett, 2003). A lack of definition continues to be an area of professional debate (Ryan et al, 1996) and one which the recent review of progress has identified as continuing to lack consistency (Smith et al, 2014). It may be more helpful within the school context to describe the behaviours and the context rather than rely on technical language and a perception of normal and acceptable. The Department of Health (2006) states:

'Due to the lack of knowledge regarding 'normal sexual development' and childhood sexuality it is difficult to define sexually harmful behaviours committed by young people.

(Department of Health 2006, p4)

Normal development of sexual behaviour is not well documented and there is little research in schools as to the perception of the norms around sexual behaviour. This research supports Ryan's (2000a) research with other professionals i.e. that teachers also want to know more about what normal sexual behaviour looks like. However in this school it would be a local understanding of normal that teachers wanted to explore, interpreting normal within their context and their individual position.

One of the concerns of identifying SHB was the negative impact of the label. This narrative of stigma is spoken of as young people being stigmatised by this label and their short and long-term future could be impacted. Knowing i.e. being labelled, could change a teacher's perception of the young person and there is uncertainty whether teachers and ultimately fellow pupils would benefit from being aware of the SHB. Young people are concerned about their schools knowing about their SHB (Hackett and Masson 2006) and their concerns are justified considering negative community responses (Hackett, Masson, Balfe and Phillips 2015). Research supports the aspiration to combat stigmatising effects of SHB labels and this view is heavily supported in the drive to use terminology which recognises the behaviour and young person as separate (Hackett 2004) and the growth of intervention approaches in which the young person is central (Myers 2002). Using the terminology focuses the teachers

on the behaviour which they find difficult to understand. When focused on the young person instead the discussion was more directed towards needs, action and solutions. Ryan (2000b) in her training programme emphasises the assumption to the trainees that:

'Any child can become confused about sexuality and demonstrate some deviant or abusive behaviour without being doomed to sexual pathology.'

(Ryan 2000a p41)

Labels '*deny the complex nature of the behaviour*' (Myers 2002, p339) and young people are '*encouraged to find different and more positive ways of conceptualising themselves*' (Myers 2002 p342). The use of narrative approaches and the attention to language may offer a path for professionals to gain access to the unique experience and meaning to the young person. Social constructionism recognises the lived experience of individuals and narrative offers the vehicle to tell the story of these experiences. Myers (2005) suggests that local knowledge of the young person is key when offering support and this suggests these child centred approaches which do not stigmatise may be more conducive to the school context.

Developing sexually harmful behaviour

The theme of how SHB develops explored how a range of characteristics, backgrounds and needs have influence with no single factor being viewed as the sole cause of the behaviour. It showed a more complex understanding. This perspective mirrors much of the research, identifying influencing factors for young people such as possible abuse (e.g. Ryan et al 1996, Manocha and Mezey 1998), characteristics such as learning needs (e.g. Ryan, 1996), social and emotional difficulties (e.g. Almond 2006, Vizard, 2007), social isolation/ rejection from peers (e.g. Vizard 2007) and traumatic home circumstances (e.g. Hutton and Whyte 2009). The range of factors teachers talked about as possibilities agrees with the research findings that this is a heterogeneous group (Hackett 2004).

S6: I think all the pupils we've sort of talked about because they've had a lot of other/ behavioural things going on it's never really been just that

(G: 774-776)

What was interesting was teachers also recognised that many of the features of young people who show SHB are the same features for young people the teachers work with every day who show other behaviour issues (O'Halloran 2002). This is a perspective which has developed within the SHB literature but is not present in earlier intervention models or practices which apply adult models to children and young people. Teachers already recognise in their daily practice the commonalities between young people who show SHB and other behaviour problems e.g. anti-social behaviour supporting research such as Rutter et al (1999) and Vizard et al (2006) and that some young people who show harmful and problematic behaviour have none of these additional needs (Ryan et al 1996). One group member highlights that narratives of a young person would not have perceived them as a risk.

When talking about the young person the dominant narratives that teachers offer are holistic. They recognise the influence of sexuality particularly and of cultural understanding. This theme agrees with research that young people should be considered within their developmental levels and understandings (Hackett 2004) and within a cultural lens (Boyden 1997). Teacher perspectives appear liberal and enlightened compared to some of the criminal justice research, unburdened by the need to take responsibility for the criminal actions and being able to see their role as supporting the holistic needs of an individual.

Telling the story of an individual feels as if there are more details which can be drawn upon. Stories of young people gave multiple facets to explore and a range of possible factors, characteristics, backgrounds and uniqueness of the context to make meaning from. Myers (2002) description of the Junction project states that to engage with the young person meaningfully allows 'the recognition of uniqueness in the children and young people' (Myers 2002, p343). This competes with the search for unifying

characteristics and instead suggests the young person should be central and considered as a partner in change.

Developing identity as an adolescent with SHB

The narrative of adolescence positions the young person different from adults in understanding and developmental stage in terms of developing their identity. As part of the narrative of identity young people who show SHB are spoken about as needing support in their lives as both adolescents and as someone who shows SHB. Their behaviour risks isolation from peers, yet they need the same opportunities for growth and development.

The theme of developing sexual identity was significant. The assumption was for most young people an emerging sexuality is normal and that they are in a period of learning. Narratives of sexuality are accepted and the norms identified within school are professional seemingly uninfluenced by any possible discrimination. Being gay is considered part of normal sexuality by the teachers but they recognise that same sex attraction is not as accepted by many of the young people in school specifically some young men and specific communities. Whilst this is laudable the Stonewall Trust Schools Survey (2014) states that 86% of secondary school teachers say pupils at their school are bullied, harassed or called names for being, or suspected of being, lesbian, gay or bisexual and 13% say this happens often. McIntyre (2009) suggests that teacher's perspectives are 'set within a liberal discourse of tolerance' (p303) and that although expressed as tolerance, teachers who are not used to discussing LGBT issues, result in silences and institutional heterosexism.

Many of the stories spoken about were of young men whose sexuality was uncertain. There was a sense of adults knowing about the young person's same sex attraction but he or she not wanting to articulate or accept it. Confusion about sexuality is found in some studies as a characteristic of young people who show SHB (Almond et al 2006). The teachers recognised that it may be that young people are experimenting and learning about or denying their sexuality. However as with other identified

characteristics, confusion about sexuality occurs for some young people who show SHB but not all. This was recognised in the group, yet I felt that some of the group felt this is an often-overlooked factor.

Within this narrative young people were constructed as being open to influence from positive relationships with both peers and adults. In social constructionism the relationship i.e. interaction, constructs the self (Gergen 1985). The theme of the relationship is key and the construction of self through interaction is supported by this data. Teachers are aware that the loss of relationships with these pupils leads to a loss of their influence. Positive relationships are identified as protective factors in assessments (Griffin et al 2008) i.e. a positive relationship with adults and use of a positive support network. Teachers' narratives of relationships as important in constructing identity are supported by Gergen's theoretical perspective.

Developing sexual identity is mentioned frequently by the group alongside the role of the relationships with teachers. Robinson (2012) states that for young people who have lesbian or gay identities their relationships with adults in school are a key source of support. This supports the teachers' view that access to understanding adult relationships are essential and may be even more so for those struggling with sexuality issues.

6.1.2 How do teachers construct the role of school for young people who show sexually harmful behaviour? Reflections on the themes around school

Within this narrative teachers talk about themselves as having both agency and of not being able to influence. They speak with detail about young people they know, but with uncertainty about the way SHB develops. Uncertainty is a feature but not one which only constrains. Within uncertainty is recognition of the complexity of the phenomenon. I interpreted the differing aspects of certainty and uncertainty, agency and helplessness as parts of a narrative of professional and personal voice.

To frame the narrative as professional voice offers an understanding of the explicit role of teachers and the resulting changes one can make in systems and practice in an education setting. Teachers story themselves as understanding the specific aspects of the school context and the areas where they can influence positively. They speak with agency about supporting young people and making a difference and discuss school as being a vital culture and one which can impact. They recognise changes in school which need to occur to improve. The teachers talk of their role in offering opportunity and normalising experiences.

Curriculum and school values are recognised as important alongside the continued need to build relevant conversations with young people. Teachers identify specific areas of development within their school. This includes a range of practical suggestions for young people who show SHB including:

- Developing a school culture which examines sexuality and adult responses.
- Making changes in the classroom
- Normalising the classroom experience
- Developing relationships in school
- Access to opportunities which normalise
- Consider the language used to describe events
- Re- examination of school processes to consider describing events which would support consideration of holistic needs and possible early intervention
- More PSHCE and building of social and emotional skills for all e.g. self-esteem.
- Considering the systems in schools so young peoples' need can be highlighted earlier
- Focus on these areas if needed in SRE

The key goals for intervention (Hackett 2004) include many aspects of support which teachers recognise as part of their role. The teachers' narrative agrees with research that young people who show SHB need a broad set of holistic needs addressed (Hackett 2004). Essential components of intervention identified by Hackett (2004) are also identified by teachers who specifically reference how they can build social skills, positive relationships and raise self-esteem through targeted groups alongside the

formal curriculum offer. Teacher's narratives are of empowering and normalising through SRE and the school experience in general. They feel school offers a discourse of acceptance around sexuality. This agrees with research that SRE acts as a vehicle to discuss sexuality, supporting understanding of gender roles and producing an ethical framework for expressing sexuality (Reiss 1993). Vosmer et al (2009) suggests that young people who show inappropriate sexual behaviour may need to acquire knowledge of acceptable sexual boundaries. If it cannot be taught at home it should be taught elsewhere (Vosmer et al 2009 p284) and this could be school. SRE is seen as essential by many, but its role and content remains subject to individual interpretation.

Teachers recognise the role of schools in early intervention. Research has criticised extensive intervention for all young people who show SHB favouring a tiered response (Henniker et al 2002). This suggests not only that early intervention could be a role for schools but that for those young people deemed as lower risk, school based support or educational programmes would be acutely appropriate. Henniker et al (2002) stated *'the entry point into any ... response is effective assessment'*. (p115) and it may be that to only utilise teachers following assessment is to miss an opportunity to better inform intervention. Teachers understand the young people in detail but they do not recognise a role for themselves in assessment, which contrasts with the views of some researchers. e.g. Hackett and Taylor 2008 (p 96). Hackett (2004) suggests schools are positioned to be key partners in identification of early problems, assessment and supporting young people with problematic behaviours. Service users agreed that at times the external agencies are involved for too long (Hackett and Masson 2006) and identify the need for a multi-agency response (Smith et al 2014). This again could be a role for teachers offering the transition support within schools from higher to lower levels of outside agency support.

An interesting omission from the dominant narrative is the teachers do not explicitly refer to learning as an intervention or protective factor and learning and progress do not feature heavily in the discussions. Educational difficulties are significant in this cohort. Research identifies a range of needs in school including general behavioural

problems, disruptive behaviour and general problems at school (Dolan et al 1996, Vizard et al 2007) which is supported by the data. However, it is not talked about as frequently as expected. Evidence continues to support educational achievement as a protective factor (Jackson and Martin, 1998). The teachers' narratives do not directly identify their role in this, but it may be that they share an implicit understanding. They also do not recognise that they may be best placed to advise on a differentiated approach for the young person or offer preferred ways of learning i.e. insight into what works for them.

Teachers identify the school culture as needing to change, to offer more openness and discourses relevant to the young person. I feel this underpins the implicit curriculum and the tensions within the system which needs to change but as a result has lost close relationships and some of these shared values. As we were leaving one participant is captured on tape saying:

S2: That whole school, that broad base. We've got those things haven't we once it's something but how do we create that open accepted empowered kind of stuff.

(G2: 902-904)

The teacher recognised the value system as a moving shared space which could be influenced.

The limited reference in current research to the potential role of schools when supporting SHB is changing. Research references the need to include schools more (Gray, Pithers, Busconi and Houchens 1999) but Smith et al's (2014) review suggests it is limited in practice. Some research has included teachers, (Hackett, Carpenter, Patsio and Szilassy 2013) though as yet it is limited to a few studies and not within the school context.

6.2 Reflections on the personal and professional voice

The final narrative of personal and professional voice resonated strongly with me and framed my understanding of how the teachers viewed the different roles they fulfil and subsequently the self as a professional. The personal reflections I termed the personal voice and I felt had strong emotional resonance with me. I interpreted the tensions articulated to be between the expectations of the teacher's role in light of the system and the personal beliefs they hold about children, young people and the self as an adult. I do not frame these as incompatible tensions but competing within a complex understanding.

Dilemma is not reflected on significantly within the literature. The majority of research seeks to confirm categories or produce empirical evidence of impact. Dilemma occurs when moral values compete. This brought a dimension to the discussion which is more than purely a professional response. For example, Hackett and Masson (2006) report that parents want normal experiences for their children and the teachers suggest the need to offer normalising experiences. Access to a peer group and 'fitting in' offers the context for interaction and the development of social skills often recognised as a deficit for young people who show SHB (Taylor 2003, Almond et al 2007). Teachers recognise the dilemmas which are brought forward by offering normalising experiences for all young people within the context of risk. The teachers' dominant discourses are strongly set within professional voices which focus on educational and pedagogical solutions. However, the personal voice offers insight into the dilemmas faced and the possible positions that teachers draw upon in their narratives.

These moral dilemmas do not feature in the research outside of ethics or theory. Each dilemma could be broken down and evidence offered to support the various positions. For example, opportunity for the individual as opposed to protection of all is raised by the teachers. Evidence and good practice guidance could support each opposing position. Young people have the right to a holistic response and all have the right to a positive future. Research agrees that these young people should be viewed through a

child protection lens rather than a criminal justice one (Smith et al 2014). There is also much research which supports risk management and safeguarding arrangements (e.g. Beech et al 2007, Ofsted 2011). Teachers did not focus on risk nor did they speak emotively about the young people's actions as previously experienced. The narrative of risk and protection is one the teachers understand within their daily roles in school. They accept the risk is often detailed by others. Chaffin et al (2002) suggests that practitioners consistently over estimate risk. These practitioners do not report this of themselves;

S1: (&) he was you know he was so closely monitored when he was in school but it's out in the big wide world where /the risk/ is.

(G1 614-615)

Which is most important is dependent on your position and your view of which is the greatest right. To offer empirical evidence in support of one position against another would be misguided. Research appears to focus on evidence and morality is left to the individual.

As such dilemma will be discussed in the light of the identity of the teachers. Within the dilemmas, the self is brought into view. In constructing the narratives about the young people, I interpreted teachers' narratives of their own identity. They share both a professional and a personal voice and express a tension between these positions. Drawing upon different constructs leads to dilemmas being expressed. The professional voice is heard frequently in how the teachers' roles can support young people. There are fewer instances in which the personal voice is heard. This section will share my reflections on the narratives within these two overlapping identities.

The professional narrative expresses that teachers feel a strong role in being able to support understanding in this area. Teachers are working with young people with a range of behaviours including sexually harmful ones. Their holistic responses which focus on wellbeing is supported and promoted in the literature (Lambie and Seymour 2006, Parish Standard and Cobia 2008) and the teachers agree this should be part of the school's role. Within the professional self the teacher is mostly constructed as

being approachable and comfortable talking about sex, sexuality and relationships. They are competent and understanding of a range of issues and liberal in their views.

Yet teachers are rarely included in multi-agency approaches and they appear to have a lack of opportunity to engage professionally in the subject area. There is an absence of opportunity to gain a professional understanding or expertise which leads to doubt and uncertainty. The uncertainties are expressed as dilemmas and are part of the personal voice. Language is highlighted as a source of difficulty. Child and dangerous is spoken about as incompatible. One teacher recognised that childhood as a construct of innocence would preclude them being dangerous. Robinson's (2008) premise of situating sexuality in the adult world is supported here with the teacher struggling to comprehend a dangerous sexual act being committed by a child or of a child not being innocent and the recipient of danger. Some behaviour is equated with dangerous and outside of childhood. A child who is dangerous may not also be innocent. If this is the case does it lead to those young people not being constructed as children but as adults supporting and therefore open to practices and processes of the adult world? This dilemma is opened once again when a teacher talks about child and adult. How could a child do something so morally wrong? The use of language to shape resistance appears as an available discourse. Narrative would suggest that these discourses are not only moral dilemmas but available alternative discourses (Morgan 2000).

Though it was not highlighted through the thematic analysis the use of language resonated with me. Different constructs used language which competed in the discussion. To use the term child rather than adolescent led to tension when the person was called dangerous. Whilst for the majority of time the identity was an adolescent, child was also used to express the person's state and the emotional response for the adult. Myers (2002) article on the Junction Project offers a critique on the consequences of discourse and highlights how engaging in intervention which recognises the significant impact of language and applies theory critically can result in a focus on the young person. This offers them empowerment and seeks real meaning

for these young people. However there remains a number of ethical issues to address if young people are to be included in research such as rights to participate.

Morality is rarely mentioned in the research but the dilemmas raised are premised on moral rationality. MacIntyre (2011) talks of conflicting moral arguments based on a rationality which is pluralistic. Each argument has its own arguable rationale which is not hierarchical or agreed for all time. Therefore, the teachers' dilemmas are based on opposing moral underpinnings and there may be little to hold one more important than the other. Williamson (1997) states there are 'no absolute values, no objective moral truths' (p96). He goes on to say that whilst there are social conventions and personal beliefs, they reflect the values of the social group. If the social group has not shared their understandings or if discourse and narrative is rarely heard, how can their lived experience inform a shared moral understanding?

Dilemmas such as the rights of the individual and rights of all can exemplify the issues teachers talked about. Teachers talked about monitoring yet the young person having rights to privacy. National guidance, though limited, suggests that good practice would be to seek the best outcomes for the young person but also to protect children from maltreatment (Working Together to Safeguard 2013). This offers opportunity in school for individual pupils whilst also stating that others have the right to grow up in safe environments. The rights to safety for all children is privileged in safeguarding documentation and protects the many as well as the few (British Psychological Society 2014, Department for Education 2015). Macintyre (2011) states 'there is in our society no established way of deciding between these claims' (p9). The dilemmas expressed by the teachers support this and recognises it in practical terms.

The research focuses on support for the individual. Lambie and Seymour (2006) suggest adolescents should be viewed differently from adults and support the argument of the rights of the individual. Intervention is intended to reduce the risks and support positive changes (Hackett 2004) but it is found that with a lack of community support, risk factors are increased. (Hackett et al 2015). So, if a young person is

denied access to a context where change would be found how can they change?
Again, when these appear as rationale arguments they avoid the moral underpinnings.

Teachers recognised their discomfort. There was tension between their hopes for all children and how their hopes may not be reached for them. I feel the different faces of self may offer a method of coping for teachers, as the professional voice appeared not as connected. The personal voice maybe reflects the connection to children and it is possible that the group forum did not offer a safe enough space to explore this fully. The narratives of personal voice recognise some of the aspects of the experience for the young person such as affecting how the pupil is reacted to. There is little research which privileges the experience of the young person. The few research articles which recognise uncertainties for adults are found mostly within therapeutic relationships and in these, similar coping mechanisms for professionals such as being detached were identified (Shevade, Norris and Swann 2011). I wonder if being able to offer a more child centred approach would create a greater connection for teachers to the young person's experience and offer more insight into their own dilemmas.

Macintyre (2011) suggests that moral beliefs can be expressed within roles. A distinction is made between role and individual (MacIntyre 2011, p35). To offer a non-emotional response maybe should not be judged as less connected but instead of a different moral perspective, one of the collective. However, as Bion (1948) and Damasio (1999) both suggest that an emotional response is a valuable one in terms of learning and connection. Teachers might be expressing connection in terms of their role, i.e. within protection and offering a social and pragmatic perspective but the role for emotion in response needs to be more widely considered as should the risks of leaving it absent.

6.3 Implications for practice

6.3.1 Schools and teachers

School has been indicated as a positive context for this group of young people in terms of practical ways to support alongside ensuring holistic development. However, it has a potential greater role to play as part of a multi-agency joint response. Teachers agree that they could offer more but currently they are not included in the external systems of support and they lack the opportunities to discuss SHB, knowledge of the issues and develop confidence in their expertise. Hackett (2004) states that offence specific work is only one aspect of intervention and that a systemic approach is essential which addresses holistic needs include educational needs and school context.

Teachers within school have a sense of agency and whilst not completely confident in their roles they recognise that if young people are of school age they need access to education. The school environment is a protective factor and one which can offer support and opportunity. It is a context for building resilience, offering positive relationships, a secure base, a sense of belonging and self-efficacy (Gilligan 2000). With this in mind there remains the need to support teachers to plan effectively and to implement changes needed within the system. The themes raised issues such as increasing resilience, interventions for emotional and social skills as well as widening the focus to consider support and planning which reflects their wider needs e.g. curriculum, and which are already present in a school's arsenal. The EP can support each of these areas of thinking and practice and in doing so develop teacher confidence at a systems and individual level.

- Resilience

As previously stated resilience factors are assessed in many of the assessment tools used e.g. AIM 2. Teachers know their pupils and this knowing allows a nuanced assessment in a school context of skills, strengths and areas for development. Teachers can also offer insight into factors within school which strengthen ecological resilience and do not rely solely on factors within the child. To include schools in assessment may raise additional ethical issues such as the rights of the young person to confidentiality i.e. the right to not inform schools if appropriate. However, in the most serious cases, schools have been informed in order to ensure 'safety of all' and an approach which supports holistic thinking would offer alternative narratives alongside the often-dominating risk narrative.

- Intervention for emotional and social issues

Intervention around social emotional and behavioural issues may be equally or more important in terms of reducing risk (Lambie and Seymour 2006). Approaches such as MST already recognise and engage with the broader social ecology including school and education (Hackett 2004, p69). If difficulties at school are an identified characteristic (Vizard 2006) then to engage with professionals in schools would offer a significant contribution to the debate and provide more support in terms of universal and targeted provision in schools. If there is external agency support and intervention schools would be able to tailor their approaches to support the work carried out outside of school.

- Accessing existing support for young people who have additional needs

Many young people have already been identified as having problems in schools requiring a range of different interventions. The suggestions of the potential role of schools (Hackett and Taylor, 2008) would be welcomed but possibly does not recognise that for many young people direct interventions may already be in place. What is an issue, is that if these young people are excluded they will not have access to these interventions nor some of the positively influencing systems? It is vital that when considering exclusion of young people who show SHB, that governors and head teachers are aware of the impact on the behaviour and the recidivism rates and balance safeguarding with risk assessment. The dilemma of protection and rights needs further debate but these teachers did not view school as a high risk. Currently rights of the individual are being masked under concerns of perceived risk. However, if the risks, as suggested, are minimal for reoffending and teachers do not view the school as a high-risk environment, then exclusion increases risk for the most vulnerable and not the majority.

- Developing curriculum

Curriculum in schools provides a universal support to all young people. For those who sexually harm they may have no identifiable needs but still require the support to develop socially accepted sexual behaviour. Whittaker et al (2000) found that some young people who sexually harm have less sexual knowledge and this makes them vulnerable. Both PSHCE and SRE play a vital role in offering opportunities to express and discuss norms, to discuss relationships and sexuality and to be heard. The current state of SRE is inadequate in schools (Ofsted 2011) and whilst this school felt SRE was strength, it is essential that teachers develop strong practice and confidence in this area. The teachers

did not identify standard curriculum as a need and learning was almost disregarded. However, as a protective factor it is essential that access to learning and the benefits of this are recognised explicitly.

- Developing systems

Teachers returned to the need to strengthen and ensure relationships with young people. They recognised the importance of relationships and the implicit curriculum highlighted by Weare (2000) as crucial aspects for emotional health and well-being. Teachers views of the changes in school culture should be adhered to and the values which underpin the school system need to be explicitly planned for within the school day. Further training and CPD to support whole school thinking and a shared language should be part of school development plans to support a holistic offer within schools and promote earlier intervention (Weare 2015).

6.3.2 Educational Psychologists

There are personal challenges when considering how EPs engage in this area. There is an expectation from others and from ourselves that we offer a professional voice but by doing so we may further disconnect from the emotional distress that is real for others. The distinction between personal and professional voice that I interpreted in the teacher's narratives are equally valid within me. Though the professional perspective may be required to support a pragmatic, contained and sensitive response, the sentient response should not be excluded from the EP role. Supervision to explore our own thoughts and concerns in cases is needed to provide the same to others.

The EP can offer a space where it is safe to identify with the personal voice and which recognises a dualism of roles. Narrative approaches offer this space. The rich description of young people which was shared by the teachers feels hopeful. The research worked well as a group process but there is a requirement to take a risk and not know what might happen. An approach to casework such as this could open a lens into the wider experience of the young person. Billington (2006) states that there

can be a ‘fracture between professional knowledge and the young person’s experience” (p136). A narrative approach would offer a chance to reflect on the young person’s experience and encourage their meaning to be sought.

Research in groups links clearly with common practices such as multi-agency meetings, early help meetings and group problem solving. Opportunities to create and highlight alternative narratives can be found within all these forums. The teachers’ sense of agency alongside their uncertainties expressed a sense of hope that they could make a difference. The uncertainties allow a space to explore alternative narratives which we know are available and problem solve possibilities. A group discussion offers a clear role for EPs to highlight and reflect on questions of meaning and experience. To view a child or young person as the phenomenon is antithetical. The EP has a role in the language she uses and the position that places the young person in. Language can empower and promote inclusive solutions in which the actors have a role and influence (Milner 2008). The EP can encourage talk about the problem separately and use a range of tools to widen the focus from a narrow perspective of pathology.

Young people who show SHB are an agreed heterogeneous cohort. This could be better communicated to others and in itself, has some useful reflections in terms of EP support. Literature recognises that for most young people their actions are criminal but not pervasive. This needs to be considered through assessment but it is incumbent on the EP to keep at the forefront of their practice and not position these young people within an adult framework. EPs need to believe in the role they can have in supporting thinking in areas traditionally adopted by other ‘experts’. It may be that this requires more exploration as EPs are not immune to the doubts or uncertainties of sensitive and emotive subjects or the pressures from a risk aware society. A wider reflection of methodologies within the literature could offer a research base which is applicable for EPs, reflecting a social constructionist perspective.

To be confident to share that these young people are individuals is vital. Wider narratives in society could be so dominant that alternatives could be obscured. SHB is an area where teachers may not have previous experience professionally and where information in schools is lacking. In light of this teachers rely on their skills as educators and this is spoken of with confidence. Teachers recognise that there is external expertise, but they do not recognise that their understanding of a young person is significant and can be essential. They do not see their role in a multi-agency process of assessment and intervention. They privilege the perspective and expertise of the professionals working in the field. Whilst they recognise the professional role of others they overlook the possible roles they have expertise within. The EP role could balance the need to contain and support teachers understanding of their unique perspective of the whole child.

There are implications in terms of direct support to schools but also in terms of how we practice around sensitive issues. Whilst this research is about teachers it could have explored the phenomenon with EPs and found similar uncertainties. Narrative offers a rich picture of more than the phenomenon. It shares the dominant stories of SHB yet exposes possible narratives and therefore more truths about the young person. Interventions support the use of narrative, i.e. Good Lives model (West 2007) and other approaches adopt similarly underpinned constructionist models e.g. Signs of Safety (Turnell and Edwards 1999). Both are models of working in which EPs hold expertise and skill. When working with the phenomenon of SHB it would be important for EPs to recognise their current skills, knowledge and practices can be applied.

In my practice I position myself as advocating for the child. The discourse of protection and safeguarding is significant to me and I feel underpins my values. Williamson (1997) suggests that in decisions of morality and of right and wrong, there needs to be 'sympathy towards and concern for the needs of others together with a strong inner conviction of an obligation to meet those needs.' (p98). The professional discourse of inclusion and advocating for the young person is inherent in my practice but also constructed by the professional space I engage in. There is a significant focus in this current climate on vulnerable groups and it is within this space that there could

be more reflection on the EP role in supporting new narratives helpful within the school context.

6.3.3 Engaging in wider systems

EPs are well placed to offer support within the wider local authority systems and engage in a coordinated multi-agency response. Whilst many EPs may not be comfortable with the assessment process EPs can engage with a critical lens and explore some of the current constructs and identities that are in use in these contexts. Understanding protective factors and ecological resilience within the school system could offer not only individual support but also new understandings for partners in other agencies.

In the few studies which included the young person's voice the attitude of school is a concern (Hackett and Masson 2006) alongside possibility of exclusion and seeking subsequent provision. For children who show SHB, a consistent school environment creates safety, develops confidence and opportunities for tangible support to be put into place (Milner 2008). Child protection policies of local authorities should encourage schools to consider this group as vulnerable. EPs are well placed to challenge exclusionary practices both in individual casework and at a systemic level.

A joint local authority response should be in place where all professionals working with these young people understand and can articulate the risks and needs of this group of young people including understanding of appropriate approaches. Smith et al (2014) lament the lack of national policy but there is recognition of some good practice in multi-agency approaches which include educational settings. There are an increasing number of studies in SHB where professionals from education are referenced. Teachers have significant knowledge of young people in their charge. Not only could they offer support into early and holistic intervention but they could also be part of multi-agency response.

6.4 Reflections on and cautions of the research

6.4.1 Methodological considerations

A thematic approach appealed to me as a new researcher. It initially felt intuitive and well suited to a group context to explore narratives. I wanted to ensure that the narrative thematic analysis did not lose the whole picture. However, in practice the use of thematic analysis left me frustrated and I felt it did not always adequately reflect the tone or feeling of the discussion. It led me reflecting on the overall narratives I heard within the analysis to offer some coherence and to use narratives from the transcripts in as full form as possible.

Narratives are intended to be kept as intact as possible (Riessman 2008). Although I attempted to keep the narrative intact, to write in a narrative manner is at times at odds with the need to have clear themes which do not overlap (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Whilst there are some definite benefits to thematic analysis there are also compromises. It offered a structure which gave me confidence in using an accepted approach. However, I feel that separating themes lacks some coherence with my epistemological position. Coding and offering this as an attempt at transparency lacks the authenticity I was hoping for. As a result, I shared the analysis within narratives or themes but was happy for overlap and there not to be as clearly defined sections. I would like to have been more confident in narrative methods and opted to be completely reflexive in my approach. A lack of self-belief led me to using this mode of analysis which has an academically accepted framework allowing reflection onto discourse within a structure and through recognition of its limitations feels an acceptable compromise.

I felt it was more authentic to not force the strictest definitions of SHB upon the group. As research which is not seeking reliability in a positivist paradigm the need to control the narrative was not within the study. I would consider offering more information about harmful behaviour and problematic behaviour if I were to repeat the study. However, I would continue to discuss both as considering the problematic alongside harmful explores the available spectrum of discourse about not normal sexual behaviour.

Using the narrative model, the focus group session was structured and discussed alike to professional development. I wondered afterwards if this set a tone which was 'professional', where people's uncertainty and unknowing was presented through a professional discourse. Rarely was emotion evident in the discussion. One teacher wrote the reflective log, '*The discussion was quite matter of fact really*'. The group chose the tone of the narrative and carried it throughout most of the discussion. Some emotions were directly referred to but did not always feel to be a true reflection of the situation. Emotion heard in the voices and the way a thought was expressed is not captured in the thematic analysis but as an interpreter of the narrative it was evident.

The urgency of an individual case was not present so teachers were able to focus on the narrative and not the difficult emotions possibly experienced. There were moments when direct questions meant the teachers were asked to express their feelings but mostly the emotional response occurred spontaneously. I felt the personal responses reflected alternative narratives to those usually offered and that it would be beneficial to also consider individual interviews alongside the focus group which may have elicited a stronger personal story.

A thematic analysis shared possible discourses but the group processes are not captured. I reflected on some as I shared narratives but the process did not capture the group's responses, the ways the group stopped certain narratives from being spoken or any resistance to those offering a strong dominant alternative. The discussion had a circular nature. I attempted to capture some of this within the analysis and recognised reflexivity and the interpretive role of the researcher.

When I decided to study SHB I recognised that teachers hold a key position and are able to influence, but that the voice of the young person is lacking. Research from young people suggests that school knowing is of significant concern to them (Hackett and Masson 2006). I believe that any support in schools should be in discussion with the young person. This research has added to the voice of professionals and as such it perpetuates the passive nature voice of young people.

There is a need for more work within group narratives as case studies or as narratives of context. Riessman (2008) writes that a limitation of this method is that not all themes within the same cluster may mean the same. However, its strength is that whilst being my interpretation of narratives, the issues are dealt with within group construction and can be checked and questioned as the group discusses. The group method offers a wealth of information about possible discourses and considering the paucity of research is a strong initial exploration of possible narratives.

6.4.2 Future research

As stated throughout the research there is a paucity of qualitative research in this area and the judgements from some researchers are based within their own paradigms as highlighted by correspondence between Myers (2007) and Beech, Print Henniker Griffin (2008). To reflect on the limitations could suggest that an interpretive paradigm constructs too variable a truth which is not helpful to others. I would suggest this uncertainty is inevitable. Reflection on the limitations of the research is not only intended to offer insight into future research methods but also to highlight the positives of research such as this.

We live in a messy social world and to study phenomena within it needs to recognise the complexity. The rich description shared would not be available without acceptance of uncertainties, resistance and inconsistencies. Approaches which address how meanings relate to lived experience and the meanings that people make are inevitably unique to context. The narrative approach used offers opportunity to reflect on alternative narratives and one that is applicable to everyday practice. Within the school context it may be that dominant narratives of adolescents and their needs are understood, but narrative approaches present a mode of inquiry and discussion that can resist some of the pathologising narratives of sexual harm and explore how to influence within the context. For me it offers an optimistic spotlight into teacher narratives and the overwhelming narrative of support and concern. Narratives of SHB within EP services would also offer insight into the confidence and availability of narratives within support services such as ours.

Whilst it is ethically difficult to assess the young person's voice I feel further attempts to capture experience and meaning would help within this field. The use of future case studies to consider how a school has worked with a young person, how the young person feels engaged with or how teachers have responded to their needs should be considered. There needs to be further exploration of how young people in school consider problematic, normal and acceptable sexuality and sexual behaviour and how they view their role in influencing school policy. Often children and young people are considered as developing, learning and needing protection and guidance (Wyness 2006). Research which challenges these assumptions are needed in order for young people to be positioned as active agents, a position that they view themselves in (Bale 2011).

References

AIM Project (2012) Available at: <http://www.aimproject.org.uk> [Accessed 14th April 2014]

Allen L. (2011) *Young People and Sexuality Education Rethinking key debates*. London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Almond, L. (2014). Working with children and young people with harmful sexual behaviours: exploring impact on practitioners and sources of support. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 20, 3, 333-353. DOI: 10.1080/13552600.2013.836576

Almond, L. & Canter, D. (2007). Youths who sexually harm: A multivariate model of behaviour. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international, interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 13, 3, 217-233

Almond, L., Canter, D & Salfati, C.G. (2006). Youths who sexually harm: A multivariate model of characteristics. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international, interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 12, 2, 97-114

Almond, L. and Giles, S. (2008). Young people with harmful sexual behaviour: Do those with learning disabilities form a distinct subgroup? *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international, interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 14:3, 227-239
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13552600802304909>

Andrews, M., Squires, C., & Tamboukou, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Doing Narrative Research*. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Araji, S. (1997). *Sexually Aggressive Children: Coming To Understand Them*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications.

Ayland, L. & West, B. (2007). The Good Way model: A strengths-based approach for working with young people, especially those with intellectual difficulties, who have sexually abusive behaviour. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 12 (2): 189-201

The American Psychological Association (APA) Task Force on the Sexualisation of Girls (2007). Available online: <http://www.apa.org/pi/women/programs/girls/report-full.pdf>; 'Sexualisation of Children in the Contemporary Media', available online: http://www.aph.gov.au/SENATE/committee/eca_ctte/sexualisation_of_children/report/index.htm [Accessed 14/4/2015]

Baginsky, M. (2008). *Safeguarding Children and Schools*. London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Bale, C. (2011) Raunch or romance? Framing and interpreting the relationship between sexualised culture and young peoples' sexual health Children, 'sexualisation' and consumer culture. *Sex Education Sexuality, Society and Learning*. 11,3, 303-314

Banks, N. and Ward, P. (2014). Sexually harmful behaviour and treatment within an attachment based framework: An adolescent case study. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 31 (3) 22-31.

Bannister, P., Bunn, G., Burman, E., Daniels, J., Duckett, P., Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., Parker, I., Runswick-Cole, K., Sixsmith, J., Smailes, S., Tindall, C. and Whelan, P. (2011) *Qualitative Methods in Psychology: A Research Guide*. Open University Press.

Beech A. (2007) A Response to Steve Myers Article Entitled De Constructing the Risk Categories in the AIM Assessment Model for Children with Sexually Harmful Behaviour Children and Society. *Children and Society*, 22, 63-69.

Beech, A., Print, B., Henniker, J. and Griffin, H. (2008), A response to Steve Myers' article Entitled '(De)Constructing the Risk Categories in the AIM Assessment Model for Children with Sexually Harmful Behaviours. *Children & Society*, 22: 63–67. Doi: 10.1111/j.1099-0860.2007.00134_1.x

Berger, P. and Luckman, T. (1966) *The Social Construction of Reality*. Garden City :New York, Doubleday.

Biesta, G.J.J. (2010) Why 'what works' still won't work: From evidence- Based education to value based education. *Studies in Philosophical Education*, 29: 491-503.

Billington, T. (1995). Discourse Analysis: Acknowledging Interpretation in Everyday Practice. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 11 (3):, 36-45.

Billington T (2000) *Separating, Losing and Excluding Children: Narratives of Difference*. London: RoutledgeFalmer

Billington, T. (2006) *Working with Children: Assessment, Representation and Intervention*. London, SAGE.

Billington, T. (2012). 'When they're making breakfast they'll talk...': Narrative approaches in the evaluation of Nurture Groups. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*. 10 (3): 318-331.

Bion, W. R. (1948). Experiences in groups: II. *Human Relations*. 1, 487-496.

Blaise, M. (2013). Charting new territories: re-assembling childhood sexuality in the early years classroom. *Gender and Education*, 25 (7): 801-817.

Borduin, C. M, Henggeler, S.W., Blaske, D. M. and Stein, R. (1990). Multi systemic treatment of Adolescent Sexual Offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 35: 105 - 114

Boyatzis, R.E. (1998). *Transforming Qualitative Information Thematic analysis and Code Development*. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Boyden, J. (1997). Childhood and the Policy Makers. A Comparative Perspective on the Globalization of Childhood (Chapter 9) In: James A. and Prout A. (2003) *Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Studies of Childhood*. (2nd Edition) Routledge Falmer, Oxon.

Bragg S. Buckingham D., Russell R. and Willett R. (2011) Too much too soon? Children, 'sexualisation' and consumer culture. *Sex Education Sexuality, Society and Learning*, 11,3, 279 -302

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3: 77-101.

Brinkmann, S. & Kvale, S. (2005). Confronting the Ethics of Qualitative Research. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 18 (2): 157-181, DOI: 10.1080/10720530590914789

British Psychological Society (2014) *Safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children Position Paper*. Leicester, British Psychological Society.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1991). The Narrative Construction of Reality, *Critical Inquiry*, 18 (1): 1-21.

Burman, E (2008). *Deconstructing Developmental Psychology* (2nd Ed). Hove, East Sussex, Routledge.

Burman, E. and Whelan, P. (2011). ~~Problems~~ In/Of Qualitative Research (Chapter 14). In: Bannister, P., Bunn, G., Burman, E., Daniels, J., Duckett, P., Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., Parker, I., Runswick-Cole, K., Sixsmith, J., Smailes, S., Tindall, C. and Whelan, P. (2011). *Qualitative Methods in Psychology: A Research Guide*. Open University Press.

Burr, V. (2003), *Social Constructionism*. 2nd Edition. Hove, East Sussex, Routledge.

Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. East Sussex Routledge.

Calder M (1999) A conceptual framework for Managing Young people who sexually Abuse: Towards a Consortium Approach, 109-150. In Calder M (ed) Working with Young people who sexually Abuse: New Pieces of the Jigsaw Puzzle. Dorset, Russell House Publishing.

Chaffin, M., Letourneau, E. J., and Silovsky, J. F. (2002). Adults, adolescents, and children who sexually abuse children: A developmental perspective pp. 205-232, In J. Myers (Ed.) *The APSAC handbook on child maltreatment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Clarke,V. and Kitzinger,C. (2004) Lesbianism and gay parents on talk show: resistance or collusion in heterosexism. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 1:195-217.

Cosaro W. (2015) *The Sociology of Childhood*. 4th Ed. London, Sage.

Creeden, K. (2009) How trauma and attachment can impact neurodevelopment: Informing our understanding and treatment of sexual behaviour problems. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international, interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 15 (3): 261-273.

Criminal Justice Joint Inspection (2013). *Examining Multi-Agency Responses to Children and Young People who sexually offend*. London. Multi-Agency Responses t

Cromby, J., Harper, D. and Reavey, P. (2013). *Psychology Mental health and Distress*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan. O

Damasio, A. (1999). *The Feeling of What Happens: Body and Emotion in the Making of Consciousness*. New York, Harcourt Brace.

De Bruijn, P. Burrie, I. & van Wel, F. (2006). A risky boundary: Unwanted sexual behaviour among youth. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international, interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 12 (2): 81-96.

Dent, R.J., & Cameron, R.J. (2003). Developing resilience in children who are in public care: The educational psychology perspective. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 19 (1): 3-19.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln Y. S.(2005). *Handbook of Qualitative Research (2nd eds)* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Department for Children, Schools and Families (2007). *Social and emotional aspects of learning for secondary schools*. Nottingham: DCSF Publications.

Department for Children Schools and Families (2008) *The Education and Skills Act*. London HSMO

Department for Children Schools and Families (2010). *Safeguarding Children and Safer Recruitment in Education*. Crown Copyright, Surrey.

Department for Communities and Local Government (2012). *Working with Troubled Families*. London: Department for Communities and Local Government, Crown Copyright, London.

Department for Education (2011). *Letting Children be Children Report of an Independent Review of the Commercialisation and Sexualisation of Childhood*. Norwich, Crown Copyright.

Department for Education (2013) *Working Together to Safeguard Children A guide to inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children*. Norwich, Crown Copyright.

Department for Education (2014) *Mental health and behaviour in schools: Departmental advice for school staff*. London: Department for Education.

Department for Education (2015) *Counselling in schools: a blueprint for the future: departmental advice for school staff and counsellors*. London: Department for Education.

Department for Education (2015) *Permanent and fixed-period exclusions in England: 2013 to 2014*. London, Crown Copyright. Available online at <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/permanent-and-fixed-period-exclusions-in-england-2013-to-2014> [Accessed 06/09/15]

Department for Education and Employment (2000). *Sex and Relationship Education Guidance*. Nottingham, DfEE Publications.

Department for Education and Skills (2003). *Every Child Matters*. London, The Stationary Office.

Department of Health (1999) DoH (1999). *Working together to safeguard children : A guide to inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children*. London: The Stationery Office.

Department of Health (2006) *The needs and effective treatment of young people who*

sexually abuse: current evidence. London, Crown Copyright.

Department of Health (2013) *A framework for sexual health Improvement in England*, London, Crown Copyright. Accessed online at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/142592/9287-2900714-TSO-SexualHealthPolicyNW_ACCESSIBLE.pdf [Accessed 8th July 2014]

Department of Health (2015) *Future in mind Promoting, protecting and improving our children and young people's mental health and wellbeing*. London, Crown Copyright.

De Shazer S.(1985) *Keys to Solution in Brief Therapy*. London,W.W. Norton and Company.

Dolan,M., Holloway, J, Bailey, S. and Kroll, L. (1996). The psychosocial characteristics of juvenile sexual offenders referred to an adolescent forensic service in the UK. *Medical Science Law*, 36 (4): 343-52.

Donaldson M. (1978) *Children's Minds*. London, Fontana.

Edwards and Mercer (1987) Edwards, D. and Mercer, N. (1987) *Common Knowledge*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.Quoted in in T. Billington (1995) Discourse Analysis:, *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 11:3, 36-45, DOI: 10.1080/0266736950110306

Edley,N. (2001) Unravelling Social Constructionsim.*Theory and Psychology* 11 (3):433-441.

Egan, R.D. and Hawkes, G.L. (2008). Imperilled and Perilous: Exploring the History of Childhood Sexuality. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 21 (4): 355-367

Elley S. (2013) *Understanding Sex Relationships Education, Youth and Class*. Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan.

Elliot J. (2005) *Using Narrative in Social Research*. London, Sage. Accessed on line <http://dx.doi.org/sheffield.idm.oclc.org/10.4135/9780857020246>

Erikson. E. H. (1959). *Identity and the Life Cycle*. New York: International Universities Press.

Evans J. (2010). *Not present and not correct: Understanding and preventing school exclusions*. Essex, Barnardo's.

Feyerabend D, P. (1975). *Against Method*. London: NLB.

Fishman S. (1982) The History of Childhood Sexuality, *Journal of Contemporary History*,. 17 (2): 269-283.

Flick, U. (Ed). (2007). *Designing Qualitative Research*. London, England: SAGE Publications, Ltd. Available online at doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849208826> [Accessed 12/09/15]

Fortune C. & Lambie I. (2006). Sexually abusive youth: A review of recidivism studies and methodological issues for future research. *Clinical Psychology Review* ,26: 1078–1095.

Foucault, M. (1979). *The history of sexuality, vol 1, the Will to Knowledge*. London, Penguin.

Freud S. (1913) *Totem and Taboo: some points of agreement between the mental lives of savages and neurotics*. New York, Norton.

Freud S. (1920) Three Essays on the theory of Sexuality, 2nd Edition. Global Grey. Available online at <http://www.globalgreybooks.com/Books/three-essays-on-the-theory-of-sexuality.pdf> [Accessed 15/07/15]

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London, Penguin Books.

Friedrich, W.N., Fisher, J, Broughton, D, Houston, M., Shafran, C.R. (1998). Normative Sexual behaviour in children: contemporary Sample. *Paediatrics* 101 (4):E9

Frith H. (2000) Focusing on Sex: Using Focus Groups in Sex Research. *Sexualities*, 3, (3) 275-297.

Furlong A. (2013) *Youth Studies, An Introduction*. London, Routledge.

Fyson R. (2009). Sexually inappropriate or abusive behaviour among pupils in special schools. *British Journal of Special Education*, 36 (2): 85-94.

Gagnon J.H. and Simon W. (1974 [1973]) *Sexual Conduct: The Social Sources of Human Sexuality*. London, Hutchinson

Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist*. 40 (3): 266-275.

Gergen, K. (2009). *Relational Being: Beyond Self and Community*. Oxford University Press.

Gergen, K. J. (2011) The Self As Social Construction *Psychological Studies*. 56: 108-116. Accessed online at DOI 10.1007/s12646-011-0066-1 [Accessed 11/04/16]

Gerhold,C.K., Browne, K.D. and Beckett, R. (2007). Predicting recidivism in adolescent sexual offenders, *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12: 427–438

German,M., Wolfendale,S. and McLoughlin L.(2000). The Role of Educational Psychologists in Child Protection, *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 15(4): 263-271. Accessed online at DOI: 10.1080/0266736000150408 [Accessed 23/07/14]

Giddens A (2010) The Scope of Sociology Chapter 2 p 9-13 in Giddens A. and Sutton P.W. (2010) *Sociology Introductory Readings 3rd Ed*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Gilgun J. (1999) CASPARS: New Tools for Assessing Client Risks and Strengths. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*. 80 (5): 450-459.

Goleman, D. (2004). *Emotional Intelligence and Working with Emotional Intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury.

Goodley, D. (2011). Narrative Enquiry (Chapter 11) in Bannister, P., Bunn, G., Burman, E., Daniels, J., Duckett, P., Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., Parker, I., Runswick-Cole, K., Sixsmith, J., Smailes, S., Tindall, C. and Whelan, P. (2011). *Qualitative Methods in Psychology: A Research Guide*. Open University Press.

Goodley, D. and Smailes, S. (2011). Positionalities (Chapter 3) In: Bannister, P., Bunn, G., Burman, E., Daniels, J., Duckett, P., Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., Parker, I., Runswick-Cole, K., Sixsmith, J., Smailes, S., Tindall, C. and Whelan, P. (2011). *Qualitative Methods in Psychology: A Research Guide*. Open University Press.

Grant, A. (2000). The Historical Development of Treatment for Adolescent Sex Offenders, Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice. *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 145. Australian Institute of Criminology.

Griffin, H.L. , Beech, A. , Print, B. , Bradshaw,H. & Quayle, J. (2008). The development and initial testing of the AIM2 framework to assess risk and strengths in young people who sexually offend. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 14(3): 211-225.

Gray, A., Pithers, W.D., Busconi, A . and Houchens, P. (1999). Developmental and Etiological Characteristics of Children with Sexual Behaviour Problems: treatment Implications. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 23 (6): 601–621.

Griffin, H. L., Beech, A., Print, B., Bradshaw, H. and Quayle, J. (2008). The development and initial testing of the AIM2 framework to assess risk and strengths in young people who sexually offend. *Journal of Sexual Aggression* 14 (3): 211-225.

Hackett S. (2003). Evidence based assessment : a critical assessment in Calder M.C. and Hackett s. (Eds) *Assessment in child care: Using and Developing frameworks for practice*. Russell House Publishing, Lyme Regis.

Hackett S.(2004). *What works for children and young people with harmful sexual behaviours*. Essex, Barnados.

Hackett, S., Carpenter, J, Patsios, D. and Szilassy, E. (2013). Interprofessional and interagency training for working with young people with harmful sexual behaviours: An evaluation of outcomes. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 19 (3): 329-344. Available online at DOI: 10.1080/13552600.2012.753122 [Accessed 07/01/15]

Hackett, S. and Masson, H. (2006). Young People who have Sexually Abused: What do they (and their parents) want from Professionals? *Children and Society*, 20, 183–195.

Hackett S., Masson, H. and Phillips, S. (2006). Exploring Consensus in Practice with Youth Who Are Sexually Abusive: Findings from a Delphi Study of Practitioner Views in the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland. *Child Maltreatment*, 11(2): 146-156 DOI: 10.1177/1077559505285744

Hackett,S. Masson, H., Balfe, M. and Phillips, J.(2015).Community reactions to young people who have sexually abused and their families: a Shotgun blast, not a rifle shot. *Children and Society*, 29(4): 243-254.

Hackett, S. & Taylor, A. (2008). School Responses to Children with Harmful Sexual Behaviours. (Chapter 6) In_Baginsky, M. (2008) *Safeguarding Children and Schools*. London, Jessica Kingsley.

Hall, S. (2001). Foucault: power, knowledge and discourse, in Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. & Yates, S. (2001) *Discourse theory and practice: a reader*. London: Sage.

Hall, S. (2006). Children with Harmful Sexual behaviours – What promotes Good Practice? A study of one Social Services Department. *Child Abuse Review*, 15, 273-284

Hammersley, M. (2007). The issue of quality in qualitative Research. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 30 (3): 287–305.

Hatfield, S.(2014). Safeguarding the safeguarders: Supporting workers with children who sexually abuse peers. *Educational & Child Psychology*, 31 (3): 33 -41.

Hawkes, C. (2011). Description of a UK study of onset of sexually harmful behaviour before the age of ten years in boys referred to a specialist assessment and treatment service. *Child Abuse Review*, 20, 82–101.

Hawkes G.L. and Egan R.D. (2008). Developing the Sexual Child, *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 21, 4, 443–465.

Heiman, M.L. Leiblum, S. Esquilan, S.C. and Palitto L.M. (1998). A Comparative Survey of Beliefs about “Normal” Sexual behaviours. *Child Abuse and Neglect* 22 (4): 289-304.

Henniker J, Print B. and Morrison T. (2002). An Inter-agency Assessment Framework for Young People Who Sexually Abuse: Principles, Processes and Practicalities. *Child Care in Practice*, 8 (2): 114-126.

Hickey N, McCrory E, Farmer E, Vizard E, (2008). Comparing the developmental and behavioural characteristics of female and male juveniles who present with sexually abusive behaviour. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 14, 241-252

Higgins, H. J. and Gulliford, A. (2014) Understanding teaching assistant self-efficacy in role and in training: its susceptibility to influence. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 30 (2): 120-138.

H M Government The Children Act (2004). London HSMO. Available online at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/31/contents> [Accessed on 12/06/14].

HM Government (2010) *Working Together to Safeguard Children: A Guide to Inter-agency Working to Safeguard and Promote the Welfare of Children*, London: DCSF

H M Government The Children and Families Act. (2014). London HSMO.

Hollway, W. and Jefferson, T. (2000). *Doing Qualitative Research Differently: free association, narrative and the interview method*. London, Sage.

Horner G, (2004). Sexual behaviour in Children Normal or Not? *Journal of Pediatric Health Care*, 18 (2): 57-64.

Humphrey, N., Lendrum, A., & Wigelsworth, M. (2010). *Social and emotional aspects of learning (SEAL) programme in secondary schools: National evaluation*. London: Department for Education. Available online at : <https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DFE-RR049.pdf> [Accessed 07/03/15]

Hutton, L. and Whyte, B. (2006). Children and young people with harmful sexual behaviours: First analysis of data from a Scottish sample. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international, interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 12 (2): 115-125

Hydén, M.(2008). Narrating Sensitive Topics (Chapter 7): in Andrews, M., Squire, C. and Tamboukou, M. (Eds.) (2008). *Doing Narrative Research*. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Jackson, S. and Martin, P.Y. (1998). Surviving the Care System, Education and resilience. *Journal of Adolescence*, 21(5):569-583.

Jackson S. and Scott, S. (2010) Rehabilitating Interactionism for a Feminist Sociology of Sexuality *Sociology*, 44 (5): 811 - 826

James and Prout (1997) *Constructing and reconstructing Childhood. Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Studies of Childhood*. (2nd Ed) Oxon, Routledge.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed). *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. (pp: 13-31). Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Josselson, R. (2011). Narrative research: constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing story. In: Wertz, F.J., Charmaz, K., McMullen, L. M., Josselson, R., Anderson, R. and McSpadden, E. (2011). *Five Ways of Doing Qualitative Analysis: Phenomenological Psychology, Grounded Theory, Discourse Analysis, Narrative Research, and Intuitive Inquiry*. London, The Guilford Press.

Kehily M. (2004) *An Introduction to Childhood Studies* Maidenhead, Open University Press.

Kehily, M J (2012). Contextualising the sexualisation of girls debate: innocence, experience and young female sexuality. *Gender and Education*, 24 (3): 255-268.

Kitzinger, J.(1997) Who are you kidding? Children, Power and the Struggle against Sexual Abuse (Chapter 8) in James and Prout (1997) *Constructing and reconstructing*

Childhood. Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Studies of Childhood. (2nd Ed) Oxon, Routledge.

Kitzinger, J. (1998) Defending Ideologies of Childhood. *Feminist Review* 28 (28) :77-87

Kohlberg L. (1979). *Measuring Moral Judgement.* Worcester MA, Clark University Press.

Lamb, S. (2013). Just the Facts? The Separation of Sex Education from Moral Education. *Educational Theory*, 63: 443–460. doi: 10.1111/edth.12034

Lambie I. and Seymour F. (2006). One size does not fit all: Future directions for the treatment of sexually abusive youth in New Zealand. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international, interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 12 (2):175-187.

Lambie, I. and Price, M. (2015). Transitioning youth with sexually harmful behaviour back into the community. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international, interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 21 (2): 244-265. Available online at DOI: 10.1080/13552600.2013.873829 [Accessed 27/05/15]

Laming, H. (2003). *The Victoria Climbié Inquiry.* Norwich, HMSO.

Larsson, I. and Svedin, C.G. (2002). Teachers' and parents' reports on 3- to 6-year-old children's sexual behavior—a comparison. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 26: 247–266.

Letourneau and Borduin (2008). The Effective Treatment of Juveniles Who Sexually Offend: An Ethical Imperative. *Ethics and Behavior*, 18 (2–3): 286–306.

Lieblich, A. Tuval-Mashiach R. and Zilber, T (1998). *Narrative Research reading , Analysis and Interpretation.* London Sage Publications.

Lightfoot, S. and Evans, I.M. (2000). Risk Factors for a new Zealand Sample of Sexually Abusive Children and Adolescents. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 24, (9): 1185–1198.

MacKay, T. (2000). Educational psychology and the future of special educational needs legislation. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 17(2): 27-35.

MacIntyre, A.. (2011) *After Virtue*. London, Bloomsbury.

Manocha, K.F. and Mezey G. (1998). British Adolescents who sexually abuse. A descriptive study. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, 9 (3): 588-608.

Marks, M. (2002). Perspectives of evidence-based practice, *Health Development Agency Public Health Steering Group*. City University London. Available online at:

http://www.nice.org.uk/about/nice/whoweare/aboutthehda/evidencebase/publichealthvidencesteeinggroupproceedings/perspectives_on_evidence_based_practice.jsp

[Retrieved 07/0712]

Marks D.F. and Yardley, L. (2004) Eds. Research Methods for Clinical and Health Psychology 2004, 'Qualitative Data Collection: Interviews and Focus Groups', in David F. Marks, & L Yardley (eds). SAGE Publications, Ltd, London, England, pp. 39-56, Available online at doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849209793.n3>. [Accessed 30 /08/2015]

Marshall, W.L., Cripps, E., Anderson, D., & Cortoni, F. (1999). Self-esteem and coping strategies in child molesters. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14 (9): 955-962.

Maslow S.H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50: 370-396.

Masson, H. and Hackett, S. (2003). A decade on from the NCH Report (1992): Adolescent sexual aggression policy, practice and service delivery across the UK and Republic of Ireland. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 9 (2): 109- 124.

Masson, H. and Hackett, S. (2004). The Extent and Nature of Work with Adolescents Who Have Sexual Behaviour Problems: Findings from a Survey of Youth Offending Teams in England and Wales. *Youth Justice*, 4: 160-177, Available online at doi:10.1177/147322540400400302 [Accessed 12/08/2015]

Masson, H. & Hackett, S. (2005). The extent and nature of work with adolescents who have sexually abused others: Results of a survey of Youth Offending Teams in England and Wales. *Youth Justice*, 4(3): 160-177.

Masson, H. and Hackett, S.(2006). Young People who have Sexually Abused: What do they (and their parents) want from Professionals? *Children and Society* , 20 :183–195

McAvoy P. (2013). The aims of sex education: Demoting autonomy and promoting mutuality. *Educational Theory*, 63 (5): 483-496

McIntyre E. (2009). Teacher discourse on lesbian, gay and bisexual pupils in Scottish schools. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 25 (4): 301-314.

Mental Health Foundation (1999). *Supporting Young People's Mental Health Eight Points for Action: A Policy Briefing from the Mental Health Foundation*. London, MHF.

Mercieca, D. (2011). *Beyond Conventional Boundaries Uncertainty in research and Practice with Children*. Rotterdam, Sense Publishers.

Miller, A. & Todd, Z. (2002). Educational psychology and difficult behaviour in schools: Conceptual and methodological challenges for an evidence-based profession. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 19 (3): 82-95.

Milner J. (2008). Solution-focused approaches to caring for children whose behaviour is sexually harmful. *Adoption and Fostering*, 32 (4): 42-50.

Ministry of Justice (2015). *Youth Justice Statistics 2013/14 England and Wales*
Available online at
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/399379/youth-justice-annual-stats-13-14.pdf [Accessed 06/06/2016]

Morgan, A. (2000). *What is narrative therapy? An easy-to-read introduction*.
Adelaide, Dulwich Centre Publishing.

Morgan, D. L. (2012). Focus groups and social interaction. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. Marvasti, & K. D. McKinney (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (p. 161-175). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Myers, S. (2002). Language, Discourse and Empowerment: Changing Approaches to Children and Young People who have Sexually Abused Others. *Children and Society*, 16: 334–345.

Myers, S. (2005). A Signs of Safety Approach to Assessing Children with Sexually Concerning or Harmful Behaviour. *Child Abuse Review*, 14: 97 – 112.

Myers, S. (2007). (De) Constructing the Risk Categories in the AIM Assessment Model for Children with Sexually Harmful Behaviour. *Children and Society* 21: 365 – 377

Myers, S., McLaughlin, M. and Warwick, K. (2003). The day the touching monster came': Solution-focused and narrative approaches to working with children and young people with sexually inappropriate behaviour. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 20, (1): 76-89

Nash K. (1994) The Feminist Production of Knowledge: Is Deconstruction a Practice for Women? *Feminist Review* , 47, 65 -77

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence NICHE (2009). *Social and emotional wellbeing in secondary education*. NICE public health guidance 20 Available online at <http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ph20/resources/guidance-social-and-emotional-wellbeing-in-secondary-education-pdf> [Accessed 12/05/2015]

Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) (2011). *Safeguarding in schools: best practice*. Available online at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/413514/Safeguarding_in_schools.pdf [Accessed 12/10/15]

Ofsted (2013). *Not yet good enough: personal, social, health and economic education in schools Personal, social and health education in English schools in 2012*, Available online at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/413178/Not_yet_good_enough_personal__social__health_and_economic_education_in_schools.pdf [Accessed 12/10/15]

O'Halloran, M., Carr, A, O'Reilly, G., Sheerin, D. Cherry, J., Turner, R., Beckett, R. and Brown, S. (2002). Psychological profiles of sexually abusive adolescents in Ireland. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 26:349–370.

Papadopoulos, L. (2010). *Sexualisation of Young People Review*. London: Home Office Publication,

Parker, I. (2005). *Qualitative Psychology: Introducing Radical Research*. Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press.

Parrish, M S ,Stanard, R.P. and Cobia, D C. (2008). Using Existential-Humanistic Approaches in Counselling Adolescents With Inappropriate Sexual Behaviors. *Journal of Humanistic Counselling, Education and Development*, 47: 26-41

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

Piaget, J. (1932) *The moral judgment of the child*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Piaget, J. & Gabian, M. (1977). *The moral judgement of the child* (Penguin education). Harmondsworth (etc.): Penguin.

Potter J. (1996). *Representing reality: discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. London: Sage

Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London, Sage

Power, M. (2011) Foucault and Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 37, (1) 35-56

Public Health England (2015). *Promoting children and young people's emotional health and wellbeing A whole school and college approach*. London, Crown Copyright.

Rahman, M., & Jackson, S. (2010). *Gender and sexuality: sociological approaches*. Cambridge, Polity.

Reiss M. (1993). What Are the Aims of School Sex Education?, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 23 (2): 125-136

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

Righthand S. and Welch C. (2001). *Juveniles who have sexually offended A review of professional literature Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Washington*.

Robinson, K.H. (2008). In the name of 'childhood innocence': A discursive exploration of the moral panic associated with childhood and sexuality. *Cultural Studies Review*, 14 (2): 113-129.

Robinson K. (2012) 'Difficult citizenship': The precarious relationships between childhood, sexuality and access to knowledge. *Sexualities*, 15 (3-4): 257–276.

Robinson, K. and Davies, C. (2008). Docile bodies and heteronormative moral subjects: Constructing the child and sexual knowledge in schooling. *Sexuality & Culture*, 12 (4): 221-239.

Runswick-Cole K. (2011) Ethnography Chapter 5 in Bannister, P., Bunn, G., Burman, E., Daniels, J., Duckett, P., Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., Parker, I., Runswick-Cole, K., Sixsmith, J., Smailes, S., Tindall, C. and Whelan, P. (2011) *Qualitative Methods in Psychology: A Research Guide*. Open University Press

Rutter, M. (1985). Resilience in the face of adversity. Protective factors and resistance to psychiatric disorder. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 147(6): 598-611. Available online at DOI: 10.1192/bjp.147.6.598 [Accessed 26/04/14]

Rutter, J., Giller, H. and Hagell, A. (1999). Antisocial Behaviour by Young People, A Major New Review. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 40 (6): 981 – 983.

Ryan, G. (1999) 'Treatment of sexually abusive youth: The evolving consensus', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14 (4): 422–436.

Ryan, G.(2000a). Childhood Sexuality: A decade of study Part 1 – Research and Curriculum Development. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 24 (1): 33–48.

Ryan, G.(2000b). Childhood Sexuality: A decade of study Part 2 Dissemination and Future Directions. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 24 (1) 49–61.

Ryan, G, Miyoshi, T.J, Metzner, J.L., Krugman, R.D., Fryer, G.E.(1996). Trends in a National Sample of Sexually Abusive Youths *Journal of American Academic Child Adolescent Psychiatry*, 35 (1):17-25.

Scaife, J. (2010) *Supervising the Reflective Practitioner: An Essential Guide to Theory and Practice*. East Sussex , Routledge.

Sharpe, S. (2002). 'It's Just Really Hard to Come to Terms With': Young people's views on homosexuality, *Sex Education*, 2 (3): 263-277, Available online at DOI: 10.1080/1468181022000025811 [Accessed 15/05/2015]

Sharrocks L. (2014) *School staff perceptions of well-being and experience of an intervention to promote well-being*. *Educational Psychology in Practice* , 30, (1) 19-36.

Shevade D., Norris, E. and Swann R. (2011) *An exploration of therapists' reactions to working with children displaying sexually problematic behaviour: a thematic analytic study*. *Journal of Child Psychotherapy*, 37 (1): 52–74.

Silovsky J. F and Niec, L. (2001). Characteristics of young children with sexual behavior problems: A pilot study, *Child Maltreatment* 7,187–197.

Smith, C., Allardyce, S.,Hackett, S., Bradbury-Jones, C. ,Lazenbatt, A. & Julie Taylor (2014). Practice and policy in the UK with children and young people who display harmful sexual behaviours: an analysis and critical review. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international, interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 20 (3): 267-280.

Smith, P K., Cowie, H, and Blades, M. (1998). *Understanding Children's Development*. 3rd ed. Basic Psychology. Oxford, Blackwell

Smith, B. and Sparkes, A.C. (2006). Narrative inquiry in psychology: exploring the tensions within. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 (3): 169-192.

Smith R. and Standish P. (eds) (1997). *Teaching Right and Wrong; moral education in the balance*. Stoke on trent, Trentham Books Ltd.

Social Exclusion Unit (2004). *The Social Exclusion Report*. London ,HMSO.

Spector-Mersel G. (2010). Narrative research: Time for a paradigm. *Narrative Inquiry*. 20 (1): 204–224.

Stanley, N (2006). Safeguarding Children alongside and through the Criminal Justice System. *Child Abuse Review*, 15, 221–223.

Stonewall Trust Schools (2014) The Teachers Report: Homophobic Bullying in British Schools in 2014. Available on line at https://www.stonewall.org.uk/sites/default/files/teachers_report_2014.pdf [Accessed June 2015]

Taylor, A. (2010). “Troubling Childhood Innocence: Reframing the Debate Over the Media Sexualisation of Children”. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 35 (1): 48 – 57.

Taylor, J.F. (2003) Children and young people accused of child sexual abuse: A study within a community, *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international, interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 9:,1, 57-70. Available online at DOI: 10.1080/1355260031000149154 [Accessed 20/02/2016]

Thanasiu, P. L. (2004). Childhood Sexuality: Discerning Healthy From Abnormal Sexual Behaviors. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 26 (4): 309-319.

Tidefors I, Goulding A & Arvidsson H (2011) A Swedish sample of 45 adolescent males who have sexually offended, *Nordic Psychology*, 63 (4):18-34, Available online at DOI: 10.1027/1901-2276/a000043 [Accessed 23/02/2016]

Tolman, D. L. and McClelland, S. I. (2011), Normative Sexuality Development in Adolescence: A Decade in Review, 2000–2009. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21: 242–255.

Turnell, A., & Edwards, S. (1999) *Signs of Safety: A safety and solution orientated approach to child protection casework..* New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc.

UNICEF (1989). *UN Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Geneva: Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. UNICEF.

UNICEF (2005) Children Under Threat The state of the World's Children 2005. Available online at <http://www.unicef.org/sowc05/english/childhooddefined.html> [Accessed 25/02/2016]

Vaughn, S., Schumm, J., & Sinagub, J. (2013). Focus group interviews in education and psychology. London: Sage

Vizard, E. (2006). Sexually Abusive Behaviour by Children and Adolescents. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 11 (1): 2–8.

Vizard E, Hickey, N. , French, L & McCrory, E. (2007). Children and adolescents who present with sexually abusive behaviour: A UK descriptive study. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 18 (1): 59-73.

Vosmer S, Hackett, S. & Callanan, M. (2009): “Normal” and “inappropriate” childhood sexual behaviours: Findings from a Delphi study of professionals in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international, interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 15(3): 275-288.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky L. (1986) *Thought and Language*-Revised edition. Cambridge Massachusetts, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Wagner, P. (2000). Consultation: developing a comprehensive approach to service delivery. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 16 (1): 9-19.

Walther, S. and Fox, H. (2012) Narrative therapy and outsider witness practice: Teachers as a community of acknowledgement. *Education and Child Psychology* 29 (2): 8-17.

Ward, T., & Gannon, T. (2006). Rehabilitation, etiology, and self-regulation: The Good Lives Model of rehabilitation for sexual offenders. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 11: 77–94.

Weare K. (2000). *Promoting Mental, Emotional and Social Health: A Whole School Approach*. London: Routledge

Weare K. (2004). *Developing the emotionally literate school* , London , Sage.

Weare K. (2015). *What works in promoting social and emotional well-being and responding to mental health*. London, National Children's Bureau. Available online at http://www.ncb.org.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/documents/Health_wellbeing_docs/ncb_framework_for_promoting_well-being_and_responding_to_mental_health_in_schools.pdf [Accessed 15/12/2015]

Weare, K. and Gray, G. (2003). *What works in developing children's emotional and social competence and well being?* The Health Education Unit, Research and Graduate School of Education, University of Southampton.

Weeks J. (2003) *Sexuality* 2nd Edition. London, Routledge.

Weeks J (2010) Social Constructions of Sexuality Chapter 30 p 175 -180 in Giddens A. and Sutton P.W. (2010) *Sociology Introductory Readings 3rd Ed*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

West B. (2007): Using the Good Way model to work positively with adults and youth with intellectual difficulties and sexually abusive behaviour. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international, interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 13 (3): 253-266.

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

Whittaker, M. K., Brown, J., Beckett, R. & Gerhold, C. (2006). Sexual knowledge and empathy: A comparison of adolescent child molesters and non-offending adolescents. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 12, 143-154

Williamson B.(1997). Moral learning: a lifelong task (Chapter 8) in Smith R. and Standish P. (eds) (1997). *Teaching Right and Wrong; moral education in the balance*. Stoke on trent, Trentham Books Ltd.

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

Woodhead M. (2015) Psychology and the Cultural Construction of Children (Chapter 3) in James A. and Prout A. (Eds) (2015) *Constructing and reconstructing Childhood. Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Studies of Childhood*. (Classic Edition) Oxon, Routledge.

Woods,K., Bond, C.,Tyldesley K., Farrell P. and Humphrey N. (2011). The Role of School Psychologists in Child Protection and Safeguarding, *School Psychology International*, 32, (4): 361-376. Available online at DOI:[10.1177/0143034311406812](https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034311406812). [Accessed 17th April 2015]

Wylie, L.A. & Griffin, H.L. (2013). G-map's application of the Good Lives Model to adolescent males who sexually harm: A case study. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international, interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 19 (3): 345-356.

Wyness M. (2006) *Childhood and Society: An Introduction to the Sociology of Childhood*. London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Worling J.R. & Curwen T. (2000). Adolescent Sexual Offender Recidivism: Success of Specialised treatment and Implications for risk Prediction. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 24, (7): 965–982.

Worling J.R. & Langstrom (2003. Assessment of criminal recidivism risk with adolescents who have offended sexually: A Review. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, 4 (4) 341-362.

Yardley L. (2000). Dilemmas in qualitative health research. *Psychology & Health*, 15 (2) 215-228

Youth Justice Board for England and Wales (2010) Youth Justice Board for England and Wales Young People Who Sexually Abuse - Key Elements of Effective Practice, London

Appendices

Appendix One

Ethical Approval letter



The School Of Education.

Karen Jessup
DEdPsy

Head of School
Professor Cathy Nutbrown

School of Education
335 Glossop Road
Sheffield
S10 2JA

07 November 2013

Telephone: +44 (0)114 222 8180
Email: MPhil-PhD@sheffield.ac.uk

Dear Karen,

ETHICAL APPROVAL LETTER

"Narratives in school about young people who show sexually harmful/problematic behaviour and the role of the school context (aged 11-14)"

Thank you for submitting your ethics application. I am writing to confirm that your application has now been approved.

We recommend you refer to the reviewers' additional comments (please see attached). You should discuss how you are going to respond to these comments with your supervisor BEFORE you proceed with your research.

This letter is evidence that your application has been approved and should be included as an Appendix in your final submission.

Good luck with your research.

Yours sincerely



Professor Dan Goodley
Chair of the School of Education Ethics Review Panel

cc Professor Tom Billington

Appendix Two

Initial Letter to School staff

18th September 2014

Dear

Re: Research on narratives of young people who show sexually harmful or problematic behaviour

I am Karen Jessup, Senior Educational Psychologist (XXX) and I am conducting a research project as part of an Educational Psychology Doctorate at the University of Sheffield. I would like to offer staff within your school the opportunity to take part in a research project and CPD opportunity.

The title of the research project is 'Educational professionals' narratives about young people age 11-14 who show sexually harmful/ problematic behaviour and the role of the school context.'

This will contribute to the developing research knowledge in this area from a perspective previously not explored as well as offer a significant learning opportunity for staff. It is hoped participation will further develop the understanding and confidence of staff including understanding of practices within school.

I would like conduct two sessions with staff of one hour each, with teachers who have worked either currently on in the past with young people who show sexually harmful behaviours.

The first session (focus group) will involve information sharing regarding narrative methods and discuss the issues of sexually problematic/harmful behaviour within a school environment.

The agenda of the second session will be developed from initial analysis of the content of the first session and recap the use of narrative methods to explore themes emerging. We will discuss the role of the school context in light of the emerging themes.

Participants would need to attend both groups.

The timing of the focus groups can be arranged to accommodate the participants and will involve 4-6 teachers from a range of schools. A central location will therefore be chosen for the focus groups. Each focus group will take around an hour.

Confidentiality will be maintained at all times. It will not be possible to identify individual responses, or schools, nor will participants be named.

Please could you share this letter with staff you feel would benefit from this opportunity and circulate the attached information sheet.

If you or a member of your staff have any further questions do not hesitate to contact me by telephone on or by email at Karen.jessup@xxxxleeds.gov.uk.

I will contact you on Thursday 25th September to see if there are any participants who would like to take part.

Yours sincerely,

Karen Jessup
Senior Educational Psychologist (XXX)

Appendix Three

Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a research project. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. If there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information please contact me using the contact details provided.

Research Project Title: *Narratives of educational professionals about young people age 11-14 who show sexually harmful behaviour and the role of the school context.*

1. What is sexually harmful behaviour (SHB)?

Sexually harmful behaviour is sexual behaviour which is a problem for the young person and affects those around him/her. It persists following responses by adults aimed to direct to positive behaviour. The behaviour does not have to be at the level where youth justice services are involved, but includes all behaviours which present a problem for the young person, is harmful to others and has required a school response. It does not have to be present in the school context but is a feature of some part of the pupil's life. Sexually harmful behaviour is often characterised by impacting others, having coercive features and/or a power imbalance.

2. What is the aim of the project?

The aim of this project is to explore the experience of adults working in schools with young people who show sexually harmful behaviour. Through exploring stories of working with young people, the aim is to develop understanding of the main themes talked about and how teachers view the role of school.

There has been lots of research into this area from the perspective of social care and youth offending. Whilst it is recognised that school is an important aspect of a young person's life, research in this context is limited. The use of narrative methods enables an opportunity to share experiences and construct a shared understanding of the issues.

The research fulfils an academic research role but also forms a significant CPD opportunity for staff to discuss their understanding with each other and share understanding in this area.

3. How have I been chosen?

Schools known to have experienced young people with sexually harmful behaviour were contacted directly by the researcher via members of their SLT. Following an initial phone call, a letter was sent to these the school contact asking for volunteers to take part in this project. The Senior leadership team in your school asked for volunteers based on your experiences of working with this group of young people.

4. How will the project be carried out?

The project will be carried out by an me, experienced educational psychologist and will take approximately two years to complete (your involvement will over approximately four to six weeks).

You will be required to participate in facilitated group discussions with adults from your school. The sessions will last approximately one hour around the topic outlined above. There will be 2 sessions in total.

The focus groups will take place at a time in school negotiated with your selves by

Session 1: The first session will involve information sharing regarding narrative methods and discuss the issues of sexually harmful behaviour within a school environment.

Session2: The agenda of the second session will be developed from initial analysis of the content of the first session and recap the use of narrative methods to explore themes emerging. We will discuss the role of the school context in light of the emerging themes.

In between sessions participants will be asked to keep a reflective diary to capture any thoughts or experiences if possible.

The content of the focus groups will be analysed and themes identified in order to address the research aims.

5. Do I have to take part?

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 be asked to sign a consent form) and you can withdraw at any time, before or during the focus groups and you would not have to give a reason.

6. Will I be recorded, and how will the recorded media be used?

The discussion will be recorded for the purpose of the research so I can interpret and analyse the data. The audio recordings of the focus group discussions made during the research will be used for analysis and transcripts and possibly within conference presentations and lectures. No other use will be made of them without your written permission, and no one outside the project will be allowed access to the original recordings.

7. What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?

There are no identifiable disadvantages or risks to taking part. All data will be confidential.

8. What are the possible benefits of taking part?

The aim is to provide an opportunity for Continuing Professional Development. Participants would develop their understanding of narrative approaches, holistic needs of young people with sexually harmful behaviours and discuss the possible role of schools to support the needs of children who have experienced.

Following completion of the research it is hoped that this work will inform ways to support schools who are working with children who show sexually harmful behaviours.

9. What happens if the research study stops earlier than expected?

If the research is discontinued due to unforeseen circumstances you will be notified as soon as practically possible and informed of the reasons for the research ending.

10. What if something goes wrong?

If you wish to raise a complaint in relation to the content or procedures used in this research please contact the research supervisor:

Professor Tom Billington,
School of Education
University of Sheffield
Email: t.billington@sheffield.ac.uk
Telephone: 0114 222 8113

If you feel your complaint has not been handled to a satisfactory level you can contact the University's Registrar and Secretary:

Philip Harvey
Office of the Registrar and Secretary
University of Sheffield
Firth Court
Western Bank
Sheffield
S10 2TN
Email : registrar@sheffield.ac.uk
Telephone: 0114 222 1100
Fax: 0114 222 1103

www.shef.ac.uk/registrar

Confidentiality

What will happen to the results of the research project?

The results of the research will form a doctoral thesis for Educational Psychology at the University of Sheffield. The research project will be available at the University and may be submitted for publication in a relevant journal when the research is complete. Individuals will not be identified in any report or publication.

The researcher

The research is organised by the researcher Karen Jessup (Educational Psychologist) and supervised by the research supervisor Professor Tom Billington in relation to doctoral studies in Educational Psychology.

Who has ethically reviewed the project?

This research has been ethically reviewed by The School of Education Ethical Review Committee, University of Sheffield.

Contact for further information

Karen Jessup
Educational Psychologist
Email: Karen.jessup@xxxxx.gov.uk
Telephone: *telephone number*

Tom Billington
Email: t.billington@sheffield.ac.uk
Telephone: 0114 222 8113

You will be given a copy of this information sheet to keep and a copy of a signed consent form if you agree to participate in the focus group.

Thank you for reading and participating in this research.

Appendix Four

Information Gathering Sheet Narrative Research on Sexually Harmful Behaviour

Title of Project: Narratives in school of young people who show sexually harmful or problematic behaviour (aged 11-14 years.) and the role of the school context.

Name of Researcher: Karen Jessup

Role in school:

Please mark the applicable boxes

1. I am interested in participating in the focus groups

a) I currently teach/know a young person in school who has shown sexually harmful behaviours

or

b) In the last three years I have worked in school with a young person who has shown sexually harmful behaviours

2. I am available to participate in the focus group between ...and ... pm on:

Mondays

Tuesdays

Wednesdays

Thursdays

Fridays

3. Further correspondence; including the date and time of focus groups will be shared through the school SLT contact :

Appendix Six

Information shared in the Session

A different way to do research

- Offers opportunity for reflection and development of practice
- Uses an approach which can be used again
- Focuses not on the phenomena but on how it is talked about.

Basic Principles

- You are the experts in your own narratives.
- There are ways in which staff can develop confidence in articulating chosen narratives about young people who show SHB.
- Staff can make choices about preferred narratives and, for example, choose those which are associated with feelings and the emotional lives of children and themselves.

Elements

Externalising problems

It establishes a context where the problem is separate from the young person.

It gives space to take action against the problem not the person.

It still allows them to describe themselves in non problem ways.

Relative Influencing Questions

These explore the effects of the problem.

How it influences them.

How they can influence it.

Unique outcomes

- These are events which don't seem to fit with the problem.
- We call them alternative stories.

It allows us to reflect on their beliefs, values and personal qualities.

These can be strengths, other aspects of the person or times you have been with the person when you think about them in a positive way.

Appendix Seven

Transcript Conventions

Edwards and Mercer (1987)

(...)	Words undeciphered
.	Omitted conversation
.	irrelevant to the issue
.	being discussed or not
	appropriate to include
/	Pause of less than two seconds
//	Pause of greater than two seconds
[Simultaneous or interrupted speech
(&)	Continuing speech, separated in the transcript by an interrupting speaker.

Jefferson Convention (Jefferson 2004) is used for latched speech

= Latched speech, a continuation of talk

Emphatic speech is not highlighted in bold.

Confidentiality

All names in the transcripts are pseudonyms to maintain confidentiality.

Appendix Eight Transcripts

Session One

1 *R: I know it is really busy in schools so I really appreciate you coming*
2 *and doing this. Let me just explain who I am. I'm Karen Jessup. I'm*
3 *Senior Educational Psychologist for the West North West. Umm... The*
4 *piece of work I'm doing is a project around working with children with*
5 *sexually harmful behaviour. So kindly offered umm to use staff*
6 *within school and ask if you'd participate in this. The ...Do you just*
7 *want just- just tell me your names and just what your role is within*
8 *school. So I've got a -*

9 S1 I'm I'm the

10 S2: I'm the

11 S3: I'm a

12 S4: I'mI'm a

13 S5:

14 S6:head of

15 *R: OK . So all the people here will have had experience of working with*
16 *young people who have shown sexually harmful or sexually problematic*
17 *behaviours. So the idea for the research is I sent some - a little*
18 *informant about it.*

19 *The idea is that we have got a lot of information about working with*
20 *children who have sexually harmful behaviour. The definition for it and*
21 *we are going to use the phrase children who show sexually harmful*
22 *behaviour... the definition is its harmful to somebody else.. It's a*
23 *problem for that child but it's also a problem for somebody else. So it*
24 *can range from behaviours that are are effecting another child. so it*
25 *might be a child who for example is masturbating in front of another*
26 *child purposefully trying to be explicit. That would be classed as*
27 *problematic and harmful as it has automatic impact and it is intended to*
28 *and it can be all the way through to SHB which are criminally dealt with.*
29 *So in context there's about...2760.... the figures I've got are there are*
30 *2750 behaviours which are fixed term excluded in the country and*
31 *about 70 PX. Which doesn't sound very many actually? When you*
32 *look at some of the research that we've got. If I went round the schools*

33 *in Leeds to find out which schools have go work with children who've*
34 *got these SHB its almost every secondary school and quite a few of the*
35 *primary schools. So it is not particular schools it's not particular*
36 *demographics when you look at all the information they've got it's not*
37 *like one sort of child.*

38 *What I've hoping to do is to actually use a slightly different approach*
39 *that is normally done. We know that the research keeps coming back*
40 *and saying that school is really important. We know that a lot of these*
41 *young people are still in school. What we don't know is what is*
42 *happening in school as there is no research about it. There is*
43 *absolutely nothing out there about how you're dealing with it the ways*
44 *you're talking about these ch and young people and the way that that*
45 *impacts what action is carried out.*

46 *So what I am going to do is do these 2 sessions, one now and one*
47 *which we'll arrange at the end of this. And split it into 2 parts and then*
48 *after that if there is a piece of work you would like me to follow up on I*
49 *am happy to do that and to bring back some of the information I've*
50 *already got cos I've got stacks of the stuff. Does that sound about what*
51 *you've signed up for.*

52 *Good . So. I've got a little bit of information in the packs. I thought there*
53 *were 5 of you not 6 so I am very excited that was able to join us. I*
54 *wasn't sure if you were able to come. So I will put another one together*
55 *and bring it in.*

56 *So basically we are going to use an approach called narrative*
57 *approaches. What often happens in any sort of training is is that*
58 *someone comes along and gives you stuff and it's .. it's an approach*
59 *which says I am going to come and tell you something. But actually in*
60 *this case stuff is not out there around schools. So what we are going to*
61 *do is to use this narrative approach. It acts in two ways, one it's a*
62 *research model but secondly it's like a CPD opportunity cos it gives you*
63 *an opportunity to reflect on what your practice is, the way that the*
64 *narrative has been built within the school and how people are*
65 *constructing it and talking about these children actually what that then*

66 means for how you go on and act. It also gives you a chance to reflect
67 on what sort of language is being used and whether that is what you
68 want to use. Because sometimes we adopt language from other
69 places. It doesn't focus on the phenomena it focuses on the language
70 around it. And it's the idea I suppose that there is a person and a
71 listener and usually information transfers to the listener. In this
72 approach it's about having this third space there's a listener a person
73 but then that third space is the opportunity to reflect on what is being
74 said and how it's been said and why. It's really popular is narrative
75 approaches and you can use it in anything so I've brought some a little
76 bit of information for you to read at the end around narrative
77 approaches.

78 So if I just tell you a little bit about the narrative stuff. The basic
79 principles are that you are the expert in these stories; you understand
80 the stories of these children you piece together little bits of
81 information and you create a story about what is happening for that
82 child. But in everyone's life there is more than one story.

83 I have a story about myself as being a good driver. Narrative therapy
84 and narrative approaches would say that's OK. If I actually crash my car
85 or bump my car it doesn't necessarily affect my story that is my strong
86 dominant story. But there are always little stories that run next to it.
87 Somebody might have a different story about me; there are other parts
88 of me being a driver where I might be a bit careless for certain reasons
89 but I attribute that to somebody else. So you can have lots of little
90 stories running alongside each other.

91 We can develop ways of being confident articulating an alternative story
92 to the one that is been given to us. What we can do is we can choose
93 and make choices about the sorts of preferred narratives that we want
94 to engage in. In terms of this it means that actually when we talk about
95 children with sexually harmful behaviour the narrative is really strong a
96 lot of the time and its about children with sexually harmful behaviour .
97 You are in a position where you know those children as children and
98 young people; you know the whole of their story not just that one bit. So
99 it's it's an approach that allows you to think about what it is that school

100 *what's the school's roles for that child who shows this sexually harmful*
101 *behaviour so it's a little bit more open than just focusing on the harmful*
102 *behaviour. If that sort of makes sense.*

103 S3: Mmmm

104 *R: Right. In the pack I put a little bit on on the principles. Sorry can I*
105 *borrow yours.*

106 S5: Of course yeah.

107 *R: that just says what the principles are because it is slightly different*
108 *its bottom up research instead of top down it's bottom up research.*
109 *And on this side there are 3 elements. I've got some information for you*
110 *about and I was hoping that after this you could read it in between the*
111 *sessions. And there are 3 elements that I'll just describe to you now and*
112 *then we'll go on to talk about children that you've worked with. So the*
113 *three elements are the first one is in narrative therapy they do this thing*
114 *called externalising problems, schools are brilliant at it cos it's the*
115 *problem is the problem the child is the child. You separate them it*
116 *becomes - Instead of being a sexually harmful child it becomes a child*
117 *with who shows sexually harmful behaviours so it establishes a context*
118 *separate. And it then allows you to have a little bit of space because*
119 *that is one facet of that child you are then able to think about that child*
120 *in other ways as well. So it's that it's called externalising.*

121 *The second part is about influencing questions which we will go on to*
122 *which is what impact does that problem have on that child, how does it*
123 *impact not just them but their relationships, their context, how they are*
124 *engaging in their context their family situation the way they think about*
125 *themselves, so how big is that problem and it thinks also about how can*
126 *that child or YP influence the problem and in this situation how do you*
127 *influence that problem. Which parts of that child do you influence do*
128 *you know do you influence the sexually harmful behaviour part are you*
129 *going to think about other parts of that child.*

130 *And the third bit is about unique outcomes. You know when I was*
131 *saying about there is lots of stories running along at once because no*

132 *story fits every single situation does it so but actually there are these*
133 *alternative stories we call them unique outcomes. There's times when*
134 *there's opportunity for it and it's just not happening. Cos you never do it*
135 *100% of the time. You know if I'm a good driver I'm not a good driver*
136 *100% of the time there are times when it's the other way round just like*
137 *if you think of yourself as not being very good at maths there are times*
138 *where you will be. There'll be times when you will be able to actually do*
139 *you'll be be doing maths and actually that's a unique outcomes., You're*
140 *not it's something you're not paying attention to it doesn't fit with your*
141 *story but it's it's another aspect that we talk about in narrative therapy*
142 *and I've produced a little bit of information for you about it. So those*
143 *three elements are things we are going to use in this bit of research.*
144 *And I just wanted you to think about this is a space for you to be as*
145 *open as possible you can use any sorts of language and ways of talking*
146 *about these children and young people, do not get do not feel like you*
147 *have to talk in the ways that you are spoken to about it don't feel you*
148 *have to adopt any language that comes from another source that has*
149 *been given to you but actually the way that you actually understand you*
150 *are going to give me loads and loads of rich information cos you are*
151 *going to give me your expertise about what you know and what you do.*

152 *That's stopped me talking now. That's it. I've done my bit. Right so I*
153 *suppose the first – what I'd like is to tell me the story of working with a*
154 *child in this school. Anybody can start and you can all contribute if you*
155 *know the same child.*

156 I'll start.

157 R: Who would like to start? Tell me what your experience is.

158 S3: Yeah he's a (...)

159 R: Ok So if you/talk about a child you can just don't use any names.

160 And then anything that does get said I will anonymise it well so –

161 S3: We'll call him Bob.

162 S4: Yeah

163 S2: We have a year 10 student and he is /very/ touchy - feely with the
164 [girls.
165 S3: [girls
166 S2: He thinks he's just being friendly. And he doesn't actually
167 understand that his behaviour/ makes them feel [uncomfortable (&
168 S3: [uncomfortable
169 S2: (&) awkward .
170 S1 : And he's had someone spoke to him to him so many times and he
171 finds it very hard to [accept
172 S3: [He doesn't (&
173 S3: (&) understand . He doesn't feel he's doing anything wrong .he's
174 just to him he's just being friendly/ but the ways we've explained it to
175 him where you know/ specially the girls are saying =
176 S2: = and personal space umm and that sort of thing. He just doesn't
177 get it does he?
178 S3: Hmmm
179 S2: And quite often we've had instances recorded where he has
180 touched touched bottoms in class/ and he can't understand why girls
181 would be uncomfortable with that.
182 S3: When he's run up to them and just/ hugged them or tried to pick
183 them up and stuff like that /and he thinks he's just being very friendly.
184 S4: He can't separate being a child and being a teenager adult. Those
185 feelings in between/ he's still doing it like a child.
186 S6: I think / I think it's/ sometimes as well to do with / it's almost to do
187 with that popularity in a weird kind of way. If you're if you're a young
188 man or girl who is quite seen as quite cool or quite popular and sort of
189 quite good looking I think sometimes that it kind of normalises the
190 behaviour / Like if for example if there was a year 10 boy who everyone

191 thought was a bit odd who had no friends and everyone thought he was
192 a bit cool if he was going to do something like that I think [there would
193 be uproar (&)

194 S3: [Yeah yeah

195 S6: (&) Do you know what I mean? But I think when it's a lad who's
196 quite/ [like Bob (&)

197 S3: [Very

198 S6: (&) who we are talking about who is very sort of confident and
199 loud and rururur do you know what I I think it can kind of/ I think that
200 sometimes can / I just noticed you can sort of find it as well [I think//

201 S1: [I think
202 (&) S1: (&) there's another boy an Asian boy who does the same kind
203 of things whose got a lot of learning needs. And it's exactly the same as
204 you've said people are in uproar if he does it [because (&)

205 S6: [Right yeah

206 S3: [Whereas

207 S1: (&) whereas he's quite a weak and sad character really and he
208 doesn't understand what he's doing at all.

209 S2: No He's actually copying [other behaviour (&)

210 S4: [Yep yeah

211 S2: (&) That he sees on the corridors or you know the changeover of
212 lessons really. He's copying that behaviour but the children take real
213 offence at him and actually find/ it =

214 S4: =Weird yeah.

215 S2: [A bit weird

216 S3: [Weird (&)

217 S3: (&) yeah it's [odd

218 S5: [Do you think (&
219 S5(&) Do they [perceive other (&
220 S2: [Yeah I was going to say
221 S5: (&) things differently? =
222 S5: = Probably cos I know that the Asian lad you're talking about I know
223 I've had quite a lot of staff come and say that they are very very
224 concerned about the way that he's been acting, what he's done/
225 whereas I it's not so much.
226 S2: I think it's the girls' reactions to the boys
227 [isn't it. That's the popular boys (&
228 S5: [Well yeah I know. its extreme isn't it
229 S2: (&) it's sort of accepted a lot more. Whereas =
230 S1: =And is it how you take the child's emotional age as well because
231 the Asian boy were thinking about emotionally in many ways he's very
232 young isn't [he (&
233 S3: [Yeah
234 S2: [Yeah
235 S1: (&) And he does these things but doesn't really realise
236 [what he's (&
237 S4: [Understand it
238 S1: (&) doing I don't think.
239 S5: No.
240 **R: Do you have any young people who actually who are showing**
241 **SHB because you're talking about emotional understanding . Do**
242 **you have any young people who are showing those behaviours**
243 **where you feel they do understand and you find it very difficult to**
244 **engage?**

245 S1 : We've had a [young man yeah (&
246 [In the past
247 S1: (&) not with us now he we we thought he'd got issues around his
248 sexuality and he was involved in an incident not here but at another
249 provision and he was really proud of it, and talking about it to a lots of
250 people so that they knew about it and I think that was/ in a way
251 because he comes from a very macho kind of home background it was
252 a bit like I don't know a badge [of honour/ I don't know / yeah
253 S3: [yeah, yeah I think
254 S1: do you know that I've done this to a [girl (&
255 S3: [yes
256 S1: (&) and it it was really difficult for us to deal with because you know
257 normally you wouldn't discuss anything like this in front of any other kids
258 but it was him that was telling everyone [he'd done it
259 S4: [His parents (&
260 S4: (&) his parents kind of liked that kind [of thing.
261 S1: [But they then (&
262 S4: (&) were the same as well really in a way weren't they. They were
263 kind of proud [of it.
264 S5: [Like saying well done
265 S1: Yeah
266 S2: I mean It did go to court and he was he was / he was accused of
267 rape that's what [it was (&
268 S4: [Yes
269 S2: (&) on more than one occasion / but his behaviour was
270 S3: I think that was to do with his sexuality=.

271 S2: = [Yeah I think so

272 S1: [yes

273 S6: I think that's an issue though. I'm thinking of another year ten very
274 flamboyant pupil that we've got at the moment you know very problem
275 you know a /does misbehaves quite a lot very attention seeking but very
276 bright/who I strongly believe is Gay or bisexual and I think that there's
277 been quite a few issues there that have had to be recorded which when
278 he I've not really seen it that way before . So it's obviously been him
279 with with boys and even just yesterday when I was on outside break
280 duty he went over to one of his friends and started [hugging (&)

281 S4: [yeah

282 S6: (&) him and you know and he's and it wasn't inappropriate from a
283 point of view they were just hugging but what was inappropriate I think
284 is because there has been so much of that where he has been/some of
285 the boys have been saying oh he looks at me in a funny/ or he touches
286 me in a way that makes me feel

287 [uncomfortable (&)

288 S3: [hmmm uncomfortable

289 S5: [Yeah

290 S6: (&) And then obviously then there's the whole issue of
291 homosexuality with young teenage boys anyway which is an added/you
292 know that makes it even more sort of difficult to deal with. And I
293 suppose that's when you've got the problematic sexual behaviours in
294 he's clearly making/ the other boys just as it would the other girls
295 uncomfortable but then it sometimes the double whammy of how that's
296 probably I'm sure going back into himself and his own/ you know trying
297 to deal deal with it himself rea do you know it's almost like a/ really a
298 sort of double (laughs) cos you know you know its difficult /sort of going
299 both ways really.

300 R: **There's quite a range of different sexually problematic**
301 **behaviours that you're talking about going from going from those**

302 **that are in school now where you've talked about ways people**
303 **thinking and the reaction from the peer group to quite extreme**
304 **sexually harmful behaviour where it's gone to court, and they**
305 **seem very different . When you are thinking about working with**
306 **these young people, what sort of language do you hear in school**
307 **about them? Because the language that you're talking about is**
308 **that common place do you feel that=**

309 S4: =Its normal language?

310 R: Sorry?

311 S4: It's normal language

312 **How do you feel the CH and YP talk about this?**

313 S4: As an everyday thing.

314 S6: Do you mean in terms of what they would call the people?

315 R: **I just wondered mean that in terms the influence of SHB has an**
316 **influence. As a problem it influences things so it influences how**
317 **that young person is talked about. So in terms of how peers talk**
318 **about [that person (&)**

319 S6: [Right I see I see.

320 R: **(&) what sorts of language and what sorts of conversations are**
321 **you having to deal with?**

322 S6: Ones I suppose that I've heard that I've seen its right across the
323 range from weirdo from that sort of thing to he's a poof or/ thinking
324 about the different types of homophobic language I suppose down to
325 just any sort of slang words for being a bit weird or a bit odd. I haven't
326 heard I've not ever heard personally words like pervert or perve or
327 anything like [that Oh have you (&)

328 S1: [I have

329 S6: (&) I've heard that talking about adults but not about

330 S1: Yeah

331 S3: No I've heard that from kids as well, but

332 S1: But it depends [who (&)]

333 S3: [mmmmm]

334 S1: (&) because the same behaviour done by one [person (&)]

335 S6: [Yeah]

336 S1: (&) Is [is (&)]

337 S3: (&) [is different]

338 S1: (&) yeah Miss he's a perv and then/ it's similar I wouldn't

339 [say , yeah yeah I know]

340 S6: [Paedo I hear a lot and (&)]

341 S6: (&) then kids get confused even though even though in sex ed they

342 know what the definition of a paedophile is

343 [they use the term paedo for general slang for someone (&)]

344 S1: [it's a slang it's a slang yeah]

345 S6: (&) whose I suppose like a [sexual deviant (&)]

346 [???

347 S6: (&) or a bit creepy. So paedo I hear but I personally I haven't

348 heard obviously I've seen you have.

349 **R: For that YP you were talking about who has left the school**

350 **since who He he ? He was taken to court and the charge was**

351 **rape how ..how were peers reacting to him?**

352 S4: He wasn't liked anyway . (Laugh)

353 S1: No he wasn't like at all and he was working only in a very small,

354 very small group. So/

355 S4: He had no friends

356 S1: No he had no friends and he wasn't he was what shall we say a very
357 difficult young man anyway so he wasn't liked by =

358 S4: =Anybody.

359 S1: = the other pupils and/ I would say not liked by staff either. Not
360 because of that behaviour just but because of his general [behaviour
361 (&)

362 S4: [behaviour

363 S1: (&) towards others. It wasn't relating to that behaviour particularly it
364 was just the way that he presented himself to everybody [all of the time

365 S4: [He wanted (&)

366 S4: (&) He wanted to get somebody to notice him.

367 S1: Yeah

368 S4: He wanted him noticed. He did anything in his possibility to get
369 noticed.

370 **R: What other aspects of him were there? You say that the the**
371 **staff=**

372 S2: Ohh he would constantly swear at people, he would/ say things
373 about staff all the [time use lots (&)

374 S1: [he would use

375 S1: (&) of sexual language

376 S3: yeah

377 S2: Yeah [foul language

378 S1: [Extremely crude (&)

379 S1: (&) in a lot of the things that he would say and a lot of =

380 S4: =with the girls especially in a small groups

381 S5: We don't know who you are talking about?

382 S3: You do.

383 .

384 .

385 .

386 .

387 S1: But I think/

388 S3: Do you think part of that is to come from his home life

389 [with his dad (&)

390 S1: [yeah yeah (&)

391 S3: (&)with his dad being an army [man (&)

392 S2: [Yeah I think there

393 S3: (&) So he struggled

394 S1:Yeah I mean there were conflicts at home as well I think his dad

395 was very very hard on him / (&)

396 S4: Very Hard. [macho

397 S1: (&) [and macho (&)

398 S1: (&) And I think quite an aggressive man, probably I should imagine I

399 don't know for sure but I should imagine there was domestic violence

400 there. And his dad wanted him to go into army cadets there and he did

401 for a while didn't it and then that stopped

402 [didn't it (&)

403 S3: [yeah

404 S1: (&) and his dad wanted him to play rugby and

405 [he.... Is he still doing that ? Right

406 S2: [he still is

407 S3: [Is he still playing rugby

408 S6: [Yeah. (&)

409 S6: I bumped into him too actually (&)

410 S1: Yeah

411 S6: (&) up in Tesco's and he said he was still .

412 S1: But he was not an easy person to get on with at all and he'd kind of

413 latch onto people so he'd say you're you know I can get on with you

414 and then you'd [get on (&)

415 S6: [for about an hour

416 S1: (&) for a couple of weeks maybe if you were lucky and then " I hate

417 you. I hate you more than I hate anybody else and then he'd pick up on

418 somebody else and say I like you. And that might last for a little while

419 and then he'd break that [relationship

420 S1: [I have to say (&)

421 S1: (&) when he first came in year seven and year eight he wasn't/ a

422 model student [he still had (&)

423 S4: [but he was all right

424 S1: (&) there was /some sort of disruptive behaviour in the classroom

425 cos he was actually / quite [low level. (&)

426 S4: [yeah

427 S1: (&) low ability. I have always felt and I could be totally wrong as

428 I've got no evidence about this, but something happened during that

429 summer before he moved into year nine because when he came back

430 after that six week holiday =

431 S4: = he was angry

432 S2: he was angry [and that's (&)

433 S4: [angry yeah

434 S2: (&) when we saw this change in his behaviour. And for nearly three
435 years he was actually placed in the learning support unit in school
436 because/ it was difficult for him to go into lessons. Because/ he couldn't
437 sort of control himself really could he. So although we've got and I
438 mean social care were involved. And they had the same feelings that
439 we did that something happened (&)

440 S4: ()

441 S2: (&) we don't know what that is, what it even looks like but there was
442 a massive/ change. So whether or not it was something to do with his
443 sexuality or something happened to him and/ he came back in year
444 nine a different boy.

445 **R: And then the incident that happened?**

446 S2: That happened two years later. There was two incidents and that
447 happened two years later . There were lots of little things leading up to
448 that.

449 S4: [Yeah

450 S1: [Yeah and the (&)

451 S1: (&) And the first one of those incidents. There were 2 boys that
452 they were both there at the same time and neither of them told the truth
453 about anything did they?/ And it wasn't actually him that carried the can
454 for the first one actually was it? [It was the other boy (&)

455 S2: [No it was the other boy

456 S1: But there was there was conflict then between those two boys
457 because each said that the other had lied about it. That's the big one
458 that we've got issues with now about/(&)

459 S4 : ()

460 S1 : (&) / and / so there was a lot of stuff going on between those two
461 and I think the other boy took the blame [for that (&)

462 S4: [He took the blame

463 S1: (&) Or might have well been to blame I don't know/ But they've both
464 been accused of it hadn't they I think. But the second incident was just
465 the boy that we're talking about.

466 **R: How do you think /when the sexually harmful behaviour**
467 **happened, how / how aware were staff about this, how did it**
468 **change the way people talked about him, the way they treated**
469 **him? Was there a big change? Was there a huge awareness of it?**

470 S1: [No well

471 S6: [Not well (&)

472 S6: (&) I teach sex ed and I wasn't aware of it.

473 S2: In the pastoral side of school we were aware of that=

474 S1: = But he wasn't out in mainstream school anyway.

475 S6: Right

476 S1: so that's why that's why that wasn't really highlighted to anybody
477 else and it was an out of school issue any way wasn't it.=

478 S2: =yeah.=

479 S1: =But he he was just in our learning support unit on a very reduced
480 timetable.

481 S2: I think if there had of been any risk to other children/ and he was in
482 mainstream lessons then there would have been a risk assessment
483 completed.

484 S1: And there was with the other boy wasn't there

485 S2: Yeah.

486 S1: The bigger boy /there was a risk assessment done with him and he
487 was actually escorted to and from all his lessons and had support in all
488 his lessons. For a while/ and then he /I can't remember exactly what

489 happened but something else happened he was just based in the
490 learning support unit on a reduced timetable as well. We tried to find
491 alternative placement for him didn't we? (&)

492 S4: ()

493 S1: (&) But it is so difficult to find alternative placement for people
494 who've been involved in sexually harmful behaviour and particularly as I
495 think both of these boys/they were both on an alternative curriculum
496 and the incident had happened not at the alternative curriculum but to a
497 girl to different girls [that went there (&)]

498 S2: [that went there

499 S1: (&) and so they were very reluctant to have those boys back there .
500 And in fact one of those came back into school on the back of that
501 because he couldn't go back there cos the girl was there. And we
502 couldn't find anywhere could we that we could place him.

503 S2: No

504 **How do you think about that? In terms of what that YP needs?**
505 **What is your view just about what you've said? It's really difficult**
506 **to find somewhere [for the child?]**

507 S4: [I feel uncomfortable (&)]

508 S4: (&) I feel uncomfortable cos the possibility of the of the other
509 children's safety lays in our hands [all the time

510 S1: [Yeah I don't think its (&)]

511 S1: (&) I think it's even more than that. It's the /young person's future
512 and what that young person might do to somebody/ in the future as
513 [well

514 S2: [Yeah (&)]

515 S2: (&) I think the risk assessment protects both the victim and or/you
516 know, the student who/ is displaying that behaviour but also the other
517 children as well that's what the risk assessment does.

518 S1:But once they are in the big cit/ big outside world there's with no
519 real/ input into that kind of behaviour

520 S6: And we cause an incident obviously with an ex pupil that ended up

521 S2: Yeah.

522 S6: that actau you know that raping.

523 S2: yeah

524 S1: We've also had a student who was pupil accused of something
525 relating to younger siblings/ and/ when he first came here he was in the
526 [learning support (&)

527 S4: [isol

528 S1: (&) unit cos we didn't know what to do with him or what the risks
529 were. Now I think / he he was meant to have a lot of support from social
530 care in terms of dealing with his issues/ but unfortunately became
531 seriously ill and so that had to go on the back burner but the scary thing
532 about that is then even now he's on the road to recovery the person
533 that was going to do that work has now pulled out and I don't know
534 whether he's ever going to get that [beha (&)

535 S2: [No

536 S1: (&) You know that therapy that he was meant to have

537 S5: You know/ when/ they're doing when they're identified is there
538 anybody who can work with them? Is there an agency [that can (&)

539 S1: [There is but

540 S5: (&) look at why and where that comes from cos what you're talking
541 about there is identified is there anyone that can work with them cos
542 what you're talking about there is a like boy/ that/ has come from a
543 family where/ raping a/ young girl/ raping a/ 14 15 year old is a good
544 thing. So I mean if they're (&)

545 ()

546 S5: (&) are brought up with that mind set (&)
547 ()
548 S5: (&) how do you change that mind set [if they're (&)
549 S2: [I think
550 S5: (&) are all sat round, his friends egging him on its like// cos its like
551 the risk that they are depends/ on kind of where they come from in
552 terms and why they've done it.
553 S2: Youth offending [do run (&)
554 S3: [yeah they do
555 S2: (&) programmes with them. They do(&)
556 (Outside Interruption)
557 S2: (&) Youth offending. (Outside Interruption). Youth offending
558 usually have therapeutic /
559 S3: [social workers
560 S2: [counselling (&)
561 S2: (&) and therapeutic couns / social workers working with the children
562 and with the families/
563 S3: And they have therapy and everything [don't they
564 S2: [Yeah (&)
565 S2: (&) But it's what they put in place but it's up to the children to
566 engage
567 S1: yeah
568 S3: and [they know
569 S1: [And its always

570 S1: time limited as well it's not kind of outcome /
571 [outcome led yeah yeah

572 S5: [That s' / that's it six session rather than as (&
573 S5: (&) it should has it changed the behaviour.

574 S1: Yeah yeah . It// I think

575 S3: It doesn't make sense does it?

576 S1: [No No It doesn't really..

577 S3: [No (&)

578 S3: (&) How can you give somebody 6 sessions and call it a cure?
579 ()

580 S1:And I think two of these young people we've spoken about/ the
581 Youth Offending Service have said well that one of in particularly, is one
582 of the most dangerous young people that they've kind of come across.

583 S3: hmhhh

584 S1: Because they also believed and you might not believe this that the
585 big boy/they thought he had issues with his sexuality as well.

586 S3: Ohh

587 S5: [And somat

588 S4: [That makes a lot of sense

589 S1: [You can kind of see it when that's said .

590 S5: Yeah yeah

591 S1:Can't you

592 **When they when they use that language with you and say this is**
593 **one of the most dangerous children YP that we've worked with**
594 **what's the impact of that? I'm just thinking in terms of school**
595 **what's the impact in the way you're thinking is there a different**

596 **narrative that you have of that young person that you want to**
597 **share? Or do you feel that taking that story [on**

598 S1: [I think (&)

599 S1: (&) that the danger was an out of school danger rather than an in
600 school [danger / because (&)

601 S4: [In school they're protected.

602 S1: (&) he was you know he was so closely monitored when he was in
603 school but its out in the big wide world where /the risk/ is.

604 S5: I think it's really hard that like. I mean/ I know who you are talking
605 about and I would I would have just said absolutely I told you that when
606 I referred you to/ in the first place but I think it is if someone comes in
607 and says they are a danger or they're are a risk there's sometimes what
608 runs through my head it's like 'They are a child'. You yeah / Danger / I
609 sometimes find it sometimes really difficult to think about a child being
610 that dangerous.

611 S1: I suppose they're thinking more long term. Though aren't they. They
612 are thinking [about (&)

613 [???

614 S1: (&) not the here and now [but what (&)

615 S3: [???

616 S1: (&) obviously they've got experience have the/of where somebody
617 has been and what they've gone to [do (&)

618 S5: [Yeah

619 S1: (&) And what they've gone on to do. And I think that's more what
620 they were meaning that he's a danger for the future [was (&)

621 S3: [Yeah

622 S1: (&) more [significant

623 S5: [When I say that /.

624 S4: The child might think in age he's a child but in mind he might not be
625 a child.

626 S6: Well there again were going back to the pupil who we all know
627 about who you know was still [school age (&)

628 S4: [yeah

629 S6: (&) and you know with a friend obviously raped [that (&)

630 S4: [yeah

631 S6: (&) women in the city centre. So [do you know what I mean (&)

632 S4: [Yeah

633 S6: (&) that was /you know

634 S4: It's a mind set

635 S2: [He came in

636 S6: [But what what was quite (&)

637 S6: (&) scary I think that's another I suppose like how you don't always
638 know, because I/ I've been in a room with him on my own many a time
639 taught him for quite a few [lessons, (&)

640 S4: [Yeah

641 S6: (&) you know never ever was ever was on the radar as you know I
642 never noticed anything /you know/ sort of strange or sexually you know
643 nothing really and that s what makes it quite ooh gosh /
644 [shocked (&)

645 S4 : [Scary

646 S6: (&) a few people because obviously there was something
647 underlying where there was the need and it was very much a
648 premediated from the CCTV waiting around
649 [to find someone. (&)

650 S4: [Hunted . Hunting them down

651 S6: (& you know [it wasn't (&

652 S4: [Their prey

653 S6: (& someone that they knew and things got out of hand. I'm not
654 saying trying to say that's Ok I'm say/it wasn't/ something led to
655 something it was a /we have gone into town with the sole purpose of
656 [waiting for (&

657 S4: [Waiting;

658 S6: (&a stranger to rape it was you know it was very pre meditated.
659 And there'd been / you know I said in my/ I hadn't sort of noticed/ If if
660 anything I'd noticed when I was teaching sex education with that pupil/
661 there was a little bit of/ he was/ a devout Muslim so there was a lot of
662 you know no sex like sex before marriage is wrong talking about you
663 know people ...think there is a bit of uncomfortableness around that but
664 that's that's not uncommon at all and I think that shocked/ you know it
665 shocked it shocked me. Although he was a pupil that the kids would
666 often use words like oh [he's odd (&

667 S4: [he's

668 S6: (& he's weird he's that and that makes you think 'Gosh you know
669 was there aspects of his behaviour ' but he'd never done anything that
670 has made [on record (&

671 S4: [Said he's creepy

672 S6: (& that was kind of serious but yet some of the girls says he looks
673 at me [funny

674 S4: [Yeah

675 S6: (& watches me funny. Yeah/ Its hard. (laughs)

676 **R: In terms of those terminologies and that language and those**
677 **terminologies that being used by the children and young people**
678 **what impact does that have in terms of the child cos you're ...E**

679 **was talking about its difficult to think about the child ... The child**
680 **is a difference narrative isn't it? That child and young person**
681 **growing up is one of the stories isn't it? Running alongside this**
682 **story about this child with sexually harmful behaviour. So what**
683 **was the impact of this just in terms of peer relationships. It's**
684 **obviously been there before.**

685 S6: Do you mean while he was still in school with us and things?

686 R: **Yes I suppose in terms of what's that child's story? How do**
687 **you think that child sees himself in terms of friendships,**
688 **[school**

689 S6: [I think he/ (&)

690 S6: (&) I think there were a lot of things he didn't speak English which
691 not too... it isn't too abnormal when he first came and I think he found/ I
692 think he was finding it / cos at the time my husband was actually his
693 head of year which was quite strange but at the time there was a lot of/
694 he had two identities. He had his kind of he/ was you know Muslim non
695 English speaking / strict you know that was very very strict and
696 suddenly I'm in a western school and there's girls that are wear/ I think
697 a few /there was a few and again this is opinions I've heard so I can't
698 say obviously is true... of suddenly there's girls that are wearing things
699 that to him would probably seem really provocative/ and I don't think he
700 really knew how to socialise

701 S6: [And he didn't (&)

702 S5: [Well he=

703 S6: (&) really know how to how to

704 S4: The one moved to England and they put him straight into a hostel.
705 To look after himself in a flat. I remember him coming to school and
706 you know being put up in a flat.

707 S6: So it's happened like an adult. [And going back to Bob.

708 S4: [A children was in a flat (&)

709 S4: (&) And you'd hate to see a child in a flat. And the social worker
710 came to see him one

711 S6 : [Suppose that

712 S3: [What about (&)

713 S3: (&) Sorry what about the time that he were come into Britain? How
714 do we know something didn't happen
715 [in that period cos he come from Afghanistan (&)

716 S2: [Yeah he came from Afghanistan

717 S3: (&) and there was a lot of stuff going on there.

718 S2: Yeah.

719 S4: And he got [picked on no support.

720 S3: [so//that

721 S6: Its funny but talking about the whole narrative thing again if we talk
722 about Bob who we were talking about at the beginning /look how
723 differently really in school cos we didn't know anything about what he
724 went on to do . What he went on to do that was I don't think anyone
725 saw that coming. So if you think about the behaviour of [Bob (&)

726 S3: [mmmmmm

727 S6: (&) and then the behaviour of the other boy we've been talking
728 about actually I'd say Bob was is /stepping way more in line but it goes
729 to show doesn't it if someone that's /though I know not British born
730 English speaking quite cool quite popular doing it whereas with the
731 other boy it was / I think people/ the peer group view things of how
732 sinister they are as to how popular someone is, and how /how sort of
733 cool they are or if they're/ a bit strange really.

734 **R: Do you think there is a difference between the way you are**
735 **talking about children with SHB and how other adults in school**
736 **some of the other adults in school would talk about it? Are you. Do**

737 **you think you are reflective of the way people talk about these**
738 **behaviours? Or the children who show those behaviours?**

739 S5: It's [hard.

740 S4: [It depends

741 S4: I think we'll talk more about it because we have more contact
742 [with

743 S1: [I was going to say (&)

744 S1: (&) we don't really talk about it=

745 S4: = No but we do talk about it amongst ourselves. In pastoral care.
746 What do you think?

747 S6: I'm trying to think now. How// I don't/ know like. I think all the pupils
748 we've sort of talked about because they've had a lot of other/
749 behavioural things going on it's never really been just that//so when so
750 when they've they've been talked about It's just been the sort of
751 normal language that you'd probably hear in schools talking about any
752 pupil like ' ah they're disruptive or they're naughty or like you know like
753 bloody hell I've got /so and so next lesson. He's been a right idiot but
754 nothing in terms of the sexual behaviour I haven't heard.

755 **R: So if in terms of in terms of when an instance occurred.. has**
756 **that changed anything in other peoples language or responses.**
757 **Do you hear talking about one thing or is it they don't have contact**
758 **with that child?**

759 S3: [they would not have (&)

760 S6: [Often if it's.

761 S3: (&) contact because I've come across it because first

762 S1: [They wouldn't know (&)

763 S5: [Because the Bob (&)

764 S1: (&) They would know// No

765 S5: (&) you're talking about I've seen him on the corridor but in terms of
766 anything serious no I have no awareness of that / But the one of the
767 things/ thinking about how different people there are - I have seen
768 differences in perhaps the way that is responded to. Just generally just
769 on the corridor behaviour/ you know like when they play the game with
770 the grabbing each other's.. the boys grabbing each other's privates
771 there's there's some staff that go absolutely no that's absolutely not
772 acceptable you must not do that that's inappropriate / It's [very clear
773 and very serious (&)

774 S4: [Straight to the point

775 S5: (&) And then there's other staff that are just kind of like ' Oh
776 they're playing a game and it's just a laugh it's you know and I think
777 staff do treat it [differently (&)

778 S3: [differently)

779 S5: (&) and you know with with Bob sort of holding onto people it's not
780 it's not treated like it's not something you should be doing. It's/ very
781 jokey and argh get off her and you know.//So I think staff do talk about it
782 differently.

783 S6: And I think how the person they're doing it to is sort of /reacting how
784 people may be change cos/ if someone is saying/touching another pupil
785 or grabbing another pupil /the pupil that they're doing it to sometimes it
786 might be to save face or cos they're in the group even if they're feeling
787 uncomfortable if they're sort of more like oh what you're doing And I
788 think then if you were to observe that as a teacher it might look I'm
789 thinking if it's a busy situation corridor that might look more like 'oh just
790 pack it in whereas obviously if there was/ a pupil that was like/ looking
791 obviously really [uncomfortable

792 S5: [One to one (&)

793 S5: (&) at the top of the stairs

794 S6: Yeah

795 S3: Or is it how the people- that person's been brought up?

796 S6: Yeah it could [be
797 S3: [Like you're saying (&
798 S3: (&) 'oh he's only messing about just go on . And whereas someone
799 like (teachers name) would be saying [no//no
800 S6: [And if (&
801 S6: (&) And if you know things. But I find like when I'm teaching it and
802 when we do lessons on like you know what's appropriate and what's
803 inappropriate in terms of like touching and things like that and oh my -
804 the difference/ it is it's just bonkers like and sometimes you're like are
805 you /are you/ kidding me? You actually think that's acceptable. [Its and
806 there's lots of people sort of say (&
807 S3: [But its cultural
808 S4: [Cultural
809 S6: (&) Yeah I know its [completely acceptable
810 S4: [Brought up in a (&
811 S4: (&) a very strict black family. Hell no. I didn't see my sisters body
812 my father's body. Nothing. Strict as hell. Cover yourself up. That's the
813 way I was brought up. The Muslim girls same thing . Covered/ OK. But
814 then my generation /my parents' generation and now we've got a new
815 generation that's so open about sex and I'm, thinking oh my god=
816 S6: = I was going to say its going off on a bit of a tangent from the boys
817 with the girls but I think its important to talk about the girls because [
818 S4: [yeah
819 S6: (&) I had to have a really serious conversation with We've got a
820 group of , You'll all know who (laugh) a group of very top dog alpha
821 female loud year eight girls.
822 S4: Hmmm mmmmm

823 S6: And there's been a few times that they've really used quite sexually
824 explicit language but then one of my lessons was covered/ and I came
825 back a little bit early and I was talking to the cover supervisor and she
826 said oh you know I had to/ had to sort of tell some of the girls off for for
827 /for the language that they were using . And I said oh you know what
828 was it and its quite vulgar but Im going to say it for the research cos I
829 could tell she was quite shocked. Its not swearing and she was
830 basically the girl was mimicking saying I'm going to finger myself. I'm
831 going to finger myself. Oh look at you. You're all fingering yourself. Oh
832 Smell my fingers smell my fingers ..like really really graphic and that
833 was in front of a whole class sort of situation it was very much led by
834 one/ [girl (&)]

835 S1: [girl]

836 S6: (&) but then sort of other girls joining in and I was absolutely / Cos
837 oh gosh you hear all sorts from kids like f ing this you know swearing . I
838 could tell/ it had really shocked the cover supervisor cos it wasn't just
839 angry swearing it was really sexually and I can't even rem it was it was
840 quite quite/

841 R: Is it difficult when it's a girl?

842 S6: It's a lot of stuff = I think it was probably/ she might find it more
843 shocking I mean I didn't find it more shocking cos it was a girl but I
844 think maybe. I teach with that you hear it like/ you hear that a bit but it
845 was more/ it was very much/ see you know I wasn't there to observe I
846 can only say what was said but it was like a / look at how mature and
847 look at my status. This is/ this is what I'm doing. But then I I don't know
848 it worries me cos you think // [you should know]

849 S3: [You're ..Yes]

850 S6: I don't know they were year seven at the time this was the back end
851 of year seven so it was buzz? But then you worry cos do you think
852 again you have again you have to sort of see past that behaviour and
853 you know like a lot of research shows that pupils that are/ you know
854 sometimes using that sort of language and talking about that /that well it

855 / it might be that they're using it to be try and be kind of cool but it could
856 be because actually they're

857 [sexually abused (&)

858 S3: [Sexually abused

859 S6: (&) And that's why they're do you know what I mean its

860 S3: No I understand what you're saying [because (&)

861 S6: [Its hard is /

862 S3: (&) Because// over the past years I'm forever getting upset. I'll be
863 out in the playground and then I'll hear the boys the way they talk to the
864 girls and I'm saying to the girls 'Do not stand for that '. But it's like it's
865 acceptable. The way they speak to them. With foul language and all
866 how/ what they call the girls.

867 S4: I blame the internet and the computers It's normal. It's normal.
868 Language and with it they don't know what abuse is. They don't know
869 what abuse is cos they hear it that often that is it normality.

870 S6: I think with the girls it was more it was done / I think I think it's
871 normal /I think what made that instant not not in my opinion not/ normal
872 was that I think it's quite normal when people are talking in groups and
873 they're talking about that but this was very much a/ shouting out then
874 that sort of language which was them sort of words to purposely/
875 shock really. You know really and they would have been obviously year
876 seven [girls (&)

877 S4: [That's age eleven

878 S6: (&) and boys in that class who would have been absolute well they
879 wouldn't have known what she what that meant let alone why why sort
880 of someone was / saying that really. / So

881 **R: What do you think is? ...I suppose that we are going to stop in**
882 **2 or 3 minutes because the next part is having look at some of the**
883 **things you've brought up and when I go and have a look at the**
884 **information and to have a look at some themes that are coming**

885 through for you and what I'm going to bring those themes back to
886 you and see if actually that's what you agree with. You know is
887 that the themes that you actually feel are relevant to you are these
888 the themes that are coming up for you. But one of the next parts to
889 reflect on is what you think the role of the school is and what is
890 your role within school A lot of the conversation has been a bout
891 the child with inappropriate or problematic or SHB but there are
892 elements that are coming through about your role and you can
893 see where you think your role is and that is is probably what we'll
894 move onto and its probably worth stopping now just because
895 you've got lots of information and coming back to that . Is that
896 OK?

897 I've given you 2 bits of reading and a book. Now I'll come with
898 another book. You don't have to do anything. YOU don't have to
899 read it . But they are are just bits of reading about what
900 narrative approaches do about stories and then there's another
901 little bit of reading about a piece of research that use similar sorts
902 of research methodology. Ur m and what I wanted you to do
903 between now and next time is just have a think about the sorts of
904 language that you hear you know what it is you think your role is
905 anything you're reflecting on form this conversation and form
906 having this story just even in terms of you know some of the
907 things that came through that might you might I didn't really think
908 about it, is there anything that's in your mind that's been one of
909 those persistent thoughts and it's just a little opportunity to note
910 it down. It doesn't have to make sense rhyme nor reason to me
911 you just write a little bit I'll just send you a little reminder by email
912 and then when we come back next time what I wanted to do was
913 focus on your role within the school what is your role for those
914 children and how do you think you influence the problem where
915 you think you might need more support and help in terms of how
916 to influence the problem and where you should put your time .
917 there were things that we talked about Debbie mentioned we
918 talked about this is a child and its quite .. that's a very string
919 narrative isn't it about SHB.. but it's equally strong because you

920 are all very strong experienced educators.. that a very strong
921 belief that you have and well talk a little bit about where you think
922 those 2 meet and how you can start thinking about ways you can
923 start making a bit of a difference. Is that OK? I'm going to switch
924 this off?

925 (There was a bit not captured on the tape where the participants
926 continues to talk about SHB and children YP> They mentioned
927 getting to know them as them and their relationships otherwise
928 they get treated differently from the first and others. So they
929 behave differently. Mind of a child as I've worked in school CP
930 you get to see differently the first thing that comes into your head
931 is protect the child protect the other kids. But there has been
932 times when I've come in into your CP role which they feel need to
933 It would be good if staff could know more about the child How
934 much to tell them)

Session Two

1 Brilliant right so thank you very much. Second one . That's brilliant.
2 I'm so pleased you were able to come back and do this. The two parts
3 of this session are going to be the first bit we just need we are just
4 going to get some feedback. I'm just going to get some feedback from
5 you about what you thought. Your reflections from the last session.
6 What did you think about when you went away because that will be
7 things that will be said won't there that you think about afterwards and
8 think that really resonated for me or that.. that I thought once I thought
9 a bit about it that's not quite what I think we'll do 10 minutes around
10 that.
11 And that's partly things that I'll join in with as well. Because we going to
12 because its narrative it means anything that you're saying is affecting
13 what I'm thinking as well you know so I don't really sit outside as an
14 objective observer I end up being part of it even by the questions that
15 I'm asking I'm sort of influencing aren't I? So I'll do that and the second
16 bit is really around school's role and your role as a teacher or
17 educator, what you feel you should be doing how you feel you can
18 influence the problem and also we could do a little bit about what I
19 know I don't know. You know what I would like to know more of.
20 And then after we've done the session and I've done little bit I'll come
21 back at some point if you want to and feedback. But that's we can
22 negotiate afterwards. And I know who have to leave so feel free and
23 thank you very much for coming. I'll do that bit first.
24 Ok so just from last time we met what were you / I know that some
25 people met wrote little bits in the books and I know that some of you
26 didn't get a chance to and that's fine it doesn't matter and I'll just collect
27 in those at the end. What were your thoughts about the way people
28 were talking about SHB, did anything stick with you ? Did anything
29 particularly hit home?
30 S6: I was / I was just sort of quite surprised that I didn't know a lot.
31 Really do you know what I me-? Has what sort of /I'm not saying that's
32 right or wrong. I didn't know a lot you know of the things that had /
33 happened so I suppose it kind of as a teacher/ I suppose you

34 understand how much like these guys (laugh) do, you know , do
35 which you know anyway but I suppose it just high lights the different
36 roles within a school really.

37 S2: Do you think it should be shared [with teaching staff?

38 S6: [Well not necessarily (&)

39 S6: (&) It's a funny one. I sort of put this in my notes because I find it
40 because I teach PSHE and obviously Sex and relationship education
41 comes under that I suppose/ I'm a bit of a weird one for a teacher
42 because although I'm a teacher that is my role The things that I teach
43 make me perhaps closer to in some ways the inclusion team do you
44 know what I mean just in terms of the content / that I teach. But I don't
45 know really. (Enters S4) I think what S5 was saying about sometimes
46 if maybe you know too much about students because obviously risk
47 assessments are done so it's not like they're dangerous sometimes if
48 you know too much for some teachers it could have a negative impact
49 on perhaps how they were //with the child /maybe

50 R: Was there anything that people were saying that you felt - cos I
51 was really surprised by the number of times somebody said you know
52 there real questions about that child's sexuality. That came up quite a
53 regular basis in way that I wasn't I didn't know it was going to or not.
54 And at one point somebody said oh actually now I think that was
55 something that might be an issue for that young person. Was that
56 something that you recognised before you came in?

57 S6: I think/ I'd kind of perhaps /thought that was the case for some
58 students beforehand really.

59 S5: I just didn't realise how big an issue it was. That it was a problem
60 and some of the things that I'd taken just as// almost without realising
61 that that was SHB it was just behaviour and it hadn't twigged that it was
62 almost a continuum and so it they might just be doing that but there
63 may be places to go that may change. And if I allow that or I don't
64 respond correctly to small things./ And it made me worry a bit about
65 some of the things- some of the incidents that had happened with me

66 that I'd seen and I thought well 'Did I actually handle them [properly?]
67 (&)

68 S1: [Yeah

69 S5: (&) Did I stop that behaviour or did I just do blah blah blah that's
70 done . Did I record it? did I pass it on? Did I/ did I somehow contribute
71 to that behaviour escalating? //I mean we have had some a couple of
72 kids who've had serious sexual assaults and it's like// did they do
73 anything before/that could have been picked up?

74 S6: Yeah that's what I got. I felt a bit like that as well I felt sometimes
75 get a bit not / upset as such but where ever something happens
76 where/ you know if something happens with a weapon or with a n
77 unplanned pregnancy or something like that . Which is stupid just
78 because I teach lessons on it doesn't mean it's miraculously not going
79 to happen because obviously it's complete you know its more than that
80 . But yeah you do sort of think Oh gosh should more have been done
81 should you know 1:1 support with a certain pupil and this that and the
82 other.

83 **R: I was just asking was there anything form the last session that**
84 **had particularly stuck with anybody was there any reflections that**
85 **had stuck with**

86 S4: Not really. Not really at all.

87 **R: Did you feel it was reallydid you feel that people were**
88 **sharing things that you agreed with?**

89 S4: I was more interested what Kelly though because Kelly deals
90 PSHSC I was interested more in what she thought about it that's it,
91 more than anything else. But no..

92 **R: I when I was listening to it because I listened back to the tape**
93 **and it was interesting at times I felt that there were that SHB was**
94 **really big within the narrative but sometimes there were some**
95 **comments made around that child and it felt as if there were**
96 **some people saying that there's a child as well. I think somebody**

97 **actually said its really difficult when we're talking about a child or**
98 **young person and then talking about them as sexually harmful**
99 **there are different parts to that child and if they are just sexually**
100 **harmful well it's really difficult isn't it because there is lots of**
101 **other things – things educators hope for that child.**

102 **There was another comment both the children you talked about**
103 **you had actually quite serious sexual assaults both those you**
104 **were saying had a range of other issues going on which was**
105 **interesting. And the other thing I thought was interesting was**
106 **when somebody talked about what was normal. And what's ok**
107 **and there were lots of differences about that weren't there. And**
108 **there was lots of recognition about some things were normal and**
109 **there were something's around girls that were in the school that**
110 **was raised which some behaviours that you were saying were**
111 **really quite shocking to some members of staff and actually that**
112 **started a narrative about what is normal for YP what's normal for**
113 **them to hear?**

114 **S3: What do you mean like the way the boys treat the girls and how**
115 **they talked to them and respond?**

116 **R: yeah and I was thinking in terms of there were lots of what's**
117 **normal? A few things came out around what I felt you we resaying**
118 **around home environment and what's normal in the home**
119 **environment and what normal in the school environment? What's**
120 **normal language?**

121 **S2: Yeah.**

122 **R: What's normal behaviour how they viewed each other? What**
123 **was positive? And what's a popular person? What's normal to be**
124 **popular? So there were lots of things about what's normal and I**
125 **think people brought up about very clearly for different ideas**
126 **about it would be very different for one person ion their**
127 **background to say what was normal compared to YP today. I**

128 **think you particularly said something about saying to one of the**
129 **girls how you-=-**

130 S3: =Yeah how well why don't they the way the boys speak to them
131 and they don't do anything about it and they think it's normal and I
132 say it's not normal. They're supposed to respond and say they
133 shouldn't be treated in that way. // But sometimes is that not coming
134 from a cultural background as well the way they perceive women not
135 on the high scale.

136 S2: Well they do. Is it / Are they allowing it because it means that
137 they're popular

138 [So there's (&)

139 S6: [Yeah I get that impression)

140 S5: (&) Because there are other things in there . Cos its They're fitting
141 in. so they're trying to fit in they're trying to be popular so do they/they
142 do it because that's how you fit in and it's just when you do things like
143 that and that's the way to fit in that's just wrong.

144 S3: Or maybe is it their background where they come from how their
145 mother's been treated how they think it's normal

146 S1: [Could be

147 S5: [Yeah

148 S3: Could it be that?

149 S1: But that the sort of things that you see on the telly all the time
150 because I think that / I don't watch soaps but bits I've seen and the
151 bits you've seen in the newspaper that's what they show. They show a
152 lot of really inappropriate behaviour because there've got to condense
153 it all down and so if that's what coming into their homes everyday //
154 And they think that it's OK to treat women like that // Then they are
155 because that's what they see celebrities, actors doing.

156 S6: Yeah

157 S1: That they can identify with cos they're in similar situation as them
158 and so it's knowable That's what people do.

159 S6: Yeah. It's hard I suppose isn't it when teenagers going through
160 puberty and start to fancy people and things like that and its quite
161 normal I suppose when you see groups of people and they might like
162 sort of chase each other round and like grab each other and stuff like
163 that and they're all sort of joking and I suppose it's really hard sort of to
164 determine when that turns into / do you know what I mean or even a
165 boy or a girl going up to someone and grabbing her from behind in like
166 a hug and going oh get off and it's all a bit jokey. Like when does that
167 turn into actually something that's /you know =

168 S5: = sexual [and then (&)]

169 S6: [And yeah

170 S5: (&) inappropriately sexual.

171 S6: And is that hinting towards something that they might want to do in
172 the future. It's hard isn't it? Cos/

173 S5: When is it not playing?

174 S6: Yeah

175 S5: Yeah

176 S6: and then it's how do you ... how do you deal with it? Like again cos
177 its when you think of it its just behaviour but do we need to be treating
178 that behaviour/ in a different way than you would sort of like play
179 fighting do you know I mean yeah it's hard isn't it?

180 S1: I think there's been a change recently. Kids seem to be a lot more
181 physical with one another than they used to be in the in to too far
182 distant past. I've notice even recently that there's a lot of physical
183 contact between kids in a way that [I

184 S6: [I'd I'd agree&

185 S6: (&) with that on the corridors actually. Yeah

186 S5: Do you think it's because they're (laughs) they're so physically
187 distant / socially distant from each other cos they're constantly on their
188 phones. Because they will sit in a room texting each other. Texting the
189 people in the room./ So that kind of when they are together its/ intense I
190 don't know.

191 **R: When you're thinking you're talking about what are the needs**
192 **of those young people. And the two young people you talked**
193 **about last time with the most harmful behaviours and you're right**
194 **it's a spectrum isn't it and you've talked about children with**
195 **inappropriate sexual behaviours problematic and harmful.**
196 **Harmful is the end when it is criminal conviction harming**
197 **somebody else intentional , repeated. How would youwhat do**
198 **you say are their needs? If you think of the two children you**
199 **named last time. One you called Bob and the other child you had**
200 **initials AI so you all recognised it. What was the range of their**
201 **needs that those young people had?**

202 S2: Attention and power I would say.

203 S6: Yeah .

204 S2: He had very low levels / found it difficult to/ concentrate. Didn't
205 have any friends really.

206 S1: No I think he's dominated by his dad as well so I suppose it was
207 yeah power control and attention.

208 **R: And do you think all those needs feed into SHB? Are they**
209 **separate from it? What's your view on the link?**

210 S6: I think I think sadly in city school lots of issues going on I think
211 there's lots of kids that fall into the sort of low literacy not much support
212 from home but I suppose /that's its probably my opinion that if they've
213 got that bit of sort of deviant do you know what I mean
214 sexual/behaviour going on that the difference they probably /act on
215 that because they haven't got positive peer relations. I don't think
216 they're /exclusive to the point of they create each other but I think=

217 S3: =Where does it come from?

218 S6: That's a whole nature nurture thing isn't it I suppose. But I just do
219 you know what I mean. so the boys that we've spoken about, we'll
220 never know if that is something they have always sort of pre /that they
221 would do they'd always wanted to do it. But the fact that
222 they had rubbish home lives and / weren't doing very well at school and
223 things/ pushed them over the edge. Whereas if you've got someone
224 else that's / got a lot going for them they can speak about their
225 problems perhaps they can be/ you know persuaded not to take that
226 route. I mean that's just what I

227 **R: So you think some of those things you were saying around not**
228 **having those good peer relationships that was a factor within the**
229 **SHB?**

230 S6: I think so I think that's how you learn. I think your first practice of a
231 relationship is your peer do you know like I remember being a kid and
232 your best friend targeted on being your best friend anymore and you'd
233 cry and it's really upsetting. In my head that's the equivalent of when
234 you get your first boyfriend or girl friend. Do you know what I mean. I
235 think in a way your friendships and how you deal with that and
236 boundaries and everything. I think that's what plays into how you deal
237 with your romantic relationships as you get older. So if you haven't/
238 you've got rally poor relationships.// That's just my thinkin (Laugh)

239 **R: Is that general agreement? Is there a different view or...?**

240 S3: I just/ I get confused about how does it work? How do those
241 people get to that point? You're saying it's to do with relationships.[but

242 S6 : [Oh but (&)

243 S6: (&) I think that's a part of it I'm not saying it's 50:50 but I also think/
244 but no-ones ever going to know but I think sadly some people/ will just
245 do that. That's just in their/ sort of psychology as a person really

246 S3: Or [could not

247 S6: [Do you know] (&)

248 S6: (&) what I mean? So but the difference is some people might act on
249 them thoughts. Some people might not act on them thoughts. But then
250 if you're someone who's / not so very well educated hasn't got support
251 all these bad things I think you perhaps be more likely to go down that
252 negative route than someone that hasn't . But then obviously you know
253 people go onto to commit sexual assaults and rape who have / been
254 happily married and had perfect do you know what I mean so I think
255 that goes to show that it's / a bit of both really.

256 S1: Do you think it goes zero to that? Cos it// That's what worries me?
257 All the steps along the way. If they do this much and they get away with
258 it. You know. If they touch somebody in school and it's just ah that's
259 stop and then its /Is it like little tiny increments and each increment it's
260 kind of allowed because it's with a different person or in a different
261 forum then it can just slowly step up and up and up and up until/ its
262 extreme.

263 **R: So what if a child or YP person is doing little bits as they go**
264 **along what need does that meet? What need is that behaviour**
265 **addressing?**

266 S3: That's what I'm trying to figure out I'm saying

267 S5: Is it breaking the rules or is it

268 S3: [or has something dramatic happened to that person? (&)]

269 S6: [Or getting something they want. Yeah]

270 S3: (&) Cos that could happen (&)]

271 S6: Has [that happened to them

272 S3 : (&) [Or has something (&)]

273 S3: (&) dramatically happened to that person and is it their way of
274 acting that out.

275 S5: Rebellion

276 S3: Yeah or I'm trying to figure out how does it get to that point of
277 [sexuality

278 S2: [I think some of them (&)

279 S2: (&) bits like look how bad I am that kind of thing. Look at me .
280 Look what I can do

281 S5: But why would they do that instead of stealing?.

282 S3: Hmmm

283 S5: Do you know it's that It's like well/ I can understand it like those
284 little steps you might /steal something from a shop and you've got away
285 with it that once so it's like right brilliant so I can get away with that.
286 But why [sexually

287 S2: [But then nobody's noti-

288 S1: [But if (&)

289 S1 (&) you've got away with it then nobody's noticed have they?
290 Whereas if you've done something to another person then you know
291 that somebody's notices you . Does that make sense? So if you go into
292 a shop and steal a few sweets and they don't get caught then nobody's
293 noticed that they've got whatever the need it is. Whereas if you've
294 physically done something to somebody then/ that person knows/
295 minimum, don't they/. So they get noticed. I don't know.

296 S6: I do think it's probably more /a lot of it/rape. Well I've always been
297 under the impression you know when you think about rape and sexual
298 assault it's often rarely / to do with the actual sexual needs but
299 obviously the sort of need for power but then I don't know that's / I
300 think that's how I would see it with old people really. But obviously with
301 young people going through puberty and things. I don't know if it is
302 [slightly different.

303 S1: [But they powerless feel sexual power(&)

304 S1: (&) For example I'm thinking about one of those young people who
305 probably was quite powerless at home because he was dominated by
306 his dad //. And I'd of think mum was kind of/ she used to run round after
307 everybody. She was kind of put down quite a lot and I wonder if that
308 was to try and be like his dad and to try and be the big man And this is
309 how you treat people.

310 **R: It feels like you're talking in a way that young people are**
311 **different from adults and that young people might be there are**
312 **different pressures and different changes in their understanding**
313 **from adults from what you've just said. And also from thinking**
314 **about wanting to identify with somebody else. Would you say that**
315 **was reflecting what you said?**

316 S6: I think that was so Yeah. And again you can't it's not going to be all
317 sort of young people but I do think yeah I do think there are /
318 differences really. /Even just from you know you know hormones and
319 /feelings I'm just thinking if there was a kid that felt like they had no
320 power, they were shot down at home they were in all bottom sets you
321 know failing at school you know they weren't popular all of this. I don't
322 If that then coincides with/ puberty and sexual urges and power and
323 then I think it's often it's an opportunity that presents itself. You know if
324 you started all of these thoughts are going on in your head and you're
325 testing the water like you said a touch here a touch there and then an
326 opportunity presents itself when you can take it further .

327 S1: I'm just thinking about (Child) that we've talked about . And I
328 thought he had issues with his sexuality. And other people thought the
329 same. And dad's is a very very macho kind of a man. And I wondered
330 whether he'd done that to kind of prove to his dad that he wasn't=

331 S6: =Or him self =

332 S1: =Or himself Yeah that he wasn't what his dad or he thought he
333 thought he was.

334 S1: Cos he was very [very proud (&)]

335 S2: [proud

336 S1: (&) of it as well.

337 S2: Yeah

338 S6: I think the amount of people that probably yeah that have sex or do
339 (stuff)

340 S6: I'm not talking just, Consensual as well that are homosexual but but
341 yeah do it to as a way to sort of [prove to themselves.

342 S3: [Could something have happened to him?

343 S1: I suppose so.

344 S3: To make him just change like that.

345 S1: I suppose so yeah. Well I did think [so yeah. (&)

346 S6: [If it was

347 S1: (&) And he might have been acting out something that had
348 happened. You don't know do you?/

349 **R: How does this problem influence the young person and his**
350 **life? Cos when I started this and I was talking about this relative**
351 **influencing questions. It has an impact on the child. What areas**
352 **of life does the problem influence for that YP? You saying that last**
353 **time I was struck by the fact you said it was so difficult to get a**
354 **placement for this young person, once they had a conviction or**
355 **police involvement. I was thinking how that impact you then. As a**
356 **child what opportunities do you not have or have?**

357 S5: You have less normal relationships don't you? Because you may
358 have had a normal relationship with somebody, but then as soon as
359 they've found out that particularly people in authority over you as soon
360 as they've found out about that conviction over you which they would
361 do if you were like an employer or /going to college or something like
362 that then that would change their relationship with you. They may view
363 you differently.

364 S2: That closed a lot of doors before they've even opened as [well (&
365 S5: [yeah
366 S2: (&) just because people might find out before they even meet you.
367 When you're looking at/ college courses or something in the future.
368 R: Is that the same for school as well? Does it impact does it cut the
369 opportunities?
370 S1: [Yeah
371 S3: [Yeah
372 S6: [Yeah
373 S5: Cos there are some things that you won't/ you wouldn't allow for
374 example going on a school trip going to Alton Towers for a day as a
375 reward for good behaviour. Positive behaviour. Would you allow that
376 pupil to go and to just be free? In that park when you stand in Loco
377 parentis. We have to be sure that that child would be safe . //So they'd
378 have to be monitored perhaps . They'd have to stay with a member of
379 staff or in a group
380 [where as the others would have more freedom
381 S3: [I don't think that people should just say
382 **R: How does monitoring impact a child then? How does it impact**
383 **the young person?**
384 S6: I suppose it goes back to /depending on their reason they did it.
385 Like if its/ if it's something they did for power then they might not like
386 you know cos of course it's taking power away so to be monitored by
387 an adult. But then / if it was something that was more maybe/ attention
388 seeking behaviour or the kind of cry for help type route then if the
389 monitoring was done by / an adult that they got on with then it might be
390 kind of a positive thing. I mean I'm guessing they're going to react to it
391 in different

392 S2: I think if they're labelled as well sometimes they think well I've been
393 labelled with it , I might just as well continue to do it .

394 S3: Rum yeah [sort of stigma.

395 S2: [Kick back again (&)

396 S2: (&) Against everything you try and put in place to support them
397 and protect them and protect the other children as well.

398 S5: It /it curtails your freedom as well. It puts you in a gold fish bowl.
399 You've got no privacy. I think especially when they're growing up. You
400 know teenagers need a huge amount of privacy. They need to figure
401 out who they are. And if somebody's constantly like 'what are you
402 doing?' And then it's almost like as you say there's that expectation /
403 well you know he can't get any worse so// But I do think that loss of
404 privacy must be awful /You know. And your loss of freedom. I mean if
405 you're constantly monitored. You can't just go out in the playground
406 and have a normal conversation or a kick about with a football. And
407 those normal normal relationship don't develop.

408 S6: And if you then go on to get a girlfriend or a boyfriend , can you
409 imagine do you know what I mean if there someone that you knew as
410 a school had this had happened and then/ they were getting
411 romantically close to a pupil then that brings up a whole

412 S5: Yeah

413 S6: do you know what I mean then because normally a teacher won't
414 go in and get involved in that because ... but then what would happen
415 in that situation. [I don't know (&)

416 S5: [Yeah

417 S3: [it's hard

418 S6: (&) I don't even know what the guidance would be on that. Do you
419 know what I mean?

420 S3: Do you tell them?

421 S6: If you were a parent and your son or daughter was starting a
422 relationships with someone who had you know/ I'd want to know as a
423 parent do you know. I don't even know what the

424 S3: [Well I think (&)]

425 S6: [there's all of that]

426 S3: (&) mostly the other students would open their mouth and say
427 something wouldn't they.

428 S6: Mmmm

429 **R: So the problem influences you in what by you're allowing as a**
430 **teacher what your'e allowing to happen . What's as teaching staff**
431 **and educators you'd be allowing different things from other**
432 **young people. How does that feel ? //Five minutes ago you were**
433 **saying these some young people don't have very good identity,**
434 **understanding about what's normal. They've got home**
435 **background that might be giving them different information, have**
436 **experienced trauma possibly, lots of different things you were**
437 **saying that have actually made them been part of their story to get**
438 **them to this point. How does it feel // some of the things you are**
439 **talking about is the impact of the problem?**

440 S5: I don't quite understand. I don't know what you're getting to.

441 **R: I was just thinking how does it feel for you?**

442 S5: How does it feel as a child?

443 **R: As an adult in school whose providing an educational**
444 **environment for young people. How does it feel for you that**
445 **there's quite a few curtailments on these young people?**

446 S5: I don't want to do it. I don't / But / You're caught between keeping
447 everybody safe. Because you don't want

448 [the young person]

449 S2: [You detach yourself (&)]

450 S2: (&) really don't you. I definitely do. You have to detach yourself.
451 cause you have to make sure that there's risk assessment in place and
452 that you know we've got a duty of care not to the child whose
453 displayed that sort of behaviour but to everybody else as well. So I
454 think you I have to take my feelings and emotions out of that and just
455 basically / it's on paper . That's what we have to follow.

456 **R: So do you feel.**

457 S2: It's a bit clinical really I suppose.

458 S6: But I think you have I suppose in your role.

459 S2: [Yeah

460 S6: [You've got to be

461 S5: [At some point

462 S5: But then I think you have to moderate that with what you think what
463 you think is going to happen to them. Cos I think=

464 S2: =I think you have to put intervention and strategies in place to try
465 and help them change their behaviour so we've had quite a few other
466 agencies that could come into school / to actually talk through /
467 relationships, / what's appropriate touching , what's inappropriate sort
468 of going back to /going right back to basics really. I mean we had
469 somebody the other day in school / and they are always
470 inappropriately touching and you actually said about getting a doll. Do
471 you remember when we was talking upstairs? And actually talking to
472 the child and saying you know you can touch here but you can't touch
473 there. You know. And I think if you have any sort of behaviour plan or
474 risk assessment in place for a child you have to have some strategies
475 and //interventions running alongside that as well.

476 **R: So in terms of the SHB or sexually inappropriate be there are a**
477 **range of strategies that school could support with?**

478 S2: Yeah.

479 **R: What other aspects do you think school could do for that**
480 **young Person? Cos you've talked about both times I've been here**
481 **you've talked about young people as one narrative, one story and**
482 **then the SHB as another story. But you have referred to those**
483 **young people in different ways. I think you've referred to some of**
484 **the strengths and positives about those young people and how**
485 **you've been able to have good relationships with one young**
486 **people maybe not the other. But what are the parts of that you**
487 **feel school's roles is? For supporting these young people in your**
488 **setting.**

489 S2: I think we have to give them opportunities /to be around other
490 children. And we do don't we (name) A lot of the children have not just
491 about SHB but for disruptive behaviour or anger management issues or
492 whatever. They have somebody with them the whole time.

493 S4: yeah

494 S5: Yeah but they're [still being watched aren't they?

495 S4: [They're still being watched (&)

496 S4: (&) 24:7 .They still have that behaviour it's what the parents need
497 to learn from this. The parents have to take some of this responsibility
498 not place it on school. We are only part of their lives. Outside of school
499 it is the parent's responsibility not ours. So we go and do certain
500 amount but the parents must do the rest.

501 R: Do you feel that parents take a responsibility?

502 S3: No.

503 S4: No. And we can't do it all. We are not their keepers.// We're their
504 teachers. [We can only do so much (&)

505 S3: [We can only do so much for them.

506 S4: (&)There has got to be done by the parents.

507 **R: How is that welcomed if you share some of the things that**
508 **you're doing for YP who have SPB or Harmful behaviours? You**
509 **are sharing with parents what you can do in school how's that**
510 **received?//. For the two YP we were talking about last time we met**
511 **....is it positive do you feel there is a**

512 S4: Well we've got a lot of agencies involved with them two young
513 people

514 S2: Yeah but that's what we've [put in place. Since it happened

515 S4: [yeah

516 S6: Did the parents =

517 S4: =Yeah the parents [knew

518 S5: [Did they want it? Did they ask for it?

519 S1: [No.

520 S2: [No they didn't. (&)

521 S2: No I think it's because we 'd sort of said you know were doing the
522 behaviour plan were doing the risk assessment they have to access
523 these/ interventions but I think because parents think it will just happen
524 in school that was OK.

525 S3: Right.

526 S2: But a lot of parents/ have said they're sick

527 S3: YEAH

528 S2: that's one of the big things especially for our Gypsy Roma / (&)

529 S3: Very poorly

530 S2: (&) Parents

531 S1: Parents they just have this sick like..

532 S5: Oh Right. I dint really ...

533 **R: How do you respond to that?**

534 S4: What can you respond?

535 S3: [It's denial isn't it?

536 S4: [It's their kids.

537 S6: I think that's going back to like I am not saying being careful I'm
538 not at all obviously not linking homosexuality with sexual /sexually
539 deviant behaviour, but I do think as well for some pupils that are
540 having/ that might be having issues with their sexuality on top of other
541 stuff that's going on. If they then come from a family who for cultural,
542 religious or just/ homophobic and they can't /cause I'm know there are
543 sort of pupils at school where that has probably been discussed with
544 parents you know linking it to behaviour and they'd just be like NO. do
545 you know what I mean if you come from a family, I can't even imagine,
546 but if you come from a family and your you know got questions on
547 your sexuality and your parents aren't willing to / accept they might
548 have a son or daughter
549 [whose gay it must be an absolute nightmare..

550 S3: [yeah

551 S5: [It must be yeah. (&)

552 S5: (&) You have to leave Islam.

553 S6: Yeah. It's one in like All research shows its 10% of the
554 [population, it shows how many pupils in school who just

555 S5: [You're just ostracised. You lose your (&)

556 S5: (&) you lose your entire community you lose everything.

557 S6: Yeah ...

558 S5: That's why I would imagine...quite a lot of kids hide it.

559 **R: Last time you talked a lot about inappropriate behaviour as**
560 **well. There were diff.. it was all there were lots of different kinds**

561 **of behaviour, weren't there . You were talking about somebody**
562 **with inappropriate behaviour somebody who'd used language. I**
563 **mean what do you think is the role of teachers in school about**
564 **that aspect. Because for some YP they've had some quite**
565 **extreme actions which have been criminal..**

566 S6: Take it down to a level I suppose think with my PSHCE hat on
567 when I'm doing lessons like SRE lessons on/ things you now I've done
568 lessons on inappropriate behaviour or rape and assault and age of
569 consent and different things like that I try to as much as I can get all of
570 the peer group talking about what they think is acceptable and
571 unacceptable . Because what you sort of hope would happen I mean its
572 sort of lower down I haven't had any of the pupils were talking about in
573 SRE classes after they offended cos they weren't in school / but if
574 you're talking about behaviours do you think it's OK not ok doing a
575 card sort something like that then I think it's quite good. Because if
576 you're a pupil that's thinking it's OK to do something that clearly isn't
577 OK you sort of hope then if they then hear a lot of their peers saying
578 no that's absolutely not OK they might start to recognise in themselves
579 that some of their feelings what they're doing is/ is an issue. It's where
580 they then go from that. do you know what [I mean? (&)

581 S2: [Yeah

582 S6: (&) that's how I sort of try and tackle it. Or you know pupils might
583 say things that would then trigger alarm that you might be able to pass
584 on you know as a cause for concern. But it's just really hard you know
585 it's one lesson a week you know and you try I think hearing things from
586 their peers. Because you know it happens all the time even just this
587 term doing like a card sort things like what's OK and what's not ok and
588 this more about sexually violent behaviour you know down that sort of
589 route. And it was yeah shocking you know the amount of pupils that
590 still think,/ you know, it's acceptable to give your girlfriend a slap. Like if
591 she gets out of line. And it's all quite funny. Do you know what I mean
592 so all you can really do in that /class, cos it's all hypothetical isn't it you
593 know but then that's that's what you do it all goes back to that when
594 you hear about a kid that's really done something you think Oh Gosh

595 was there something that was said in class . Did I miss / Did he need
596 more [work ? Did she need more work?

597 S5: [And what's inappropriate?

598 S5: (&) What's just acting out and what's inappropriate?

599 S6: Yeah

600 S5: And cos you see... I mean how many pupils do you see in a
601 clinch? Yeah Around the school. It's like that I mean It's not appropriate
602 here/ but it's appropriate so, is that something that as a school we stop
603 or//

604 S4: We've had, cos if its appropriate at home /and parents are saying
605 yes it's OK, we say no it's not/ what does the child believe ? The
606 parents or us?

607 **R: Do you think your staff would have a common understanding**
608 **of what's appropriate behaviour in terms of sexual behaviour with**
609 **each other?**

610 S6: I think dealing with it of dealing with it?

611 **R: or what's within the realms of // you know what you want it to**
612 **look like eventually as an adult. A healthy relationship that looks a**
613 **certain way, would they have a good understanding about what**
614 **would be within the realms of what would be normal? / Cos you**
615 **talked about normal development. And normal development**
616 **would be about getting things wrong for other behaviours**
617 **wouldn't it?**

618 S6: I think it'd be more I don't know I think it would be more of a bit of
619 variation I'd say it would be a bit more of a confidence/ issue again.
620 Like I feel like I'm going back to the same issue. But so for example
621 homophobic bullying for example. Like I would feel confident enough in
622 a class if a kid used the word oh that's gay or something else, I would
623 feel confident enough no matter what the lesson was to stop it and
624 say oh that's a strange use of work that what that word that's quite
625 offensive and do all that so I think with some teachers it might be I

626 think they might be see something that they think oh gosh that's a bit /
627 but then they might think cos it's about sex ultimately might feel a bit
628 embarrassed or perhaps=

629 S2: =And it depends which story they've [heard

630 S3: [heard hmmm

631 S6: Yeah

632 S2: And what their lives and what they've experienced it as well isn't it?
633 How you sort of decide what's normal and what's not.

634 **R: And if you thought that there was a Young person with SHB or**
635 **problematic behaviour in your class you said for one of those YP**
636 **you didn't know. If you did know or if another member of staff**
637 **knew do you think you'd be acting differently, do you think they**
638 **react differently. Would they be able to frame it within what's**
639 **normal behaviour?**

640 S6: I would definitely act differently but I think in a way that would be If
641 I knew there was a pupil in my class/ that had shown harmful behaviour
642 then I would try to/ obviously in a way that wasn't you know but I would
643 try to cater/ lessons around that. Do you know what I mean? If a kid got
644 into trouble for example for like groping a girl then I would think well
645 regardless of what the topic is obviously that's the whole point of
646 PSHCE so therefore I would do a couple of lessons, but I'd do it to all
647 the class so it wasn't didn't look obvious and I would try and [tackle
648 oh yeah yeah yeah

649 S3: [Rather than single out [that person

650 S5: [It's like (&)

651 S5: (&) even in a seating plan where would you sit them in a seating
652 plan just having that information. You may just sit them where/ where /
653 that would be more appropriate. So you may not sit boy girl boy girl or
654 you may sit them on the end or you know if you've got an unequal
655 number of pupils so you may sit them with the boys/ or with particular

656 girls. Do you know what I mean? /I think that it probably would change
657 but I think it depends where /how you come at that. Is it punitive ? Is it
658 about that monitoring that watching oh I'm constantly watching you I've
659 got to make sure everybody's safe in my classroom or is it supportive
660 [You've got this (&)]

661 S6: [Yeah that's it]

662 S5: (&) problem and I will be able to help by /trying to normalise the
663 relationships, having you in the class and just [and just (&)]

664 S6: []

665 S5: (&) sat on a table in a group or so you can so. I think different
666 teachers will come at it from different directions.

667 R: What sort of things did you feel that /because I'm really aware that
668 you talked about Youth offending team, there was some sort of
669 therapeutic support , but how much support do you get? What sort of
670 support would you get in school around these sort of issues or what
671 would you actually like?

672 S4: I don't think we get any support. It's all outside of school that meet
673 with family. It's all outside school not in school.

674 S2: It would be outside [agencies].

675 S4: [agencies want nothing to do with us (&)]

676 S4: (&) They work with families work with families. They come they
677 see the families and that's it. We are not part of that questionnaire.

678 R: What would you like it to be ?

679 S4: I think dealt with outside. So the kids not targeted inside with other
680 pupils.

681 **R: So separate. So you feel like having that outside it means that**
682 **the label doesn't get stuck onto the child too much.**

683 S4: Yeah. Cos once its labelled you can't take it off.

684 S2: And I think that's the same cos we have lots of children who that
685 see the school counsellor for lots of different reasons [and (&)]

686 S4: [yeah]

687 S2: (&) a lot of them don't want to do it in school time because they're
688 coming out of a lesson and the other kids want to know what they're
689 doing where they're going

690 S3: Who they're [seeing?]

691 S2: [Who they're seeing? (&)]

692 S2: (&) You know kids ask too many questions then so I think you
693 know/ it would be better if counselling could take place or meetings
694 with other agencies outside .

695 S4: Yeah even though it makes it a lot better relationship between staff
696 and pupil // And that's where I'd prefer it in that way.

697 **R: So that staff and pupil relationship is really important. You feel**
698 **that not having the label will enable that to be stronger?**

699 S4: Given them the ability to come and talk to us which they would.
700 And other pupils can just// won't know what's going on. //That whole
701 thing is happening at home .So the family needs the counselling as
702 well, not just the child itself.

703 S5: Don't you think though that schools // really we don't talk about this
704 . We certainly don't have an open culture from what I've seen. You
705 know /we talk like you say we challenge homophobic bullying and use
706 of homophobic words and things but it's the culture of the school one
707 where this sort of thing is you're able to discuss it quite normally and
708 openly. That all staff feel that they can be clear about where the
709 boundaries are and what to do.

710 S6: I think we could do with I think/ cos it's difficult with us sort of
711 sitting here cos obviously by the very nature of us being here were all
712 quite / comfy do you know what I mean cos CPD wise it does need to
713 be more=

714 S4: =But it's the same with the kids it's who you're comfortable to talk
715 to . Kids will come who they're comfortable to talk to. It's just like staff.
716 Who you're confident in talk to =

717 S6:=The kids can spot a mile off if [a teacher is you (&)

718 S4: [yeah yeah

719 S6: (&) just can't help but be embarrassed about that stuff and that's
720 just intimate

721 S4: yeah

722 S6: but if I've had a kid that's come to me thinking that they've got an
723 STI for example of something like that they know I'm not going [to
724 behave as if it's fine (&)

725 S4: [telling them it's

726 S6: (&) but if I was oh oh oh turning them do you know what I mean
727 families it's just different. I suppose yeah its difficult isn't it?. You don't
728 know how many students they've
729 [got form tutors (&)

730 S4: []

731 (S1 leaves)

732 S6: (&) they don't really have that bond with or different things like that
733 [really

734 S2: [I think the other thing is (&)

735 S2: (&) because were a high school, because in a primary school you
736 have your like main class teacher, but in high school because kids
737 move around yes staff report incidents on the computer we look at the
738 number of incidents and we look at it for a short snap shot period of
739 time when we're looking at student behaviour. / But actually there was
740 /a child who has just been in a bit of trouble about something else and
741 when I actually read through his behaviour record from when he was

742 first admitted, there's a few things there that we should have been
743 addressing and whatever happened could have been prevented.

744 S5: that needs going through.

745 S2: Yeah and I think as a school that's one of the things. Because lots
746 of people record and yes it is centralised and yes we do talk about what
747 we do with the snap shot. These things might happen sort of 3 month
748 apart 4 month apart. It might have happened last year you know and
749 its happened twice this year . We don't actually look at a child's
750 behaviour from admission every single time we're discussing and
751 (NAME) might deal with something and then (NAME) would and I'd
752 put something on. But unless we talk we wouldn't put it all together.

753 **R: If you traced the history go the problem do you think you'd**
754 **see it in a diff not just that problem they're having but the needs**
755 **they have. Do you think they would end up with a different**
756 **response, Or would your reflect you'd of put in a different**
757 **response at a different time, Is that what you're saying to me?**

758 S2: I think the action that the staff have taken because they also put
759 not the behaviour records the action that they've taken, for that
760 particular incident that's been dealt with but when you actually put it
761 altogether then maybe there should be other things that we should be
762 doing as a school to actually help this child to you know address some
763 of those things. get to the bottom of why you know why they're doing
764 something or / what their needs are and why they you know and
765 actually have that conversation. Cos I think as a school we do deal with
766 incidents really well very quickly / and when I read through this boy's
767 record yes the sanction for the behaviour was appropriate but actually
768 when you read through and what happened in the end and like actually
769 hang on we should have probably spotted this [but then over a 2
770 year period. (&)

771 S6: [Is that what S5 was saying

772 S6: Yeah

773 S2: (&) And it gets lost I think because schools happen so quick so
774 many staff putting things on. Whereas in a primary school maybe year
775 six teacher would have remembered actually you know.

776 S5: Cos you need to see that. So that you can identify it as well and
777 put the intervention in before / and not just that specific piece of
778 intervention. It's that whole picture of the child. It's like what else is
779 happening so you can look at intervening in terms of socialisation
780 before /it gets to be a problem or you know. When we going to
781 influence it? Because with a 16 year old/ (&)

782 S3: Are we [talking???

783 S5: (&) [Reasonably were not going to

784 S5: But were not are we?

785 S3: But that's the whole point. [It's all right (&)

786 S5: [There's no time to do that.

787 S3: (&) If we'd looked at it wholly and everything like

788 S2: I'd only thought that this week and from we were sort of discussing
789 last time. You know I didn't/

790 S3: No

791 S2: I've never thought about it before But we probably do need to be
792 doing that for some of our big players if you like / you know

793 S3: A professional way of looking at it.=

794 S2: =We've got a couple of kids we discussed last time like Bob Yeah
795 we probably do need to print his behaviour record out from the day [he
796 s (&)

797 S6: [see yeah

798 S2: (&) and actually if you highlighted I bet it would tell you a story and
799 there probably more frequency incidents or the touching or

800 S6: Is there even on sims? What's the closest is [What is there?

801 S5: [I don't even think

802 there

803 S3: [There is

804 S5: [There's assault.

805 S2: But it's how the staff / label the incident [as well isn't it.

806 S6: [Yeah that's the staff

807 S5: If you've got (???) and assault and stuff like that and There's

808 [now homophobic bullying.

809 S2 : [Cos amongst that (&)

810 S2: (&) you know assault he's probably called her and been verbally

811 abusive to her or they'll you know they'll say it's physically rather than

812 sexual assault.

813 S6: I think that's a really [good point.

814 S2: [So when you know (&)

815 S2: (&) And I think that's the other thing as well isn't it. It's how people

816 describe it [and label it (&)

817 S6: [yeah

818 S2: (&) And how we then view it. Because daily I look at behaviour

819 records and previously it's there on my computer all the time. And if

820 somebody put you know /other I'd probably read it and I might change

821 the reasons to something else but I'm only looking daily, day before,

822 weekly possibly half termly. I don't actually look / and so like Bob/ [It is

823 out.

824 S6: [Well I / Yeah.

825 S2: It probably show you [a pattern with it (&)

826 S5: [Escalating

827 **R: Would you be able to see by doing that? Would you be able to**
828 **see what the needs were? Because when your were talking about**
829 **needs earlier that was quite wide and there was a range of needs**
830 **they YP . You were saying that's a behaviour that was really**
831 **concerning there were lots of needs around that YP.**

832 S2: Yeah that's what we do weekly as a as apastoral team. We look at
833 that information to look at intervention or /report to the monitoring
834 [for each child).

835 S5: [But you should be putting in place (&)

836 S5: (&) a method of finding out what the needs are. So like for example
837 that referral you might start that referral process earlier so you might
838 not know what the needs are/ but because you're referring in and
839 you're aware you might you might be looking to find out what they are
840 or refer them to somebody / who could sort/ of delve deeper and find
841 out (&)

842 S3: More [professionals?

843 S5: (&) [What the needs are (&)

844 S5: (&) before before it's gone beyond/ a point

845 S6: yeah

846 S5: that we can actually influence [and change it.

847 S6 : [But that's when you have. (&)

848 S6: (&)I suppose you'd have to work out some of it would be maybe
849 guess work but if it was a pupil that over quite a large amount of time
850 you know sexually inappropriate stuff but they were then they were
851 quite a giddy silly naughty. So some pupils you know it might be they
852 need work around sort of what's appropriate what's inappropriate. For
853 some pupils who are relatively well behaved and suddenly he's strayed
854 into behaviours which are coming through then that might obviously
855 point about that potentially there's something / something could have
856 happened to them really. But I think that's that's personally a massive

857 massive issue. I never even thought like that . on Sims you know what
858 I mean cos if that cos yeah cos like again You know going back to Bob
859 I know within that class / I know/ the teachers that put it on Sims have
860 / sort of calling the girl sexy something over and over again and well it
861 would have gone down as just verbal abuse so then if you're scanning
862 all these

863 [behaviours then I would just read that (&)

864 S2: [then I would just read that yeah

865 S6: (&) and think they've just told someone to F*** off (&)

866 S2: and [the sanction but we should be (&)

867 S6: (&) [When actually we

868 S2: (&) looking I think further back not just for sexualised and
869 inappropriate behaviours but for other types acts of behaviour as well
870 really. Harmful.

871 S5: Yeah.

872 **R: If you were talking about those young people in terms of how**
873 **they would like to be described, what do you think they would like**
874 **to be described as?**

875 S4: Young people

876 S5: Normal

877 S3: Normal

878 **R: Do you think they describe themselves as normal? Do you**
879 **think they would see themselves as**

880 S5: Some of them would I think some of them would know they need
881 help. I think sometimes that they are aware. You know it depends that
882 they/ but I think sometimes it is a cry for help when a pupil act out and
883 they do something to get themselves noticed.

884 S2: I think it's easier though asking for anger management support
885 rather than asking for support around their sexuality or around their
886 sexualised behaviour. Or even telling a member of staff what they've
887 actually done cause there's lots of things that we you know won't
888 probably pick up on. I think it's really hard and I think we probably do
889 need to find a way of making it easier for children to come and then
890 speak in a confidential quiet place. I think cause were reduced now to
891 just two progress leaders from five when we had I know the progress
892 leaders don't have that / flexibility in the timetable to just be available
893 just for somebody to come and build up that relationship [a little bit
894 more (&)

895 S6: [yeah

896 S2: (&) so they feel quite safe talking to them and knowing that actually
897 if they do disclose and sort of say this person is going to help me then
898 [I think we've lost that a little bit

899 S3: [And that's one of the.... Yeah (&)

900 S3: (&) And that's one of the key aspects in it. Being a pastoral worker
901 having them talks with the children .Knowing that they can come knock
902 at the door anytime and say look I need to talk and/ probably would let
903 out stuff that you wouldn't under other circumstances hear.

904 S2: And I think maybe a as school we don't done awful lot of sort SEAL
905 activities. /We have assemblies once well once a week isn't it but the
906 content of that sometimes we're not talking about all these

907 S3: Everyday life things/ what's gone on you know we don't talk about
908 this. Stuff it's structured isn't it? It's just

909 R: So if they're not getting that everyday life stuff at school where are
910 their getting it from? //If there not enough of that

911 S2: They do get it in [the PSHCE

912 S6: [What what what's (&)

913 S6: (&) terrifying to me is that I just think at least here they have one
914 lesson a week on it where we do you know all that sort of stuff as best
915 you can but I just think bloody hell /that's quite usual and I think /SLT
916 quite sort of value that they have that input just cos the type of kids we
917 [get and (&)

918 S2: [yeah

919 S6: (&) I think most loads of secondary schools they don't have any
920 [PSHCE (&)

921 S5: [No no

922 S6: (&) at all they might have like the odd assembly or and [its (&)

923 S2: [goodness

924 S6: (&) and it's the first subject they dropped to [push into extra maths
925 (&)

926 S2: [yeah yeah

927 S6: (&) and you know that's sort of pressures that's quite sort of scary
928 really.

929 **R: And in those opportunities to do all of those SEAL type of**
930 **things those Young People thinking of strengths how would**
931 **they describe themselves would they have that opportunity to**
932 **describe their strengths would it be opportunity for you to think**
933 **about their strengths?**

934 S2: And this is something we've discussed as a pastoral team because
935 /you know we should be having circle time even though we are a high
936 school we should be having these conversations within school open
937 discussions opportunities for kids to you know voice their opinions
938 have debates and we've sort of spoken about this as a team it's
939 something that we need to work with our learning support unit and get
940 these things running back up or even doing small group programme
941 work/ you know with maybe one target child and four that are not
942 target children you know to try that are not

943 S6: Because you can tell you know when I do like a self-esteem
944 module in year 8 and it is you/can tell it is you can straight away from
945 one lesson you can identify if they are doing something like a little work
946 sheet or a card of something like strengths /and it is quite I do find
947 teenagers do tend to find it hard to sell themselves because they just
948 do. When it gets to year eleven, personal statements and that / but you
949 can kind of tell the difference between a kid who is just like Oh I don't
950 want to be a show off to some kids who I think Oh my God I never
951 would identify you with someone who had really low self-esteem one
952 that obviously feels really crap by themselves until they cannot access
953 the work/ at all. And it's even more sort of like ooh. I've had it with
954 pupils that are kind of top set English so it's almost certainly not a
955 vocabulary it's not you know they know how to describe they just can't
956 describe themselves in a positive way because they've clearly got
957 absolutely no self-esteem so yeah if you were then able to do what you
958 can in PSHCE for the whole school but then it would be nice if there
959 was something that branched off [from that and people could

960 S2: [It's hard (&)

961 S2: (&) as an adult isn't it. To say what your strengths and
962 weaknesses are. What would you like help with and all those sorts of
963 things.

964 S5: They even struggle to do that just in lessons just in the science
965 work you know what are their strengths

966 **R: Would the adults who are around that young person would**
967 **they be able to tell to say to him what the positives are about him?**
968 **Things they liked that they found a strength**

969 S2: We have just done something with a student in year seven. And
970 that was quite interesting wasn't it? The staff did say what all the
971 positives were about him and some of them he did actually say himself
972 but I think it it really did him the power of good really.

973 S5: [Its turned it

974 S2: [The behaviour (&)

975 S2: (&) has actually changed .

976 S5: yeah it has.

977 S2: Because he thinks people do value me. I am respected. And
978 actually what I thought about what that teacher thought of me isn't true.
979 Lots of people said I smile. Lots of people said and I think it really did
980 help him and I think we as a school we need to do much more/ of
981 those activities either one to one or small groups really. To help raise
982 self esteem and make people feel more valued and respected [you
983 know

984 S5: [To get feedback (&)

985 S5: (&) on what the what they way they are coming across as well

986 S2: yeah.

987 S5: Cos they might not know/ that

988 S2: No and its like (Child's name) His / his dad's a bully. That's what
989 his dad is he tries to bully staff never mind/ you know his own children
990 and his wife and things/ and I think he did do what he did for power and
991 to prove actually you know

992 S3: I'm just as strong as my dad

993 S2: I'm just as strong as my dad so he'll be proud of me now

994 [my dad's (&)

995 S3: [yeah

996 S2: (&) gonna be proud of me now cos I've done this . There's lots of
997 work [that we need to do

998 S6: [It's its really (&)

999 S6: (&) I think it's really upsetting, because just going back to / It's hard
1000 because even though they've done things that are just awful awful evil

1001 things/ but it you keep going back its just heart-breaking they're kids I
1002 can't they're kids and before they've even left school they've gone on
1003 to do this and what the hell has happened in their life to get them to
1004 that point. And we know as adults how hard it is just surviving getting a
1005 job /and this that and the other and you just think [poor kid

1006 S5: [Don't you feel responsible?

1007 S6: Sometimes

1008 S5: I mean its its I know with Bob I must admit that I look back and I
1009 reflect and I think was I responsible for pushing at all for moving him
1010 down that road. Was there anything I did that you know isolated him a
1011 bit more or identified him and made him be excluded from/ you know
1012 his group or/ I mean he's an extreme case but there are others. We
1013 have had other cases and I just think well did I make that worse or did
1014 I make that better?

1015 S6: I think that's natural what the whole point of your job and I suppose
1016 when you're a class based teacher you have to take them from this
1017 level and get them up to that level [and I know (&)

1018 S5: [yeah

1019 S6: (&) it sounds weird and you're so used to doing that from an
1020 academic point of view

1021 S5: Yeah

1022 S6: that you almost think /well I'm failing if I can't fix their personal life.
1023 [And I know Do you know what I mean

1024 S5: [What sort of responsibility have I got towards that?

1025 S6: Yeah

1026 S5: [How responsible

1027 S6: [Cos if that was a level thing (&)

1028 S6: (&) a data collection [you'd be thinking (&)

1029 S5: [yeah

1030 S6: (&) was the work not hard enough So I suppose you naturally if
1031 you're that kind of person you naturally get into that gosh well could I
1032 have done something .

1033 S3: Or is it how the school's run? How it's changed? Cos our schools
1034 changed considerably a lot to how it used to be to what it is now.

1035 S6: I worry that we are losing a little bit of the closeness. That/

1036 S3: Well that's what [I'm saying.

1037 S6: [Especially from that (&)

1038 S6: (&) especially from you guys when there used to be like heads of
1039 year 5 of you then there's four of [you there was time

1040 S3: [Well well just said it all (&)

1041 S3: (&) with the SEALS and the stuff and the talking

1042 S2: We did still have behaviours like this though/ [years ago.

1043 S6: [Yeah

1044 S3: [Not as much

1045 S2: CP

1046 S3: Yeah

1047 S2: () That was a biggie. There was still kids=

1048 S3: =Oh I'm not saying that but I'm saying if you look back to then and
1049 how it is now with the kids and the level how it is I just think with the
1050 changes in the school. It's just

1051 S6: I think the amount of males as well I think that's a bit of an issue.
1052 You know most perpetrators are men aren't they? Sexual behaviour
1053 and [it's fair that

1054 S3 [That's a lot of, that's a lot (&)

1055 S3: (&) to do with home as well. Its to do with as well role models

1056 S6: Yeah a lot of [single parent families .

1057 S3: [A lot of single parents and everything

1058 S6: And I think that that's a bit of a

1059 S5: And high male pupil population.

1060 S6: yeah

1061 S5: We've got more [boys than the girls

1062 S6: [I think (&)

1063 S6: (&) that kind of it will be interesting having a male head if that'll

1064 don't know . I think that will... I don't know I think there's you isn't there

1065 as a male and obviously (Name) left and then there is (Name)

1066 S2: Yeah

1067 R: It just feels like your talking you know these really significant serious

1068 behaviours but a lot of the things you're talking about are very

1069 fundamental to relationships and connectedness and you know the

1070 general fabric of being a community . Which is really important about

1071 identity you know about adolescents learning about their identity about

1072 how to connec not being isolated and the impact of being isolated from

1073 peer groups. Does that sound reflective of what you're saying really?

1074 S5: Yeah it does.

1075 R:I am just very conscious of the time but I could sit and listen to you

1076 for ever. I did bring these things to open up a it further. I will come

1077 back and do a session with you if you want to. There's a purpose in

1078 doing it this way. Do you feel it is useful doing it this way? Where it's a

1079 little bit guided in your thinking but you're thinking through stuff you

1080 already know. Is it helpful? Yeah Would you still like to know stuff? It

1081 leads you onto the next.

1082 S2: Yeah a lot more. I mean you found it really interesting the last time

1083 you came in and we did all sort of go away with lots to think about. But I

1084 do think as a school we have a got lots of pastoral work to with lots of
1085 our kids and if you could give us some direction sort of strategies or
1086 interventions or things we could put in place That whole school that
1087 broad base.
1088 We've got those things haven't we once its something but how do we
1089 create that open accepted empowered kind of stuff.

Reflective Logs Reflective Log One RL1

1

2 I was quite surprised by how much goes on behind the scenes that I didn't know
3 about! I wasn't aware of some of the things discussed so surprise was my main
4 emotion. I think the discussion was quite matter of fact really. Some adults also
5 started to think about and discuss why pupils might have done what they did, I think
6 that's the nature of doing the job we do and also working in a challenging school like
7 ours, you want to find reasons for behaviour because I think almost every member of
8 staff at a school wants to try and change a pupil or the better.

9 I teach PSHE and as a result of that I teach SRE including lessons on appropriate
10 sexual behaviour/assault etc. I just felt really sad during the session, as a
11 teacher it's really depressing when you realise that pupils will take part in a
12 deviant/inappropriate/risky behaviour even though those issues have been
13 explored in class with you! Whenever I hear about a child who has got involved
14 with weapons/drugs/sex I always feel a bit 'pointless' it's frustrating because you
15 wish you could do more to help, you wonder if there were signs you didn't spot
16 and you feel gutted for everyone involved, the perpetrator, victim and the families.

17 This made me think about the schools that don't even really cover PSHE, at least
18 pupils in our school do have SE lessons, I wonder how pupils cope in schools
19 where SRE isn't taught or discussed? If they are struggling with their sexuality or
20 if they are having sexually inappropriate thoughts how do they discuss these?
21 Who do they go to? I also thought about whether it's a good thing of bad thing
22 that I didn't know the concerns raised over pupils. When it's an actual criminal
23 case and the pupils were no longer in school I guess I don't need to know but
24 with the boy displaying harmful behaviour who hasn't committed a crime then
25 yes, I think I should have known. I could tailor lessons around him and engage
26 him in discussion without it looking obvious.

Reflective Log 2 RL2

1 Break duty Pupils calling each other 'gay as an insult. Explained to pupils that this
2 wasn't appropriate.

3 (Boys name) In inclusion went over to a girl who was sat down and opened her
4 knees.

5 (Name) skin tight clothing, vest and leggings.

6 Pupils twerking in lessons – feel very uncomfortable and sometimes embarrassed
7 if they address any comments at me.

8 When a boy danced up behind a girl who was bent over a table working and
9 made suggestive movements to his friends who laughed I got very angry with
10 him. This was made worse because he didn't see that he had done anything
11 wrong. The girl was upset when she realised what had happened behind her and
12 I ordered the boy out of my classroom. Later when I was calmer I went to see
13 him to discuss this and it ended up with him seeing my point of view but I'm not
14 sure if I changed anything really.

Appendix Nine Thematic analysis

Initial Codes from sessions

- YP doesn't think he's done anything wrong.
 - Child and teenager
 - YP is popular so not recognised as sexually problematic by others
 - YP is perceived by others as weird
 - Sexuality issues
 - Child not liked
 - Impact of home means child is told his behaviour is OK
 - Wants attention
 - Difficulties with relationships
 - Support in school – risk assessments learning support.
 - Difficulties thinking about a child as dangerous
 - The rape is premeditated.
 - Different identities with cultural background
 - Lots of other behaviours
 - Factors in SHB /SPB – popularity, how it is received, previously significant experience, sexuality, home life something happened, attention, views of others.
 - Difficult for teachers to deal with when boy is bragging
 - Difficult to find them an alternative placement
 - Teacher feels uncomfortable
 - Safety of others- risk to others in the future
 - Difficulties thinking child versus dangerous
 - Teachers unaware of SHB
 - SHB and therapy not always available – needs to be outcome led, not enough time in 6 weeks.
 - Language by other professional – most dangerous YP
 - Said when got out of hand gave opinion that it was not OK.
 - Did not talk about SHB or problematic behaviour in school often.
 - What did teachers talk about- behaviour in class, direct teaching experience, not aware of the other stuff.
 - Different reactions for different teachers – experience of their own background and upbringing.
 - PSHCE – direct teaching
 - Experience of girls and sexualised language – teacher not shocked but others were.
 - Behaviour which may highlight other issues e.g. abuse.
-
- Language normal in school
 - Girls accept language which adult does not think is OK

What wasn't there:

Limited mention of impact on staff, very professional response. Said I am used to it but others are not.

Feelings of staff and others not mentioned.

Disgust at the act not mentioned.

Victims rarely mentioned.

Session two

Reflections

Me

- Sexuality

Them

- Surprised they hadn't heard about these children
- Different roles of different teachers means that not having to know these things.
- Fitting in being popular
- Cultural background
- Media impact
- Adolescents – puberty
- Physical contact increasing
- Needs – low levels, attention, control power
- Deviant underlying cause
- Learning relationships
- Different with puberty, hormones, feelings
- Stigma and labelling
- Parental responsibility
- Teaching strategies to change behaviour
- Roles of teachers
- Sharing information
- Negative impacts
- A continuum
- Focus on behaviour more
- What teachers can do
- Unsure how it happens – nature nurture, incremental steps, a trauma, sexuality, sexual power, attention.
- Impact on relationships
- Cuts opportunities
- Monitoring
- Lack of privacy versus adolescent need for privacy
- Loss of freedom normal relationships
- Teacher feelings – don't want to do it, detached, want to keep people safe.

- Parental views
- Parents cultural understandings
- Sexuality and acceptance – loss of community support
- Actions supportive or punitive

- Lessons – peer attitudes, PSHCE
- Different approaches by teachers

- Staff and YP relationships
- Consistent relationships
- Staff embarrassment ability to cope.

- Recognising patterns – see whole child
- Self esteem – positives, SEAL, PSHCE. Examples of positive impact on year 7 pupil behaviour.
- Behaviour and sexualised behaviour.

School

- Offers opportunities to be with other YP – tension with being watched
- No support in school
- Want it dealt with outside of school to stop labelling.
- Lack of response in school
- Kids and loss of future
- Worried about teachers role and missing something
- Role models
- Difference between appropriate and inappropriate at home and school.

Themes

Theme One: Normal and Not normal

Main theme	Sub Themes	Initial themes
Narrative of Normal	Developing normal and not normal	Factors in SH/PB Seeking explanations Uncertainty of explanations
	Influencing understanding of normal and not normal	Factors which influence Context and Culture Norms and their social context
	Perceptions of normal and not normal	Language and terminology Different perceptions between adults, adults and children. Perception influenced by social interaction Inappropriate and appropriate sexual behaviour
	Learning normal	Context and culture Social learning and Norms Uncertainty

Theme Two: Developing Identity

Main theme	Sub Theme	Initial theme
Developing Identity	Adolescence	Distinct period of development Different perspectives Needs and rights – freedom, privacy. Sexual identity Conditions for development Popularity and fitting in Uncertainty
	Influence of the problem/Impact of SHB	Stigma, Labels and language Loss of rights and freedoms Risk and protection Protective factors
	Relationships	Relationships with adults Relationships with peers Exclusion and isolation

Theme Three: Professional and Personal Voice

Main theme	Sub Theme	Initial theme
Professional voice	Teacher influence	Support and intervention <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive influence • Influence in the classroom • Recognition of needs • Making a difference • Social and emotional, SRE curriculum Relationships as key –Changing behaviour Failure to Impact
	Systems	School processes and systems Critique of provision Changing Relationships Factors in support, CPD needs School culture External agencies Protection of children Professional Concerns
	Coping Mechanisms	Role of others Staff responses to emotional stresses
Personal voice	Emotional responses	Empathy with child Sense of loss Young person’s needs Dilemma Reflections on self Personal Coping
	Uncertainty	Influence of SHB on adult Reflection on role Responsibility of risk
	Dilemma	Punitive or supportive change Language – what’s normal not normal Child or adult Opportunity and Protection New relationships