



Citation for published version:

Skinner, T 2021, *An Evaluative study of Project CRUSH: Education, Young People, Healthy Relationships and Domestic Abuse*.

Publication date:
2021

[Link to publication](#)

Publisher Rights
Unspecified

University of Bath

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



UNIVERSITY OF
BATH

Department of Social and Policy Sciences

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

An Evaluative study of Project CRUSH: Education, Young People, Healthy Relationships and Domestic Abuse.

Sapphire Oriana Sweetland

Tina Skinner

Jade Bloomfield-Utting

Julie-Ann Buxton-Beales

October 2020

Commissioned by:



Domestic Abuse Partnership Bath & North East Somerset

Acknowledgments

We would like to take the opportunity to thank: the facilitators of the CRUSH project, for their invaluable work and contributions to the research project; the young people for giving consent for the sessions to be recorded; the Domestic Abuse Partnership in B&NES for commissioning the evaluation; and the Home Office Violence Against Women Transformation Fund for funding it.

Abstract

This is the final report of an evaluative study of project CRUSH, a project aimed at enhancing the knowledge and skill sets of 13 to 18-year olds to form healthy relationships and address their preconceptions with regard to domestic abuse. The study analyses audio recordings of two complete runs of the programme held within two separate schools, the training materials, a facilitator interview and CRUSH database. Attendees on the programme were selected by referral on the basis of being deemed at risk of domestic abuse. The focus of the evaluation was to assess the effectiveness of the communication between facilitators and participants, the effectiveness of the training materials, and any change in knowledge and attitude of participants from beginning to end of the programme. This study aims to fill the gap within current academic literature surrounding preventive domestic abuse programmes where research regarding facilitator communication and influence upon participants of such programmes is lacking. This is also the first research project to record and analysis such a programme in session. The key findings are: (i) a shift in attitudes and responses of the participants in both groups occurred, enhancing student's understanding of domestic abuse and healthy relationships; (ii) the strength of the facilitators and flexibility of materials, to build positive relationships with the participants and adapt to individual group needs; and (iii) the importance of facilitator/student relationships to address macro, micro, meso and individual level issues/needs. The report concludes by stating that for the Governments' new Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education (PSHEE) school programme to be effective in challenging stereotypical views on gender and domestic abuse, they must ensure the people that deliver the new in school healthy relationship classes have the level of skill, empathy, knowledge and good humour displayed by the CRUSH B&NES team.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Domestic Abuse, Young People, and Education

1.1 Introduction	5
1.2 Domestic abuse and young people	7
1.2.1 Prevalence in young people	7
1.2.2 Effects on, and acceptance of domestic abuse in young people	7
1.3 Preventive domestic abuse programmes: teaching young people about healthy relationships	8
1.4 Managing classroom behaviour	12
1.5 Ontogenetic, meso, micro and macro level interaction framework	15
1.6 Aim and objectives of the study	16
1.7 Conclusion	17

Chapter 2. Methodology

2.1 Introduction	18
2.2 Access	18
2.3 The Data	19
2.4 Data Analysis	20
2.5 Ethics	22
2.6 Validity in qualitative research	22

Chapter 3. Findings

3.1 Introduction	24
3.2 Teaching techniques	24
3.2.1 Techniques addressing macro and micro level issues	27
3.2.2 Techniques targeting micro level group dynamics	27
3.3.2.1 Positive affirmation of group participation	27
3.3.3 Micro (and ontogenetic) level adaptations	29
3.3.3.1 Responding to group dynamics by altering teaching techniques	29
3.3.3.2 Time keeping	31
3.3.3.3 Time difference between Group A and B	32
3.4 Attitudes and responses during programme	32
3.4.1 Stereotyping of gender	33
3.4.2 Stereotyping of victim-survivors and victim-blaming	36
3.4.3 Awareness of warning signs	38
3.5 Experience of services and trust	39
3.6 Discussion of findings	40
3.6.1 Facilitator relationship building	41
3.6.2 Domestic abuse narratives	42
3.6.3 Building trust in services for young people	44
3.7 Limitations	45
3.8 Recommendations	45
3.9 Conclusion	46

Bibliography	48
---------------------	-----------

Appendix CRUSH B&NES Adapted Materials	52
---	-----------

Chapter One: Domestic Abuse, Young People and Education

1.1 Introduction

A total of 746,219 domestic abuse related crimes were recorded by the police in the year ending March 2019, 24 percent more than the year before (Office for National Statistics 2019). Domestic abuse is currently defined as ‘any incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive, threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between those aged 16 or over who are, or have been, intimate partners or family members regardless of gender or sexuality. The abuse can comprise, but is not solely limited to: psychological, physical, sexual, financial and/or emotional (Home Office, 2018). The Domestic Abuse Bill 2020 is set to change the definition; the main change proposed is that ‘financial’ should be replaced by ‘economic’ (Home Office, 2020).

The UK Government’s decision to extend the definition of domestic abuse from adults to young people aged 16 (Home Office 2013) indicates a rise in the level of acknowledgement of domestic in young people. The need for impactful educational programmes for young people regarding domestic abuse was emphasised by recent enquiries into governmental efforts to facilitate schools in providing such programmes (Hansard 2017). The exact numbers of young people who experience domestic abuse is not clear. British Crime Survey data indicates that 12.7percent of women aged between 16 and 19 reported an occasion of domestic abuse in the last year (Smith et al. 2011). More recent data demonstrates the magnitude of domestic abuse cases reported by women, with 7.5percent of women aged between 16 and 19 reporting an occasion of domestic abuse, with women four times more likely to be victim-survivors of domestic abuse than men (Office for National Statistics 2019). In contrast, Barter et al. (2009), found that 88percent of young people across the UK had at least one experience of domestic abuse within their relationship. The difference is likely to be linked to the latter survey asking for incidents of domestic abuse over a longer timeframe.

The focus of this evaluation is the CRUSH project in B&NES, a Home Office funded pilot project which provides an interactive learning programme aimed at young people between the ages of 13 and 18. It is a development of the project materials originally written by West Mercia Women's Aid (2014). The focus of the project is for young people to develop tools to form and maintain healthy relationships, and to challenge young people's presumptions and attitudes towards domestic abuse to develop knowledge and understanding.

Various studies over time have indicated the limitations of sex and relationship education in schools (see for example, Parker et al 2005; Brook 2011). A growing body of literature also evaluates the impact of domestic abuse education on young people (see for example, Thiara and Ellis 2014). However, very little research currently evaluates the role of the facilitator in these programmes and how information is communicated to young people (Baginsky 2015; Horner et al 2010); or uses the method of audio recording sessions to analyse the conversations and interactions that occur therein. The current lack of research in this area means it was important to observe (through audio recording) how/whether the CRUSH project in B&NES facilitates the learning of young people and how the facilitators and participants interact.

This evaluation of the CRUSH programme, as it has been adapted and delivered in B&NES, is thus focused on how facilitators communicate core content within the groups and how successfully these teaching methods translate into transformative learning for the project's participants. This study draws on a social constructivist theoretical framework emphasising the formation of knowledge through interactive experience and the impact of these experiences on the participant's individual belief systems and understanding of domestic abuse (Badie et al 2017). Two runs of the programme were recorded, transcribed and analysed for this research, alongside an interview with the facilitators.

1.2 Domestic abuse and young people

1.2.1 Prevalence in young people

A study of 1353 young people across the UK stated that 88percent of participants reported having at least one experience of domestic abuse within their relationship, with girls more likely to have experienced physical and repeated violence (Barter et al. 2009). In 2009, 12.7percent of women aged between 16 and 19 reported in the British Crime Survey that they had experienced an occasion of domestic abuse compared to 4.8percent of women aged between 55 and 59 (Smith et al. 2011). More recent data indicates that 7.5percent of women aged between 16 and 19 reported an occasion of domestic abuse, with women four times more likely to be victim-survivors of domestic abuse than men (Office for National Statistics 2019). A key reason for the differences in figures is linked to the surveys asking for incidents across different timeframes (e.g. within the last year or within a lifetime).

1.2.2 Effects on, and acceptance of, domestic abuse in young people

Research demonstrates that for children and young people witnessing domestic abuse can have severe effects (Coleman et al. 2007). Such impacts can be monumental for some young people resulting in behavioural changes, reduced attention span and speech and language impairment (Baraclough 2001). These findings are reflected by other research noting that young people who witnessed inter-parental abuse suffered significantly worse outcomes in behavioural issues than those who did not (Kitzmann et al 2003). In addition, research has indicated that males between 14 and 20 who were aware of domestic abuse within their peer groups were over two times as likely to report perpetrating forms of domestic abuse themselves (Reed et al. 2011).

Drawing on empirical data from a school-based study, McCarry (2003, 2009) conducted research with seventy-seven young people in Glasgow to explore their views and opinions of domestic abuse. McCarry's (2003, 2009) research suggests that many young people dismiss displays of abuse in relationships, have a high tolerance of interpersonal violence, and fail to report it. Similarly, Dublin Women's Aid (1999) found that young people have not only high levels of exposure to domestic abuse, but

also high levels of tolerance, with male violence being viewed as normalized in their own experiences of heterosexual teenage relationships. Many young people also hold women equally culpable despite men being more often the perpetrators of domestic abuse than women (McCarry 2003); and display resistance when confronted with the realities of heteronormative domestic abuse, offering numerous justifications for it, including presentations of victim-blaming within the sample groups (McCarry 2009).

Yet, with the exception of studies such as McCarry (2003, 2009), much research still fails to listen to the voices of young people, highlighting them as research subjects as opposed to social actors. This lack of inclusion of young people in the discussion of domestic abuse has been recognised in academic literature, particularly the lack of research that facilitates listening to the voices of young people (Callaghan 2018). Increased involvement of young people in such studies could booster young people's sense of empowerment and value them as experts in their own experiences (MacDonald 2018); providing recognition of them as active citizens of social change; contribute to increased awareness of how to help victim-survivors of domestic abuse; and help researchers elect the most relevant intervention (Coburn and Gormally 2014).

1.3 Preventative domestic abuse programmes: teaching young people about healthy relationship

Studies indicating the prevalence (for example, Barter et al. 2009; Office for National Statistics 2019) and acceptance of domestic abuse in young people (for example McCarry 2003, 2009), point towards the need for effective educational programmes. Educational programmes are thought to be fundamental in the prevention of domestic abuse, raised awareness amongst young people (Dahle and Archbold 2014) and promotion of healthy relationships.¹ Indeed, current research indicates such programmes are arguably one of the few effective ways in which young people can

¹ Whilst the majority of current research on healthy relationships in young people defines a healthy relationship as one that does not involve threatening verbal abuse or physical and sexual abuse (Shorey et al. 2008); much of this research fails to acknowledge that the perceptions of what is considered to be abusive or non-abusive varies amongst young people (Hertzog and Rowley 2014).

improve their understanding of the complex nature of domestic abuse (Reed et al. 2011).

In terms of programme content, Tyson (1999) pinpoints feminist theory as an essential theoretical framework for conveying such messages to young people. Through feminist theory the discussion of young people's beliefs which can reinforce or undermine the social, political and psychological oppression of women can be challenged (*ibid*). 'Social empathy' has also been employed by many academics working with young people and domestic abuse, where interactive activities are utilised to enable young people to gain knowledge and create empathy with the circumstances of young people in abusive relationships to close the gap between abuse perception and lived reality (Adelman et al. 2016). Mcqueeny (2016:1465) advocates a three unit structure for young people to understand the impacts of abuse on their personal lives: (a) social contexts of domestic abuse, (b) narratives of domestic abuse, and (c) strategies for ending domestic abuse. Mcqueeny (*ibid*) emphasises the importance of young people's centrality as social actors in their learning by making interactive learning central in challenging domestic abuse narratives that young people face. These approaches are reflected and implemented in project CRUSH (West Mercia Women's Aid 2014) through interactive character creation, stories and discussion of how to end abusive relationships, enabling young people to gain knowledge and a sense of empathy with victim-survivors of domestic abuse and develop their own skills.

The lack of current educational programmes available to young people has been highlighted (Hertzog and Rowley 2014; Parker et al 2005). Parker et al (2005)

suggested that only 30percent of young women felt school-based sex and relationships programmes met their needs. Traditionally curricula focused predominately on issues such as pregnancy, contraception and sexually transmitted infections; with calling for more discussion of healthy relationship dating back decades (see Lenderyou and Ray 1997; Ofsted 2006). Until 2020, mandatory topics included puberty, the biological aspects of sexual reproduction and sexually transmitted infections, yet lacked information on the formation of healthy relationships (Brook 2011; Pound et al. 2016). Previous research has called for improvements in compulsory school curriculum for the inclusion of healthy relationships to be discussed to promote the wellbeing and safe guarding of students (Brook 2011). Recent change in sex and relationship education in the school curriculum has recognised the necessity to include such content in Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education (PSHEE) classes, with compulsory programmes now including topics such as reporting abuse, victim-blaming and healthy relationship formation (Department for Education 2020).²

At present the effectiveness of the new PSHEE healthy relationships content has yet to be evaluated. Whilst mainstreaming of healthy relationship teaching for young people is to be welcomed, teaching such content involves ‘powerful experiences’ (Dragiewicz et al 2013: 6088), that can be challenging for facilitators; and it is not clear if teachers are best placed to do this work. Biddulph (2007) noted teachers have limited opportunities to train for teaching domestic abuse and healthy relationship content, and that where such training is offered, there is a risk some teachers may not be prepared emotionally to successfully teach sensitive content to young people. Stanley, Ellis and Bell (2011) further this argument by stating that a gendered approach is necessary, with specific emphasis on how these topics are delivered to young people. However, Hester and Westmarland (2005) note that unfamiliar staff pushing a feminist approach imposes the risk of material being viewed as one-sided or anti-men for young male participants. Others have responded to this argument by stating teachers should be the ones to convey the material to students, due to their prior relationship with pupils that specialist facilitators often lack (Hilton 2007). The Scottish Executive (2002) evaluation of the Zero Tolerance Initiative in Scotland provided evidence for this, stating that teaching

² Such teaching predates the running of CRUSH in B&NES and the data generation phase of this research.

staff are best suited to lead healthy relationship programmes. However, the findings from other studies suggest otherwise. Fox et al. (2014) noted the benefits of specialist facilitators in teaching such programmes due to their vast knowledge and experience in discussing domestic abuse with young people. Hester and Westmarland (2005) acknowledge that specialist facilitator may be preferable if staff do not possess the confidence and skills to adequately teach such content. Indeed, evidence indicates that a concerning minority of teaching staff may not hold the values and skills needed for tackling domestic abuse, with 22 percent of teachers who delivered a domestic abuse prevention programme to young people believing girls sometimes provoke violence towards themselves due to their behaviour and attire (Fox et al. 2014). Such a lack of knowledge of domestic abuse can result in teachers conveying the message of prevention techniques incorrectly (Hilton 2001). Lack of skills can also restrict teaching methods leading a reliance on a single teaching tool, such as worksheet-based lessons, making the content less engaging for participants (Hilton 2001).

Biddulph (2007) indicates that any teaching interaction needs to be tailored to individual classroom dynamics and responses to teaching methods, implementing techniques such as humour, scenario learning and role play. Fox et al. (2014) also highlights that facilitators responding to the individual needs of participants was crucial to the success of teaching such content. Fox et al. (2014) additionally notes that if teachers conveying such material had a previous poor relationship with students this may impact negatively with students simply disengaging. Other research highlighted the crucial role of facilitator choice emphasising the need for facilitators to be able to engage participants with high levels of respect, trust and openness (Comprehensive Research Group Research 2009). It is suggested that skilled and knowledgeable specialist facilitators can serve to provide a safe, open, trusting space free of judgement to encourage participants to take part in an array of teaching activities (Robbins 2014).

What current research is lacking is detailed knowledge and understanding of the relationship between facilitator and young participant in such programmes, resulting in calls for further study within the educational field of young people (see for example Heffernen et al. 2012). Also absent in current research on domestic abuse and healthy

relationship training is how to manage difficult classroom behaviour. This is particularly important in view of behavioural issues being one impact of children and young people experiencing domestic abuse (for example see Kitzmann et al 2003). For this reason, in the following section we have cast our net for the literature review beyond the field of domestic abuse and healthy relationships to cover more general classroom behaviour management literature.

1.4 Managing Classroom Behaviour

Often absent in discussion and evaluation of domestic abuse education programmes is how to manage challenging behaviour (see for example Brooks and Goldstein 1995). Within the past two decades the substantial development of ‘universal’ positive behaviour intervention support in educational institutions, known commonly as SWPBIS programmes, has been said to assist efforts to address challenging classroom behaviour (Bradshaw et al. 2010). From this programme a multi-tiered model of preventive methods, teaching strategy, screening and the implementation of behavioural and education practices has been permitted. The framework allows for intervention techniques available to all educators to promote positive behaviour in students (Horner et al 2010). The use of SWPBIS programmes over the past two decades has helped mould the foundations of behavioural expectations within classrooms through the establishment of explicit rules and standards for general classroom settings (Bradshaw et al. 2010). Further to setting the rules for students, Lewis et al (2010) indicates that SWPBIS has been important in providing a positive engagement framework for teachers to follow teaching strategies consistently with an emphasis on reinforcing positive behaviour.

Much of this literature places specific emphasis on the role of teacher or facilitator to take an active role in managing such classroom culture. Hamm, Hoffman and Farmer (2012) highlight the responsibility educators must take at two crucial levels in particular. Particular emphasis is placed firstly on the authority figure teachers serve as to enforce rules to emphasise the positive functions of the classroom setting. Secondly, it is stated how teachers play an important role in monitoring and recognizing students’

social interactions, setting the tone for the culture of the classroom by the formation of positive relationships with the students (Hamm et al 2012).

Gifford-Smith and Brownell (2003) note how children's social interactions and shared relationships creates a peer culture and helps to mould a peer group and; that behaviour of peers within the group is often created and reflected throughout the group setting. Many theorists have rooted discussions about classroom and peer group behaviour within social interactional theory, which recognises how individuals display their behaviours based around their peers own behaviours and thus build a culture of behavioural approaches deemed acceptable within the group (Farmer et al 2007). Patterson (1979) highlighted how the repeated interactions between individuals reinforce patterns of specific behaviour and thus teachers must be aware of these social settings in order to tackle challenging behaviour. Cairns and Cairns (1994) suggest there are three noticeable processes in which group classroom behaviours are formed: imitation, reciprocity and complementarity. During imitation one pupil may lead a behaviour which is then replicated by another individual within the setting. In the instance of reciprocity, the students imitating then behave in a similar manner which serves to solidify the common behaviours. On the other hand, in complementary exchanges the two interacting students have varying levels of status but the behaviours must take place in differing manners for the solidification of behaviour to take place, for example as viewed in the situation of a leader and follower of the peer group (Cairns and Cairns 1994). Whilst these interactions can create positive group dynamics, these processes can also create the foundations for challenging behaviours in the classroom (Farmer et al 2007).

Yet whilst this literature suggests the backgrounds of how challenging behaviours can emerge, and such current programmes serve as a guide to teachers to manage these behaviours, this literature fails to recognise the specificity of such challenges as they may arise in classroom settings (Farmer et al 2014). Other academics have highlighted that a focus on social interactional theory within the classroom setting is not enough to understand the reasons for challenging behaviour and thus how to manage it appropriately. Karve (2015) suggests the root causes of challenging behaviour are often

the result of external personal circumstances which are expressed through disruptive behaviour. Reflecting this perspective, Cefai and Cooper (2010) argue that young people identified with social difficulties which lead to disruptive behaviours during the classroom are not the result of peer group formation but in fact the opposite, recognising that disruptive students are often the most marginalised within school settings with the least sense of belonging within their peer groups (Cefai and Cooper 2010). Academics from this perspective have argued that difficult classroom behaviours should not be met with programmes such as those outlined above by the SWPBIS but with student empowerment and opportunities to allow students to voice their feelings to participate meaningfully in classroom settings to tackle disruptive behaviours (Fielding 2004). Wearmouth (2004) argued that the literature has ignored students' personal lives and how they may create challenging behaviour completely by highlighting them to be a 'difficulty' for the teacher to deal with, leading to further negative behaviours, social alienation of these pupils, and poor social functioning within adulthood. These ideas support the need for teachers and facilitators to build personal individual relationships with pupils presenting challenging behaviours in the classroom to create a positive and trusting environment to encourage positive and respectful behaviours to take place between both educator and student (Fielding 2004).

Flynn (2014) notes that through the empowerment of students displaying difficult behaviours, the students in return generate a multidirectional model of empowerment creating personable relationships between student and teacher. Through this relationship creation, a sense of value and engagement is displayed and as such is imitated by the students to the teacher (see also Cairns and Cairns 1994). These arguments reinforce the literature highlighting that challenging behaviour cannot be met with a 'universal' set of rules enforced from teachers or facilitators alone, but must catered for individual student's circumstances (such as witnessing domestic abuse) with a focus on positive relationship building to yield positive behaviours within the classroom setting (Flynn 2014).

1.5 Ontogenetic, Meso, Micro and Macro level interaction framework

In the above section the importance of both peer groups and individual needs were highlighted by different authors. According to Bronfenbrenner's (1993) 'Ecological models of human development', individual and peer interventions are not an either/or choice but are respectively micro and ontogenetic levels of intervention within an ecological system. Whilst the ontogenetic level refers to individual behaviours, needs, abilities and cognitions; the micro level refers to everyday (including peer group) interactions. These immediate interactions consolidate individual understanding of what constitutes (un)acceptable social practices, such as domestic abuse (Hagemann White et al. 2010). Bronfenbrenner's (1993) model indicates, therefore, that *both* an attention to social interaction (e.g. peer group) and individual need (e.g. witnessing domestic abuse) are required in order to address the causes of domestic abuse. However, Bronfenbrenner's (1993) model indicates these are not the only levels at which intervention is required. Patriarchal discourses have strong structural foundations, the impact of these on the lived experiences of victim-survivors and perpetrators of domestic abuse is recognizable when the micro interactions shape the perceptions of acceptable behaviours and can subsequently reinforce or challenge these notions (Hagemann et al. 2010). These larger historical, legal, cultural structures occur at the macro level (see Bronfenbrenner 1994; Hagemann White et al. 2010). This level refers to the larger overarching inequalities between men and women including the subordination of women to men (Hagemann et al. 2010), and is particularly recognised as important in research discussed in section 1.3 on domestic abuse and healthy relationship training for young people (see Mcqueeny 2016; Tyson 1999). These two levels (macro and micro) mould and interact with the ontogenetic; yet often in research they are viewed as separate entities (Netting 2005). A further level, the meso level (Bronfenbrenner 1994), involves institutions such as schools and the culture, rules, practices and norms therein. The need to understand the interwoven nature of ontogenetic, micro, meso and macro levels in interventions such as teaching and training, whilst scarce in much research regarding domestic abuse, has been recognised by Hagemann et al. (2010).

This underscores the necessity to comprehend ontogenetic, micro, meso and macro influences on young people to help understand how domestic abuse interventions may work on the ground. However, research assessing the effectiveness of practice behaviours through a micro and macro framework is scarce as the subject of empirical inquiry (Brady and O'Connor 2014), and to use all four levels is more very unusual. For example, Rothman's (2008) conceptualization of larger macro issues in social justice educational programmes emphasised the need for micro interventions to help form social advocacy. This form of community intervention has been recognised by other academics highlighting that the integration of macro awareness into micro interactive educational programmes can promote positive interconnected dynamics among participants and challenge unjust social policies (Brady and O'Connor 2014). Hardina and Obel-Jorgensen (2009) suggest that positive outcomes for a micro and macro framework in educational settings requires a facilitator with the necessary skill set (ie at the ontogenetic level) to incorporate messages of social justice including self-awareness, the ability to facilitate empowerment and create engagement. However, there does not appear to be research overtly discussing all four levels of influence on young people's lives and in their education.

1.6 Aim and objectives of the study

Based on the above review of the literature, the aim of the study was to assess the effectiveness of the communication between facilitators and participants in the B&NES CRUSH Programme, and any change in knowledge and attitude of participants from beginning to the end of the programme. This breaks down into the following objectives, to analyse:

- the relationships between facilitators and participants;
- the effectiveness of the teaching methods used; and
- whether there is any change in the knowledge/understanding of healthy relationships and domestic abuse in the participants as the programme progresses.

This was undertaken within a theoretical framework that paid attention to ontogenetic, micro, meso and macro level concerns.

1.7 Conclusion

Current research emphasises the vital need for domestic abuse to be discussed openly with young people yet the inclusion of the voices of young people in research is lacking (Callaghan 2018). Evidently, there is growing research regarding teaching preventive domestic abuse content but very little research currently addresses the vital role of the facilitator and how this information is communicated to young people (Horner et al 2010). This emphasises the need for further research on the role of facilitator/student relationship formations in the success of such programmes. The current research is unusual not only because of the focus on the facilitator and student relationship, but also the attention paid in the data analysis to macro, meso, micro and ontogenetic level issues as they play out in the CRUSH programme in B&NES.

Chapter Two: Methodology

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter the research design is discussed, from access and data generation through to data analysis and ethics.

2.2 Access

Access to the CRUSH project was granted through Bath and North-East Somerset Domestic Abuse Partnership, who utilised Home Office funding to commission the University of Bath to undertake the project evaluation. Permission to run the CRUSH project was gained by the CRUSH facilitators from each individual school involved in the programme. Consent for the University of Bath to undertake the evaluation of the project was obtained from each school, the facilitators and the young people who participated. Parents of the young people were also informed that the evaluation would be taking place. See ethics section for further details.

Challenges were encountered in gaining access including a change in approach to data generation. The original proposal was to conduct in person observations of each CRUSH session with detailed notes to be taken throughout by the researcher. The advantages of this method would have included that the many non-verbal behaviours could be observed and noted for analysis. However, after consideration, access to have a researcher present in the sessions was denied by the CRUSH facilitators. The fear expressed was that observation would impose on participants' confidentiality, and the natural flow of conversation within the group. An alternative method was chosen which took the form of audio recordings.

The decision to record sessions combated many of the challenges that observations would potentially encounter and thus eventually proved to be a highly beneficial method for data generation. The presence of two strategically placed recorders, as opposed to a person, allowed for the natural occurrence of interactions within the

groups without intrusion, reducing the creation of an observer's paradox (see also Mackey and Gass 2012). This method also allowed more of the sessions interactions to be recorded and transcribed, much of which would have been lost through the method of observations alone. The non-present audio recording observation method was essential to accessing the participant's viewpoints in an authentic manner without the influence of an observing body (see also Parsons et al 2016). Furthermore, this method helped to overcome several disadvantages associated with note taking during observations such as the potential to lose hard copies of data, incorrect reporting of events as well as the lengthy time process of personal input of notes into thick description writing (Berazneva 2014). There were limitations, however, the recorders could only be placed on the table for group work and one table close to the facilitators. Only one of these could be transcribed due to cost. Whilst the recorder at the student table (the one transcribed) was able to pick up the voices of the facilitators, it was not always able to pick up all conversations of the students. This was also an advantage though, because students could choose to be further away from the recorder if they wished. In addition, with multiple participants speaking at once or in quick succession it was not possible for the transcriber to distinguish between students. The transcripts did, however, distinguish between students and facilitators, and between the two facilitators.

2.3 The Data

The data set comprises of the original CRUSH education materials written by West Mercia Women's Aid, educational materials used in CRUSH B&NES (see Appendix 1), an interview with the facilitators, and recordings of two separate runs of the CRUSH B&NES programmes involving the same two facilitators and two different groups of 14-16 year olds (7 participants in Group A and 11 participants in Group B). There were four 'sessions' each standardly six hours long. However, the timing of delivery was adapted for the needs of each group: in one setting, that involved special needs students, here the sessions were delivered over five slightly shorter days; in the other it was delivered over two longer days.

As well as a joint recorded interview, the research team met with the facilitators twice to discuss the research project as well as the progress of the CRUSH B&NES Project, and exchanged numerous emails to gain feedback on research findings at each stage of the study. The interview with the facilitators lasted approximately 1 hour and focused on their understanding of how the programme was progressing, how they had adapted the original CRUSH materials and developments moving forward. Both the interview and programme recordings were stored on a password protected file on The University of Bath secure server and were transcribed by a professional transcriber. These transcriptions were then stored in a password protected document on the University of Bath secure server and are the basis of the data analysis.ⁱ

2.4 Data Analysis

When analysing the educational materials and interview transcript, thematic analysis was applied in order to establish, code and analyse appearing themes and patterns (Crabtree 2006). Thematic analysis was also used initially to analyse the transcripts of the recorded CRUSH sessions. However, in order to reach a deeper level of analysis of the sessions, this was subsequently combined with instructional communication theory, discourse and narrative analysis. This was done in order to delineate and explore the various linguistic devices utilised to regulate information from language into narratives and thence conveyed in the sessions (Halliday and Hasan 1976).

The CRUSH transcripts, and the educational materials, were read thoroughly in their entirety prior to analysis in order to create a familiarity with their content. The next step was to take a closer reading of the transcript alongside listening to the recordings at the same time, highlighting anything that seemed potentially relevant to the analysis, and picking up any differences in interpretation between listening to the sessions and reading the transcripts (which may have lacked the same social queues such as voice inclination). These initial readings and highlighted phrases were the start of the coding process.

Open coding was primarily utilised at this stage to break the data apart and delineate initial ideas and concepts from the raw data in the form of words, phrases and sections of highlighted text from the initial close reading (Corbin and Strauss 2008). Visual representations of codes were employed here. Colour coding was useful to represent various codes and decisions for making them; matching colours of codes with segments of text including a coding label, definition and an example to understand the formation of these codes (see also Ellis and Barkhuizen 2005). These codes were then categorized into themes through the assessment of individual codes, reviewing similarities between them and grouping them according to common features (see also Charmaz 2014). Through this process themes of the codes emerged through categorization, reducing the categories that address the research question of the study refining it further and further until the categories were viewable as relevant concepts or themes (see also Saldana 2016). The themes were then further examined to determine the relationship between them (Dey 1993) in the visual form of a table. The representation of coding in the form of a table was chosen to enhance the readability of relationships between codes, categories and themes to simplify the results of the coding process (Adu 2019). The table and coding therein was then checked and commented on by another member of the research team.

The ‘next phase’ of the analysis, though it was not completed as a linear process, was to see if these themes were linked to discourses and formed into narrative by the participants and as such if similar narratives occurred between facilitators and participants. The inclusion of narrative analysis in combination with discourse and instructional communication theory allowed for the representation of personal meanings, experiences and perspectives of the individual participants of the CRUSH project at the ontogenetic and micro level within the wider context of the institution and society at the meso and macro levels. Through the deployment of narrative analysis Cazden and Hymes (1996) argue that the dividing lines between micro and macro issues of society can be successfully joined and depicted analytically. This can lead to the development of critical meta-awareness (Roberts 1998) through the engagement of personal identification in the social construction of situations, which was crucial to understanding the facilitators own engagement with project CRUSH’s training

materials, interactions between facilitators and students and between the students themselves.

2.5 Ethics

It is paramount when dealing with raw data and conducting research to consider the ethical measures which must be taken. All phases of the project were formulated in reference to the ethical guidelines of the British Sociological Association (2017), The University of Bath (2019) and the World Health Organisation Ethical recommendations for the study of domestic abuse (Ellsberg and Heise 2005). The research project received a favourable opinion from the University of Bath Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee (SSREC code, S19-002); and each phase was discussed in detail with and approved by the project facilitators, as discussed above.

Particular caution had to be taken during the process of generating personal data from participants. All research participants were supplied with an information sheet and a consent form delineating the research purposes, the participants right to withdraw, as well as contact information in case they had any personal concerns as to how their data would be stored and utilized in the study. Parents and participants were informed of the study prior to the running of the programme. The recordings were kept on a secure server at the University of Bath, which was password protected. All relevant forms were kept in a locked cabinet in a secure office. The recordings were transcribed by a professional transcriber who adhered to the same ethical standards as the researchers. These transcriptions were made anonymous to protect individual identity and were also kept in a password protected document on The University of Bath's secure server.

2.6 Validity in qualitative research

In order to combat any potential biases that could limit the quality of the data analysis, three of the researchers working on the project peer reviewed the coding. This enabled the analysis to gain different perspectives and challenge personal biases in order to increase the validity of the analysis. Feedback was also essential from the facilitators

of the CRUSH programme through comments on previous parts of the evaluation, including a pilot analysis of one run of the programme. A reflexive journal was kept by the main data analyst to document the coding process and personal thoughts regarding the direction of the research project. This process accounted for confirmability (the range of the analyst's personal interpretations stemming from the data) through the process of peer reviewing enabling critique and questions to how conclusions from the data were drawn from the analysis (Norwell et al 2017).

Chapter Three: Findings

3.1 Introduction

Three main themes were extracted from analysis of the CRUSH data, which shall serve as focus of the discussion to follow: teaching techniques; attitudes and responses during the programme; and experiences of services and trust. Whilst some of the findings are presented in the form of single words or brief phrase, additional context has been provided. Quotations in the text have been purposefully chosen to reflect the themes and narratives of both facilitators and participants.

3.2 Teaching Techniques

One key theme to come from the analysis was the importance of the implementation of teaching techniques by the facilitators in order for the programme to be delivered successfully to the participants. On further analysis of the transcripts, it was noticed how these teaching techniques conformed to two categories: techniques targeted primarily at the micro level specifically working with the group dynamics; and those aimed at the micro and macro level, focusing on building relationships outside of the group by challenging stereotypes around domestic abuse or gender. The next section will focus on the findings relating to the teaching techniques used by the facilitators of the programme to engage the participants with the latter.

3.2.1 Techniques Addressing Macro and Micro Level Issues

Teaching techniques targeted at the use of macro level discourses and ideology (e.g. patriarchal understandings of gender) in micro level relationships were visibly utilized by the facilitators to deliver project CRUSH to both groups of participants. Analysis of transcripts signals that in both Group A and Group B, rich and varied teaching techniques were adopted by the facilitators to deliver the content; alongside facilitators using their personal skills to engage participants. This section of the findings will be dedicated to the analysis of these techniques used by the facilitators to address the macro issues of pervasive gendered discourse/myth around domestic abuse.

Instructional interactive games to facilitate learning around domestic abused myths were utilised in both group settings to engage participants with the programme content such as during the ‘Myth vs Fact’ game (see Fig. 1 in Appendix). The ‘True or False’ game (see Fig. 2 in Appendix) introduced this technique in both group settings, an example of which is shown below.

Group B DAY 1 AM (22.44)

Alcohol causes partners to be abusive, coercive or manipulative in intimate situations, true or false?

Facilitator

The use of interactive games by the facilitators allowed for discussion and debate amongst participants, supporting an open and inclusive environment for participants to vocally express their opinions and engage in the discussions surrounding healthy and abusive relationships. The ‘true or false’ quiz also appeared to enable participants to begin questioning their own ideas about their own experiences. For example, romanticising abuse was raised and questioned by one participant further on in the same session as the quiz developed:

Group A Day 1 AM PT 2 (18.59)

Is it true that boys actually pick on you because they like you? Participant

No. No, I saw this thing the other day ... Participant

[...] and it was like you shouldn't teach girls that. Participant

Yeah, absolutely. Facilitator

The reason why boys are nasty to you is because they like you. Participant

Yeah, is that true because or not because I'm so confused? Participant

The use of the ‘truth or false’ quiz therefore allowed participants to begin questioning domestic abuse myths they had already encountered. The above quote also demonstrates, for some participants, a good level of trust in the facilitators, and their peers, ability to help them decipher fact from fiction.

Within the educational materials other activities revolve around the reframing of abuse often conceptualised as love. For example, in one activity sheet describing abuse it is noted ‘love shouldn’t be conditional - especially if these conditions are to change key aspects of you’ (see Appendix fig. 3). Similar narrative patterns were found in analysing the interview with facilitators, who indicate their positive experiences of these kinds of training materials:

We've had people suddenly recognise that their relationship's abusive, and people having, for the first time, a space to talk about their parents' domestic abuse.

Group B showed similar benefits to Group A. This was particularly noticeable in the exploration of discourses of abuse within the ‘spotting the warning signs’ scenario exercise on the final day (see Fig.4 in Appendix). Participants demonstrated the ability to recognise warning signs of an abusive relationship through the scenario based elements of the exercise allowing them to explore the situation from their own personal viewpoint:

Group B DAY 6 AM (45.08)
'I'm sorry! Demanding passwords! Well done! Using forgiveness as a weapon, well I'll forgive you if you do this, this, this and this'. Participant
(agreement)
[.....] jealousy, that's fairly simple, verbal insults, which again simple ... controlling ... [...] Participant

The above quote is also an illustration of the high level of confidence students had by the end of the programme to recognise signs of an abusive relationship. The transition of participants own recognition of types of abuse from the beginning to the end of the programme will be explored further later this chapter.

Throughout the programme facilitators also used character creation to allow participants to discuss the issues surrounding domestic abuse and healthy relationships. The characters were discussed in various exercises allowing participants to address and discuss their own preconceptions about, and used of myths around, domestic abuse within the relative safety of doing so in reference to a hypothetical person. These characters consisted of two males and two females which would form one healthy and one unhealthy relationship. The characters acted as a catalyst for discussion regarding abusive tactics and also were fundamental to exposing students’ gendered preconceptions and to some of the participants’ ability to recognise abusive tendencies themselves by the end of the programme (see for examples section 3.4.1 on Stereotyping of Gender).

As discussed in this and subsequent sections, the facilitators perception of the success of the materials (quoted above), is evidenced within the group data where students are positively engaged with the tasks (see previous example quote from Group A). The facilitators see such techniques as vital early interventions to avoid myths about domestic abuse continuing into young people’s adult lives:

But there needs to be a kind of whole ... understanding that in order to tackle domestic abuse we need to be looking at younger people and their take on relationships and ... and actually in terms of outcomes, positive outcomes, if we can start that work early enough, then the longer term outcomes for young people I think are hugely better (agreement) rather than let's wait until it gets to the point where somebody's been referred into MARAC(?), well actually if we'd started way back there, they might not have got to the point where it's high risk.

3.3.2 Techniques targeting micro level group dynamics

Alongside teaching techniques to address macro issues surrounding healthy relationships, techniques used to target micro level issues (such as group dynamics) were also clearly present to keep both groups engaged with the programme. These techniques seemed relevant to the individual dynamics of each group however similar themes emerged from the analysis of both Group A and Group B. It was particularly crucial that facilitators successfully paired teaching techniques targeted at macro level ideology with the individual needs and groups dynamics at the micro level to ensure participants engaged with the CRUSH programme. The following section of this chapter will discuss the main micro level techniques coded from the transcripts in further detail with an emphasis on how facilitators utilized these techniques in each group.

3.3.2.1 Positive affirmation of group participation

Positive modelling and affirmation of group participation was a key micro technique in both groups to enable participants to contribute to the discussions and exercises of the programme with confidence. This started with the discussion of group rules with phrases such as 'respect', 'understanding', 'keeping to time', and 'listening to each other' being emphasised by the facilitators. In both groups findings supported that participants responded positively to facilitator encouragement and demonstrated increased involvement in discussion after receiving positive affirmation from the facilitators. Facilitators offered positive affirmation in the form of verbal praise and encouragement to participants who took part in discussion and exercises. For example:

Group B Day 5 AM (59.43)

I bet you can. Facilitator

You're really clever, you come up with some really amazing [...]. Facilitator

You're clever! You're amazing! Facilitator

Facilitators offering such positive encouragement to get the participants involved enabled generally positive group dynamics as well as encouragement between peers themselves, which shall be explored further later in this chapter. Positive affirmation was also used to combat challenging group behaviour, particularly in Group A, where data indicates some particularly challenging individual and group behaviour (e.g. requesting to leave within a session, talking over other students and the facilitator), for example:

Group A Day 2 PM (54.38)

I think for somebody who finds it hard to sit still, you've done really well, it is a difficult subject isn't it? Facilitator

Positive group affirmation was thus not merely used to encourage participants to engage but also was adapted to the group dynamics to combat challenging behaviour and group disruptions.

3.3.2.4 Personal insight to encourage personal responses

Alongside positive affirmation to encourage participation within the groups, facilitators also encouraged discussion by immersing themselves into the exercises and activities with their own insights to encourage participants to follow with their own personal responses. Facilitators often demonstrated their own feelings, opinions and stance on the content and were often successfully met with participants responding with their own personal view points, an example of this from the coding table is shown below from 'The Emergency' activity (see Fig. 5 in Appendix for details of this activity):

Group B Day 4 AM (36.12)

Yeah. The fact, for me, it was the fact that the first thing she says is, my nan is in hospital, she's had an accident, and he bangs on for a good while about how long he's been waiting in the cold. Now once you hear that kind of emergency situation, yes he has been waiting in the cold but he was completely ignoring that ...
Facilitator

He's pretty much being a self-centred arrogant son of ... (slams table) Participant
(laughs) I think you've nailed that, yeah! Facilitator

Here the personal insight from the facilitator encouraged the participant to participate in the discussion by offering their own personal view point. This was then followed by supportive good humour (laughter) and affirmation. Similar results were found in the analysis of Group A, where participants were able to share their own personal experiences of abuse in their life when facilitators indicated they were empathetic to such experiences. For example:

Group A Day 2 PM (59.51)

And I think especially young people, when you're in school or the person's in the same school as us, it can feel really, really difficult. But most schools now are trying to get ... trying to make sure that when there is that kind of intimate couple abuse within school, so two pupils in the same school, that they are protecting the victim rather than the perpetrator of the abuse. Facilitator

[.....]

I remember when my step-dad done that, he came back to our house like when ... like late at night mind.

Participant

Yeah. Facilitator

It was like nine, ten o'clock in the evening. And I'm up in my mum's room and I look out and there he was, just driving past really slowly, just staring into the window. Participant

Yeah. Facilitator

3.3.3 Micro (and Ontogenetic) Level Adaptations

Whilst similarities were drawn between the micro teaching techniques utilised by the facilitators in both group settings, analysis revealed that facilitators also adapted their teaching techniques to better suit the dynamics of each group and the individuals therein. This section of the findings will explore the micro level adaptations made by facilitators in order to successfully cover the CRUSH materials whilst paying attention to the group interactions in order to adapt the programme to make it suitable for the individual participants.

3.3.3.1 Responding to group dynamics by altering teaching techniques

Facilitators adapted their teaching techniques in accordance with the individual group dynamics, particularly to challenging behaviour. In Group A this was evident in facilitators choice of rearranging groups during activities after recognizing group disruption taking place:

Group A Day 2 PM (07.57)

Is it working together in smaller groups because it's certainly not working with a bigger group, we've tried this, it's not working, so maybe we need to just do smaller ... Facilitator

Go back into smaller groups. Facilitator

... smaller groups or individuals. We could do pairs. Facilitator

Facilitators also implemented humour as a tool to alleviate disruption and challenging behaviour, and to keep participants engaged with the programme content. This technique was most prevalent in Group B but was also present in Group A. For example, in an exercise where participants were deciding how the CRUSH characters would appear facilitators were able to successfully utilise humour to laugh with participants over the humour of oxymoronic gendered physical appearance suggestions for one character. Particularly this was seen for the suggestion of a boxer walking a poodle which humoured the students 'I've just got this vision of this boxer walking this poodle ...! Yeah, OK, cool!' (Facilitator, Group A Day 1 PM (10.20)).

The facilitators' interview indicates that their interaction and adaption of the programme was purposeful and view by them as of crucial value in order to promote a positive learning environment to a wide variety of participants. The adaptable nature of the materials presented and the flexibility for communication to the participants by the facilitators promoted a positive awareness of domestic abuse but also appeared to enable participants to obtain individual cognitive awareness of discussion and interactive skills in order to diffuse violence in their own lives if it does occur without aggression. Such discussions led to increased displays of emotional responses within group settings. Group B in particular showed increased sensitivity to the programme content as the sessions developed, with many participants displaying emotional responses throughout the programme, including participants needing to leave the programme temporarily due to emotional distress, for example:

Group B Day 4 AM (01.01.48)
[Name], I'm just going to take [Name] back to class ... Participant
(crying) Participant
Are you alright ? ... is it something I said [...] Facilitator
(all talking over) Participants
Yeah, OK, I'm sorry [...] Facilitator

Facilitators responded to such emotion with sensitivity, and when appropriate apology, as above.

General disruptive talking, was more common than tears and was handle effectively, in some cases, with gentle informal good humour to implement a positive environment:

Group B DAY 5 AM (27.58)
Right, right, right, calm, calm, otherwise I'm going to come down and sit in between you. No sword fights!
Facilitator
(singing in background) Participants
So do you want to let them ... oh no, they're in the middle of the flow. (pause) Why?! Just why? Have a teacake! Facilitator

In other examples the facilitator simply asked them to move on: 'OK, can we move on guys? Let's not get caught up in another one' (Facilitator Group A Day 2 pm (35.04)). A linked theme to arise here was the issue of time keeping which is discussed in the remaining section.

3.3.3.2 Time Keeping

Time keeping emerged as a key theme from the analysis and altered tremendously between Group A and B. The need to stick to the programme time table was mentioned numerous times by the facilitators to the participants. In order to ensure the programme was covered in the allocated time frame facilitators encouraged participants to work with them to cover the programme in various ways. During the initial session facilitators for both Groups A and B expressed the importance of time keeping in the programme when facilitating ground rules:

Group A Day 1 AM (13.41)

Yeah, time, trying to keep to time, well we will try and keep on time. Facilitator

Group B Day 1 AM (14.58)

OK, that's worth remembering. But we have a lot of stuff to get through, so sometimes we're going to have to push things forward, alright? Facilitator

That's fine. Participant

And it's not that we're trying to be rude, it's just that I want to get through everything.' Facilitator
I'll put stay on task.' Facilitator

Here the facilitators recognized that it was a joint responsibility for both them and participants to adhere to time keeping. More noticeable in Group B was participants' adherence to these values, displayed by the facilitators, with some participants displaying group authority to remind other participants of the value of time keeping on the programme and to encourage peers to stick to time keeping: “Come on guys, we've been waiting to get started, can we settle down?” (Participant, Group B Day 6 PM (06.28)). Time keeping recognition had to be repeated more often in Group A, to remind participants of the importance of sticking to the schedule of the programme, than Group B, for example:

Group A DAY 2 AM PT 1 (01.09.22)

Can I take five please? Participant

We have got to do one more activity before break ... Facilitator

Can I take five to calm down because ... Participant

Yeah ... Participant

That's going to delay everything else. Facilitator

Why? Participant

Because we need to finish, right, we're going to do a role play and we've got very little time. Facilitator

Whilst there were key differences in how time keeping was addressed and received in both groups it is important to note the differences in session length and time period in which the programme was covered (see below), which meant time was more pressured in Group A. This may link to some of the heightened difficulties, such as time-keeping,

experienced in Group A, and the decision by facilitators to (i) keep going despite interruptions, and (ii) mitigate this by encouraging Group A with rewards such as sweets for paying attention:

Group A Day 2 AM (26.52)

Do you want me to read it out? I met Liam through friends of friends, I was sixteen and he was twenty-five.

At first ... you're not getting the treats if you don't listen. Facilitator

What treats is it? Participant

Can I find out what they are? Participant

I met Liam through some friends of friends, I was sixteen, he was twenty-five ...Facilitator

3.3.3.2 Time Difference between Group A and B

Whilst discussing time-keeping it is important to note the time periods in which the programme was covered differed between Groups A and B. Group A undertook the CRUSH programme over a period of two days with two six hour sessions covered over two weeks. Group B however undertook the CRUSH programme in much shorter sessions of three hours per session each week over a total of five weeks. The decision to do shorter sessions over a longer period of time was made due to learning needs, with Group B being highlighted by the schools as having the majority of participants with specific learning needs. Facilitators placed the learning needs of the participants at the forefront of the programme in order to enable participants to be fully engaged to the best of their ability with the content, devising a timed teaching plan of each session for group B which can be viewed within the Appendix Fig. 6. Initially this timed plan consisted of the programme running over four sessions as opposed to the five sessions which did take place. Five sessions took place as a result of the facilitators actively recognising and responding to the learning pace of the group to ensure participants of Group B were able to engage and interact with the entirety of the programme content. As a result of the facilitators choices to elongate the programme in this manner, it is evident that participants learning was at a more comfortable pace for their ability, and the programme content, with less need for the facilitators to continually check time keeping. The data indicates that such an approach may have also benefited Group A.

3.4 Attitudes and responses during the programme

An analysis of participants' attitudes and responses was fundamental to understanding the transition of participants personal views and knowledge regarding domestic abuse and healthy relationships and observing how these attitudes changed through the

duration of the programme for both Groups A and B. In the following section the question: do the teaching techniques and material, aimed at addressing both macro level discourse/myth and managing class behaviour at the micro level, impact on the student's attitudes and responses?

Some participants arrived with limited knowledge surrounding domestic abuse and scarce awareness of many of the avenues in which abuse occurs. Analysis of the transcripts indicates that a positive transition was made for both groups in the form of participants' responses and attitudes surrounding awareness of domestic abuse and related issues. The following section of this chapter will discuss the formation of these attitudes and responses in detail, including their understandings of gender, victim-blaming, and warning signs.

3.4.1 Stereotyping of Gender

As indicated at the beginning of this chapter, participants of both groups arrived at the programme with limited knowledge of abusive behaviour in relationships and also displaying normalization of abusive behaviour with a tendency towards gender stereotyping. Such analysis indicates that participants not only came with a lack of understanding of what constituted an abusive relationship but were also initially prepared to actively challenge the facilitators ideas around what constituted abuse.

Gender stereotyping towards the programme content on Day 1 was particularly evident in Group A in reference to participants opinions of the CRUSH characters. Participants displayed a bias towards negative selection of character traits when presented with developing the female characters asked to pick an array of positive and negative traits for the characters (see Appendix fig 7):

Group A Day 1 AM PT 1 (01.17.52)
... arrogant, troublemaker, bossy, moody, gossip, rude ... impatient, disrespectful, reck ... no reckless is a good thing I think sometimes. Participant
OK. Facilitator
Jealous and that's it. Participant
Fourteen. Participant
OK, so you've got, yeah, fourteen not so positive and six positives! Facilitator
I think that's good though. Participant
Do you think?! Facilitator
Yeah. Participant

Participants tended to choose predominantly negative personality traits over positive ones when selecting female CRUSH characters. Similarly, participants displayed negative views towards the female CRUSH characters based on their appearance in a photo.

Group A DAY 1 AM PT 1 (01.17.52)
I don't like her. Participant
Why ... what is it about her? Facilitator
She just looks like ... Participant

Such negative opinions of the female CRUSH character were based primarily off their physical appearance in the picture; including displaying an expressions of dislike towards the character's dress sense to influence their dislike of the character themselves; this is indicated in the example below:

GROUP A DAY 1 AM PT 01.17.52
OK, is it the tights? Facilitator
Yes, it's the tights. Participant
Every time it's the tights. Facilitator
The tights. Participant
I think it's just all of her! Participant
I think it's just everything! Participant

Gender powered language was also found to be associated with the female CRUSH characters for both Groups A and B. In particular, the word 'bossy' was used primarily in association with the female characters by both groups.

GROUP A DAY 1 AM (01.28.07)
She's bossy and shy?! Facilitator
Yes. Participant
Well with people she's comfortable with. Participant
Who said that she's shy? Participant
Because I thought that there was something about her being really shy and not ...? Facilitator
No, she's shy around ... Participant
So she'll be shy around like other kids that she doesn't know, but as soon as she knows people she's like quite bossy to them. Participant

GROUP B DAY 2 AM (56.18)
Mm ... maybe. E [...] seems like the sort of person that would boss him around. Participant
She is bossy? Facilitator
She is bossy. Participant

Group B also displayed gender stereotyping noticeably in perceptions of masculinity. Comments were made on the physical appearance of the male CRUSH characters by Group B regarding their physique; for example, 'He's got chicken arms, look at him.' (Participant, GROUP B DAY 1 PM (53.00)). Language displays of toxic masculinity were also expressed in the group, participants displayed pressure on other participants to prescribe to traditional forms of masculinity during 'The Emergency' exercise, an

example is the use of the phrase ‘Man Up!’ by one of the participants (GROUP B DAY 5 PM (26.27)).

In addition, some of both groups’ male participants suggested an open willingness to use physical aggression at the beginning of the programme, for example:

*GROUP B DAY 1, PM (42:30):
I'd still hit that person in the corner. Participant
Would you? Facilitator
Yeah, ... Participant*

Similar attitudes of acceptance towards physical aggression were displayed by the participants initially in the earlier running of the programme:

*Group A DAY 1, AM (37.06):
Question nine! Can you name three good ways of coping when you're feeling stressed or angry? Facilitator
Punching walls? Participant*

However, despite these exhibitions of toxic masculinity found within the transcripts, participants also displayed an awareness of the pressures to conform to a specific stereotype of performative masculinity. For example, when asked to contribute, male participants responded with admittance of difficulty discussing their feelings regarding sharing personal emotions

*GROUP B DAY 2 AM (33.33)
It's not our fault! Participant
You don't understand how hard it is for men to like talk about this sort of stuff. Participant*

Whilst toxic masculinity and stereotypes of masculinity were displayed, some participants also clearly understood the pressures placed upon them to conform to these standards. Some members of the group were also very keen to challenge such stereotypes. For example, on Day 2 there was negative language use in Group A relating to women and partner loyalty:

*Group A DAY 2 AM PT 1 (01.03.54)
most girls tend to lie and cheat. That's your opinion though. Participant
Really? Facilitator
Say that again? Facilitator
That's because ...Participant
Well, sadly most girls tend to lie and cheat. Participant*

However, this was robustly challenged by other group members:

GROUP A DAY 2 AM PT 1 (01.03.54)
What do you think about that girls? Facilitator
No, that's just assuming ... Participant
That's bullshit ... Participant
... just because maybe one girl's done it, they think that all girls are going to do it ... Participant

Overall from the analysis it appeared both groups came with a somewhat limited or basic understanding of healthy relationships with tendencies to challenge the facilitators where possible. Despite expressions of gender stereotyping, it is evident that direct stereotyping was also challenged by peers showing that participants had the capacity and willingness to learn about abusive relationships and take on the skills of the programme to implement into their own personal lives (including within peer-to-peer relationships in the programme).

3.4.2 Stereotypes of victim-survivors and victim-blaming

Alongside negative stereotypes of women being displayed by Group A, victim-blaming was also visible through the coding process. At the start of the programme participants displayed a tendency to place the blame on victim-survivors of domestic abuse specifically regarding verbal abuse which were contested by the facilitators. For example:

GROUP A DAY 1 PM PT 1 (03.53)
No, I know but that's what I mean, so if she's like quite controlling, it might make him angry and then him be abusive to her. Participant
So I think we're hearing a little bit of victim-blaming going on now. Facilitator

Participants also displayed the tendency to excuse abusive behaviour at the beginning of the programme, challenging facilitators on what could be considered as abusive:

GROUP A DAY 1 AM (40.24)
This is an abusive relationship ... Facilitator
Uh oh ... Participant
... this is abusive behaviour. The person hadn't done anything wrong at all and ... Facilitator
Yeah, but it happened on a one-time thing. Participant

The need to challenge perceptions of abuse is present in the CRUSH educational materials in numerous ways to challenge and intercept the constructs that enable abusive relationships, for example, activity sheets exploring the cycle of abuse are presented in the materials such as 'What keeps couples in unhealthy relationships together, in the future?' (see Appendix Fig. 8). Noticeably, the above quotes are taken

from the beginning of the programme but as the programme continued participants were able to recognise abusive tactics themselves, no longer (overtly at least) placing the blame on the victim-survivor, but demonstrating a sense of empathy with them and recognising the abusive tactics that keep victim-survivors in abusive relationships. In particular, some participants successfully acknowledge abusive tactics by the end of the programme during the 'Ending it conversation' (see Appendix Fig. 9) exercise where participants explored how to leave an unhealthy relationship, though others did not:

GROUP A DAY 2 PM (46.01)

*So with this side of the conversation, we need to actually make a conversation which means that the person, the abusive person really hears what's being said. So you need to be kind of assertive and say ... Facilitator (burping and laughing) Participant
what do you notice about this conversation? Facilitator
I don't ... Participant
He's manipulating her into staying with him ... Participant*

Group B displayed similar changes of personal views and beliefs, for some, over the time line of the programme. In particular, these changes were displayed in the form of the friend zone myth, male participants demonstrated their expectations for friendships to become romantic relationships raising the issue of consent and choice. In the quote below, which occurs on Day 2, the facilitator has to introduce the notion of 'choice' for the female friend in the scenario being discussed:

GROUP B DAY 2 AM (12.29)

*[...] good question, how many friends do you have? Participant
Gets all the way to the end and nothing happens! Participant
It might not, because there's always choice. Facilitator*

However, by Day 4 a positive change was made for Group B in the form of participants recognising the importance of choice in healthy relationship formation. For example, in the following exert participants were able to distinguish the key value of choice when deciding whether to pursue a romantic relationship or not and actively spoke about how choice and communication should be valued.

GROUP B DAY 4 AM (44.13)

Communication. It's where you talk about [the] situation where it could potentially lead [...], the choice whether you want it or not and you also provide a reason as to why you want to do it Participant

Group B were also able to recognise the importance of not taking part in victim-blaming by the end of the programme, showing a positive awareness of victim-blaming and actively speaking out against it.

GROUP B DAY 5 AM (29.59)

*But you aren't ever to blame if someone else does that are you? Participant
No. Facilitator*

If someone else chooses to do that ...Participant

That's their choice. Facilitator

... that's them making that decision, it's never your fault if someone chooses to do that, so ...Participant

These findings support that whilst participants arrived at the programme portraying ideas that displayed victim-blaming and stereotyping of victim-survivors of domestic abuse, a transition in most student opinions as well as a clear acknowledgement of how victim-survivors become trapped in abusive relationships was made by the end of the programme for both group A and B. These findings support that the programme was successful in helping most participants understand abuse as well as an increased awareness and understanding for victims of abusive relationships.

3.4.3 Awareness of Warning Signs

Findings support a shift, as the programme continued, in participants' ability to recognise warning signs of unhealthy relationships with only limited by facilitators in Groups A and B. This was highlighted particularly in the 'Understanding and Exploring Healthy Relationships - spotting the warning signs' exercise (see Appendix Fig. 4).

GROUP A DAY 2 PM (14.10)

Can you explain yours to me [Name]? What warning signs did you see? Facilitator

That she was obsessed with him, started being controlling, she'd get jealous about him going out with his mates and family. Participant

Mm mm. Facilitator

Log on to his Facebook account, reading his private messages. Participant

Mm mm. Facilitator

Using her forgiveness as a weapon. Demanded all his passwords to everything to make her feel more secure.

She made him give up his female friends and blocked his cousins and sent abusive messages. ... Participant

Similarly, Group B were also able to confidently and successfully select the warning signs during the same exercise.

GROUP B DAY 6 AM (45.08)

So what were the warning signs? Facilitator

[...] OK, so watching what you say in fear, only keeping her happy ... reading on-line messages, violence, trying to stop her kicking off. Posing as [Name] on-line. Participant

So [...] on his account, messaging people ... I don't want to talk to you anymore. Participant

Whoa, that's mean! Participant

I'm sorry! Demanding passwords! Well done! Using forgiveness as a weapon, well I'll forgive you if you do this, this, this and this. Participant

This shift in awareness of abusive warning signs contrasts to the beginning of the programme where participants indicated uncertainty not only about warning signs but what domestic abuse is, for example on participant asked the facilitator at the start of the programme 'when you are talking about abuse what do you mean?' (GROUP A DAY 1 PM (06.00)).

CRUSH has elements directly relating to emotional abuse, physical abuse, and abuse which occurs through the use of technology. Within the curriculum, scenarios feature the use of mobile phones in order to initiate discussion into how abusive behaviour may be facilitated or perpetuated in this manner. For instance, there is a scenario to be discussed in which an ex-boyfriend calls the female in the novel relationship. The group must discuss the possible responses of an abusive and non-abusive partner. Additionally, there are multiple references to technology-related abuse in the list of example of abuse, such as 'constant calls or texts', 'checking your phone', or 'passing around intimate photos of you' to encourage participants to recognise the warning signs of abuse in their personal lives.

Whilst engagement in the discussion of warning signs was noticeably higher in group B it is also worth highlighting once more that Group B had shorter sessions over more days in comparison with Group A. The data thus may suggest that higher engagement was achieved by running the programme in this way as opposed to two longer sessions over two days. Overall however both groups displayed a positive shift in recognition of warning signs and abusive tactics.

3.5 Experiences of Services and Trust

Upon arrival participants of both groups displayed some awareness of services that were available to them, for example 'Childline' (Participant, GROUP A DAY 1 AM (50.41)). However, later in the programme a more detail discussion of services was facilitated:

GROUP B DAY 6 AM (31.10)
Do you guys know about that, like what sort of places you would get help from if you were in this sort of situation? Participant
CAMHS. Participant
CAMHS. Participant
Ehm ... Off the Record. Participant
Off the Record, good one. Participant

Group B showed noticeably higher levels of trust in external support compared with Group A, suggesting how victim-survivors could make the most of the additional support services available to them;

GROUP B DAY 6 AM (29.59)

She's probably get into like ... Participant
CAMHS ... Participant
So you could advise her to like make the most of the support she gets offered, couldn't you? Participant

Group A differed from Group B, displaying high levels of mistrust in reporting abuse and seeking support from additional support services with evidence of negative experiences of seeking support:

GROUP A DAY 2 PM (01.12.50)
... they don't actually report it properly. Participant
No, and then they say, well you must have done something for them to do that to you. Participant
Yeah, that's what they say to you. Participant
They say things like that. Participant

Despite displaying high levels of mistrust with some formal sources of 'support', Group A displayed high levels of trust in the facilitators despite spending the least amount of time with them out of both groups. For example:

GROUP A DAY 2 PM (01.12.02)
I'd much rather tell you two stuff than I would the school. Participant
Yeah. Participant
Yeah, I would as well. Participant

Positive relationship between facilitators and participants was also observable in the transcripts of Group B who continuously displayed enjoyment of the sessions content and how the facilitators ran the programme, for example:

GROUP B DAY 5 AM (01.10.21)
OK, so shall we have a break now? Start our break? Facilitator
Thanks though guys. Participant
Well done everyone. Facilitator
Thanks for that this morning. Participant
Yeah, I really enjoyed that. Really enjoyed that first lesson. Really enjoyed that. Participant

Analysis of the transcripts revealed that facilitators had successfully created a trusting and positive learning environment for the participants in both groups, despite the various challenges discussed in section 3.3.3.1. This is arguably because of the facilitators effective handling of both micro (e.g. the challenging behaviour in class) and macro level (e.g. the topic of domestic abuse and gender relations) teaching concerns.

3.6 Discussion of findings

This chapter discussed the findings which emerged from the analysis process and how it can be linked to the existing literature.

3.6.1 Facilitator relationship building

When researching educational programmes regarding domestic abuse there is an emphasis on highlighting the core definition and formations of domestic abuse, thus overlooking the importance of the fundamental relationship between facilitator(s) of the programme and participant(s) (Falb et al. 2015). Whilst such content is core to the understanding of domestic abuse, more recently there has been an increase in research carried out exploring the environments in which such programmes are taught and the importance of creating a safe space to allow for open and honest discussion amongst participants (Robbins 2014). The role of facilitator(s) in creating this safe space to discuss domestic abuse openly has been highlighted, with research indicating that facilitators must be able to engender trust, respect and encouragement with participants (Fox et al. 2014). The current research underlines this.

Much research regarding educational programmes currently draws upon the macro structural forms that facilitate domestic abuse in the form of political, economical and social factors which maintain strong inequalities between men and women cementing the continuation of domestic abuse (Montesanti et al 2015). Whilst very important, these studies often ignore the impacts of micro level interactions in the classroom on learning process and the need to tailor such content flexibly to the group dynamics (Biddulph 2007). Incorporating teaching techniques such as positive affirmation, question prompting (Goldblatt and Goldblatt 1995) and empathy (Branwhite 1998) within the micro level interactions of the classroom is essential to creating a positive relationship in which participants feel their voice is valued (O'Brien 1998). The current research further supports these findings.

More specifically, findings demonstrated that CRUSH facilitators were able to flexibly alter programme content to suit the individual group dynamics responding to the participants' needs and emphasising positive relationship building; as demonstrated through the alterations made to the time frames to suit the individual needs of Group B. Respect was also shown to be fundamental to strengthen positive learning through behavioural encouragement where facilitators simulate the response they wish to be demonstrated by the participants (see also Cooper et al. 2007) to create positive

relationships between facilitators and participants. Such positive relationship building techniques are shown throughout the analysis of the programme with (i) facilitators demonstrating personal insight to encourage personal responses from participants and (ii) positive affirmation of group encouragement to build trust and respect between them and the participants as a group. This relationship between participant and facilitator also forms a potential bridge between behavioural and transformative behaviours between the group participants (see also Farmer et al 2007). The interactions between the individuals of the groups also demonstrate, on the whole, a mutually reinforced pattern of positive peer support reinforcing and reflecting the ground rules set out at the beginning of the CRUSH sessions with key words and phrases such as ‘respect’, ‘understanding’, ‘keeping to time’ being emphasised by the facilitators and making their way into group dynamics.

It is also clear from the current research that positive facilitator/student relationships are more easily nurtured when there is the time available to do this. The longer programme model, over five shorter days of 3hrs rather than two full days of 6hrs, help facilitate a more relaxed learning environment, which helped to build trust with young people on the programme, and allowed more time to digest learning. Whilst both programme runs were successful in building trust between students and the facilitator, and changing attitudes of students, the longer programme established this in a much less challenging environment. Research indicates that vulnerable young people who have witnessed or experienced domestic abuse are likely to have their behaviour and learning impacted by that abuse (see Coleman et al. 2007; Baraclough 2001; Kitzmann et al 2003). It can be hard for young people who have experience of abuse to concentrate, they may have challenging behaviour linked to the abuse they have suffered, and they may find it hard to trust people. It is therefore logical that time and duration of learning is important for this group.

3.6.2 Domestic abuse narratives

It has been highlighted by previous research that in order to implement preventive programmes successfully the narratives of domestic abuse must be at the forefront of the discussion in such programme content (Mcqueeny 2016). Other academics note the

importance of narrative learning arguing that the construction of a coherent narrative is essential for learning to take place (Clark and Rossiter 2008). Macro-narratives can be defined as stories which can be universally understood from multiple viewpoints and are fundamental to the understanding of the narratives of domestic abuse (Devine et al. 2014). The challenging of gendered macro-narrative is evident in the teaching methods used by the facilitators to share narratives of domestic abuse with participants, including the stories woven around the CRUSH characters as well as the range of other interactive activities.

These teaching techniques allow participants to relate between their personal experience and that of the CRUSH characters, building their own confidence to recognise domestic abuse in their own lives and preparing them to carry the skills learnt into their personal interactions inside, and hopefully outside, the sessions (see also Ramakrishnan 2014). The use of narratives to display macro level causations of domestic abuse thus then may create micro-narratives within the group, facilitating meaningful learning experiences for the participants (Devine et al. 2014). The joining of macro and micro through narrative teaching can thus lead to critical meta-awareness (see also Roberts 1998), engaging participants, and aiding their understanding of social causes of domestic abuse. These benefits are reflected in the findings in the form of participants demonstrating increased recognition of warning signs of abuse in both groups as well as noticeable shifts in attitudes regarding abusive tactic.

The idea that narrative as such may be an effective way to communicate ideas has been fundamental to the implementation of narrative within domestic abuse preventive programmes (Devine et al 2014). It has been argued that narrative serves to form a sequence of meaning for those who create and interpret them (Fisher 1984). These ideas are reflected further in the analysis in the form of facilitators sharing personal experiences with participants. As such, not only do the facilitators emphasise positive relationship building with the participants in the form of mutual narrative sharing and trust (Hamm et al. 2012), but also help to shape the peer culture within the group by setting the behaviours that participants will adhere to (Gifford-Smith and Brownell 2003).

3.6.3 Building trust in services for young people

Whilst positive relationship building is fundamental to engage participants in programmes such as CRUSH during session time, it is also of great importance that such programmes are successful in implementing trust and positive relationships with domestic abuse services in order for participants to seek additional support if necessary in their own personal lives. That one of the facilitators is also a domestic abuse service provider may help develop this trust (potentially leading to trust at the meso level in services). Evidently the place of facilitator in creating this bond is essential. It has been suggested that a variety of teaching methods, that place participants as the director of their learning, can help to facilitate participants to feel trusted/trust and empowered to lead their own learning experience (Walsch 2002). CRUSH facilitators implemented group participant led discussion, questioning tactics and feedback requests throughout the sessions securing trust between facilitator and participant which emphasise the participants as valued conductors of their own learning. This sends a message of trust and power to students to take ownership of their own thoughts and thus can be of particular use in the wider social context of constructing a feminist framework of domestic abuse in the participant's personal lives. Other theorists have suggested that this form of learning environment which gives participants power and control to make their own decisions, based on knowledge, not only helps to resolve power struggles which are often viewed by young people between educator and pupil but enables participants to have the confidence to confide in support services by helping them view themselves as valued social actors of positive social change (Ellis and Thiara 2014). Thus through placing them at the centre of the learning experience a sense of 'power sharing' as opposed to a 'power-over' dynamic (Flynn 2014) facilitates a learning environment in which participants may gain confidence and trust to openly discuss their personal lives and as such confide in additional support services.

Such benefits of creating trust between participant and facilitator are demonstrated within the analysis of the transcripts with participants of both groups displaying (i) an openness to discuss their personal experiences with the facilitators, as well as (ii) positive feedback on the teaching styles of the facilitators. Group A, in particular, did not display trust in meso level services such as schools and social services, but they did

learn to trust the group facilitators. Through the evolution of trust created by the facilitators a culture of transformative learning developed (for most students). This transformative learning has been suggested to allow for the translation into positive actions in participants own personal lives (Devine et al 2014) and thus can be of particular use in the wider social context facilitating future increased trust in additional services (for example, the services the facilitator has linked to). However, further research would need to be undertake to confirm this.

3.7 Limitations

The study was not without limitations. One such limitation includes the small sample size. Whilst the data available for the two groups was rich and insightful, future studies would benefit from having a larger data sample. Other limitations include the method of data generation. Whilst audio recordings and transcripts allowed for concise and detailed coding, many non-verbal cues could not be observed during the sessions potentially allowing for the misinterpretation of data in the analysis process. Misinterpretations could be somewhat alleviated by observations however due to time constraints, and the ethical implications of observation as well as the impact this may of had on the authenticity of participant voice it was not used in this study. More importantly, there was no contact with the participants following the CRUSH B&NES sessions. As a result of this, very little can be known as to how successful project CRUSH B&NES was in allowing participants to utilise the skills learnt in the programme to build healthy relationships in their own personal lives weeks, months or years past the sessions.

3.8 Recommendations

This study is an evaluation of project CRUSH in B&NES with a focus on the relationship between facilitator and participant. The key recommendations from this research are that:

- Project CRUSH B&NES is continued and expanded, to work as part of or to enhance the new Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education (PSHEE) school programme.

- It is important to have enough time allocated to the programme to: help facilitate a relaxed learning environment, build trust with young people on the programme, and allow time to digest learning. A longer programme over four-five (depending on need) shorter days of 3hrs, is preferable to two full days of 6hrs.

In order to advance research in this area there are recommendations which could prove beneficial to creating rich and varied data in the analysis of relationships between facilitator and participants in domestic abuse preventive programmes and their long-term impacts:

- Future studies would benefit from follow-up sessions with participants to evaluate if the programme has been successful in encouraging participants to utilise services and implement the course content into their own personal lives and relationships. Follow-ups should be conducted at 6 months and one year after the programme.
- The implementation of domestic abuse and healthy relationship education within schools in B&NES should be monitored and independently evaluated; with particular attention paid to whether, and in which contexts, specialist facilitators or school teachers are best placed to deliver such a programme.

3.9 Conclusion

In conclusion, this study has aimed to conduct an analysis of the central communicative elements between facilitator and participant to evaluate the effectiveness of the teaching methods used in project CRUSH B&NES in developing student thinking on healthy relationships and domestic abuse. The findings have demonstrated the strengths of the teaching techniques and the facilitators, in terms of their ability to build positive relationships with the participants. The success of the programme is also reflected in the shift of attitudes and responses of the participants in both groups, enhancing their understanding of domestic abuse and healthy relationships. This study has also introduced an area of research within preventive domestic abuse programmes which has commonly been overlooked: the importance of facilitator/student relationships to address macro, micro, meso and individual level issues/needs. Moreover, this research

project has bridged the gap between the training materials and the facilitators own experiences with these, something which has not been done previously regarding projects such as CRUSH. Overall, the findings discussed in this paper demonstrate that, from the facilitators perspectives, the CRUSH B&NES project owes much of its success to the adaptability of the materials as well as the facilitators abilities to utilise these materials to bring abstract ideas into understanding for individual participants of the programme. This study also underscores the findings of previous research (for example Hilton 2001): the need for facilitators of such programmes to be trained and experienced enough to have the knowledge, empathy, respect and trust crucial to creating positive learning environments for young people. For the Governments' new Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education (PSHEE) school programme to be effective, they must ensure the people that deliver the new in school healthy relationship classes have the time needed to nurture trusting relationships and deep learning, as well as the level of skill, empathy, knowledge and good humour displayed by the CRUSH B&NES team.

Bibliography

- Abbott, C., Parsons, S. and Sherwood, G., 2016. Informed Consent with Children and Young People in Social Research: Is There Scope for Innovation?. *Children and Society*,30(2), pp.132-145.
- Adelman, M., Rosenberg, K. and Hobart, M., 2016. Simulations and Social Empathy: Domestic Violence Education in the New Millenium. *Violence Against Women*, 22(12), pp.1451-1462.
- Adu, P., 2019. *A step-by-step guide to qualitative data coding*. New York: Routledge.
- Althusser, L., 1971. Ideology and Ideological state apparatuses. In: L. Althusser, ed. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. London: NLB, pp.121-173.
- Badie, F., Baltaq, A., Seligman, J. and Yamada, T., 2017. From Concepts to Predicates Within Constructivist Epistemology. *Logic, Rationality and Interaction*, 10455, pp.687-692.
- Barter, C., 2009. *Partner exploitation and violence in teenage intimate relationships*. London: NSPCC.
- Berazneva, J. 2014. Audio Recording Of Household Interviews to Ensure Data Quality. *Journal of International Development*, 26(2), pp 290-296.
- Biddulph, M., 2007. Rules of Engagement: Boys, Young Men and the Challenge of Effective Sex and Relationships Education. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 25(3), pp. 24-33.
- Bradshaw, C., Mitchell , M. and Leaf, P., 2010. Examining the effects of schoolwide positive behavior interventions and supports on student outcomes: Results from a randomized controlled effectiveness trial in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 12(3), pp.133-148.
- Brady, S. and O'Connor, M. K., 2014. Understanding how community organising leads to social change: The beginning development of formal practice theory. *Journal of Community Practice*, 22(1-2), pp.210-228.
- British Sociological Association Publications Ltd., 1992. BSA Statement Of Ethical Practice. *Sociology*, 26(4),pp.703-707.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., 1993. Ecological models of human development. In: M. Gauvain and M. Cole, eds. *Readings on the development of children*. 2nd Ed. New York: Freeman, pp.37-43.
- Brook., 2011. *Sex and Relationships education for the 21st century* [Online]London: National Childrens Bureau. Available from: <https://www.pshe-association.org.uk/system/files/SRE%20for%20the%2021st%20Century%20-%20FINAL.pdf> [Accessed 5 October 2020].
- Cairns, R. B. and Cairns, B. D., 1994. *Lifelines and risks: Pathways of youth in our time*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Callaghan, J., 2018. Beyond "Witnessing": Children's Experiences of Coercive Control in Domestic Violence and Abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal violence*, 33(10), pp.1551.
- Cazden, C., 1988. *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Cefai, C. and Cooper, P., 2010. Students without voices: the unheard accounts of secondary school students with social, emotional and behaviour difficulties. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 25(2),pp.183-198.
- Charmaz, K., 2014. *Constructing grounded theory*. London, England: Sage.
- Clark, M. C. and Rossiter, M., 2008. Narrative learning in adulthood. In: S. B. Merriam, ed. *New Directions for adult and continuing education: Third update on adult learning theory*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 61-70.
- Coburn, A. and Gormally, S., 2014. 'They know what you are going through' : a service response to young people who have experienced the impact of domestic abuse. *Journal of youth studies*, 17(5), pp.642-663.
- Coleman, K., Janson K., Kaiza P and Reed, E., 2007. Homicides, Firearm Offences and Intimate Violence 2005/2006 (Supplementary Volume 1 to Crime in England and Wales 2005/2006). London, UK: Home Office.
- Cooper, J., Heron, T. and Heward, W., 2007. *Applied behavior analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

- Corbin, J. and Strauss, A., 2008. *Basics of qualitative research*. 3rd Edition. London, England: Sage.
- Comprehensive Research Group Research, 2009. *An Independent Evaluation of the Trust Education Project: Final Report*. London: Tender.
- Crabtree, B., 2006. The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education*, 40(4), pp.314-321.
- Dahle, T. and Archbold, C., 2014. "I Wish the Hitting Would Stop..." An Assessment of Domestic Violence Educational Program for Elementary Students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(13), pp.2497-2508.
- Department for Education., 2020. *Guidance: Personal, Social, Health and economic (PSHE) education* [Online]. London: Home Office. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/personal-social-health-and-economic-education-pshe/personal-social-health-and-economic-pshe-education#sex-and-relationship-education> [Accessed 27 September 2020]
- Devine, J., Quinn, T. and Aguilar, P., 2014. Teaching and Transforming Through Stories: An Exploration of Macro-and Micro-Narratives as teaching tools. *The reference librarian*, 55(4), pp.273-288.
- Dey, I., 1993. *Qualitative data analysis: A user-friendly guide for social scientists*. London: Routledge.
- Dragiewicz, M., Gover, A., Miller, S., Naccarelli, J. and Paradiso, B., 2013. Innovative University Programs for Teaching about Domestic Violence. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 24(4), pp.594-611.
- Dublin Women's Aid., 1999. *Teenage tolerance: The hidden lives of young Irish people. A study of young people's experience and responses to violence and abuse*. Dublin: Women's Aid.
- Ellis, J. and Thiara, R., eds, 2014. *Preventing Violence against women and girls: educational work with children and young people*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Ellis, R. and Barkhuizen, G., 2005. *Analysing learner language*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Ellsberg, M and Heise, L., 2005. *Researching Violence Against Women: A Practical Guide for Researchers and Activists*. Seattle: World Health Organisation.
- Falb, K. L., Annan, J. and Gupta, J., 2015. Achieving gender equality to reduce interpersonal violence against women. *The Lancet: Global Health*, 3(6), pp.302-303.
- Farmer, T., Reinke, W. and Brooks, D., 2014. Managing Classrooms and Challenging Behavior: Theoretical Considerations and Critical Issues. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 22(2), pp.67-73.
- Farmer, T., Xie, H., Cairns, B. and Hutchins, B., 2007. Social synchrony, peer networks, and aggression in school. In: P. H. Hawley, T. D. Little, and P.C. Rodkin, eds. *Aggression and adaptation: The bright side to bad behavior*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, pp.209-234.
- Fielding, M., 2004. Transformative approaches to student voice: Theoretical underpinnings, recalcitrant realities. *British Educational Research Journal*, 30(2), pp.295-311.
- Flynn, P., 2014. Empowerment and transformation for young people with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties engaged with student voice research. *New Zealand journal of educational studies*, 49(2), pp.162-175.
- Fox, C., Hale, R. and Gadd, D., 2014. Domestic abuse prevention education: listening to the views of young people. *Sex Education*, 14(1), pp.28-41.
- Gifford-Smith, M. and Brownell, C., 2003. Childhood peer relationships: Social acceptance, friendships, and peer networks. *Journal of School Psychology*, 41(4), pp.235-284.
- Goldblatt, B. and Goldblatt, M., 1995. Understanding and managing children's classroom behavior. *Journal of behavior therapy and experimental psychiatry*, 26(2), pp.169-170.
- Hagemann-White, C., 2008. Measuring Progress in Addressing Violence against Women across Europe. *International journal of comparative and applied criminal justice*, 32(2), pp.149-172.
- Halliday, M., 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hamm, J., Hoffman, A. and Farmer, T., 2012. Peer cultures of academic success in adolescence: Why they matter and what teachers can do to promote them. In: A. m.

- Ryan and G. W. Ladd, eds. *Peer relationships and adjustment at school*. New York: Information Age Publishing, pp. 219-250.
- Hansard, 2017. *Domestic Violence: Police Resources*. [online] Available from: <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Lords/2017-11-27/debates/2F754F50-A5EF-42EE-8722-547E61D09C9C/DomesticViolencePoliceResources#contribution-96BBD2CA-08D9-4646-9DD0-FE6B063B26C4> [Accessed March 21 2019].
- Hardina, D. and Obel-Jorgensen, R., 2009. Increasing social action competency: A framework for supervision. *Journal of Policy Practice*, 8(2), pp.89-109.
- Heffernen, K., Blythe, B. and Nicolson, P., 2012. How do social workers understand and respond to domestic violence and relate this to organisational policy and practice. *International Social Work*, 57(6), pp.698-713.
- Hertzog, J. and Rowley, R., 2014. My Beliefs of My Peers' Beliefs: Exploring the Gendered Nature of Social Norms in Adolescent Romantic Relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(2), pp.348-368.
- Hester, M. and Westmarland, N., 2005. *Tackling Domestic Violence: Effective Interventions and Approaches*. London: Home Office
- Hilton, G., 2001. Sex Education- The Issues When Working with Boys. *Sex Education*, 1(1), pp.31-41.
- Hilton, G., 2007. Listening to the Boys Again: An Exploration of What Boys Want to Learn in Sex Education Classes and How They Want to be Taught. *Sex Education*, 7(2), pp.161-174.
- Home Office., 2012. *New Definition of Domestic Violence* [Online] London: Home Office. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-definition-of-domestic-violence> [Accessed 6 October 2019].
- Home Office, 2013. *Information for Local Areas on the Change to the Definition of Domestic Violence and Abuse*. London: HM Government, Home office.
- Home Office., 2020. Policy Paper: *Statutory Definition of Domestic Abuse Fact Sheet* [Online] London: Home Office. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/domestic-abuse-bill-2020-factsheets/statutory-definition-of-domestic-abuse-factsheet> [Accessed 5 October 2020].
- Horner, R., Sugai, G., and Anderson C., 2010. Examining the evidence base for school-wide positive behavior support. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 42(8), pp.1-14.
- Karve, S., 2015. Managing challenging classroom behaviors. *Talent Development*, 69(10),pp.7.
- Kenway, J and Fitzclarence, L., 2010. Masculinity, Violence and Schooling: Challenging 'poisonous pedagogies'. *Gender and Education*, 9, (1), pp. 117-134.
- Kitzmann, K., Gaylord, N., Holt, A., and Kenny, E., 2003. Child witness to domestic violence: a metaanalytic review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71(1),pp.339-352.
- Lenderyou, G. and Ray, C., 1997. *Let's hear it for the boys!: supporting sex and relationships education for boys and young men*. London: National Children's Bureau.
- Lewis, T., Jones, S., Horner, R., and Sugai, G., 2010. School-wide positive behavior support and students with emotional/behavioral disorders: Implications for prevention, identification and intervention. *Exceptionality*, 18(2), pp.82-93.
- Lincoln, Y. S. and Guba, E. G. 2000. Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions and emerging confluences. In: N. k. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln, eds. *Handbook of qualitative research 2nd Ed*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Macdonald, G., 2017. Hearing children's voices including children's perspectives on their experiences of domestic violence in welfare reports prepared for the English courts in private family law proceedings. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 65,pp.1-13.
- Mackey, A. and Gass, S., 2012. *Research methods in second language acquisition: a practical guide*. 1st ed. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- McCarry, M., 2003. *The connection between masculinity and domestic violence: What young people think*. PhD Thesis. University of Bristol.
- McCarry, M., 2009. Justifications and Contradictions: Understanding Young People's Views of Domestic Abuse. *Men and Masculinities*, 11(3),pp.325-345.
- McQueeney, K., 2016. Teaching domestic violence in the new millennium: Intersectionality as a framework for social change. *Violence against women*, 22(12),pp.1463-1475.

- Montesanti, S. and Thurston, W., 2015. Mapping the role of structural and interpersonal violence in the lives of women: Implications for public health interventions and policy. *BMC women's health*, 15(1), pp.100.
- Netting, F., 2005. The future of macro social work. *Advances in Social Work*, 6(1), pp.51-59.
- O' Brien, T., 1998. *Promoting Positive Behaviour*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Office for National Statistics., 2019. *Domestic Abuse in England and Wales Overview: November 2019*. [Online] London: Office for National Statistics. Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/bulletins/domesticabuseinenglandandwalesoverview/november2019> [Accessed 5 October 2020].
- OFSTED, 2006. *Sex and Relationships Education in Schools* [Online]. England. Available from: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/sex-and-relationships-education-schools> [Accessed 04.03.2020].
- Parker, R., 2005. *Teenage Pregnant Strategy Evaluation Report*. School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine: London
- Patterson, G. R., 1979. A performance theory for coercive family interaction. In: R.B. Cairns, ed. *The analysis of social interactions: Methods, issues and illustrations*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp.119-162.
- Pound, P., Langford, R. and Campbell, R., 2016. What do young people think about their school-based sex and relationship education? A qualitative synthesis on young people's views and experiences. *BMJ Open*, 6(9), pp.011329.
- Ramakrishnan, M., 2014. Speak Out: Teaching Domestic Violence in Your Literature Classroom. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, pp.296-301.
- Reed, E., Silverman, J., Raj, A., Decker, M. and Miller, E., 2011. Male perpetration of teen dating violence: Associations with neighbourhood violence involvement, gender attitudes, and perceived peer and neighborhood norms. *Journal of Urban Health*, 88(2), pp.226-239.
- Robbins R., 2014. "She Knew what was coming": Knowledge and Domestic Violence in Social Work Education. *Social Work Education*, 33(7), pp.917-929.
- Roberts, P., 1998. Knowledge, Dialogue and Humanization: The Moral Philosophy of Paulo Freire. *The Journal of Educational Thought*, 32(2), pp.95-117.
- Rothman, J., 2008. Multi modes of intervention at the macro level. *Journal of Community Practice*, 15(4), pp.11-40.
- Saldana, J., 2016. *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Shorey, R., Cornelius, T. and Bell, K., 2008. A critical review of theoretical frameworks for dating violence: Comparing the dating and marital fields. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 13(3), pp.185-194.
- Tyson, L., 1999. *Critical theory today: a user-friendly guide*. New York: Garland Publishing Ltd.
- Warnick B. and Spencer Smith, D., 2014. The Controversy Over Controversies: A Plea for Flexibility and for "Soft-Directive" Teaching. *Educational Theory*, 64(3), pp.227-244.
- Wearmouth, J., 2004. 'Talking stones': An interview technique for disaffected students. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 22(2), pp.7-13.
- West Mercia Women's Aid 2014. *Project CRUSH training materials*. Hereford: West Mercia Women's Aid.

Appendix CRUSH B&NES Adapted Materials

Fig 1. Myth Vs Fact Exercise

Understanding and Exploring Consent (lesson 2) – the Myth and Fact exercise

<u>Fact</u>		<u>Myth</u>
	If 2 people have had sex once, they don't need to get or give Consent to it next time	
	A girl who wears revealing clothes and is 'flirty' with others shouldn't complain if they receive unwanted touching/contact	
	A girl who goes to a party with her boyfriend and gets really drunk is partially responsible if they end up having sex that they didn't want to have	
	Girls often lie about being sexually harassed, assaulted or raped because they regret what they did or because of criticism on social media	
	Once boys have been sexually aroused they can't control their urge, they have to have sex – and can't help it if they misread consent signals	
	When it comes to sexual activity, girls often 'play hard to get', saying 'No' when really they want to – they're just worried what others will think	
	Only heterosexual people are perpetrators or victims of sexual harassment, assault or rape	
	Girls are most likely to experience sexual harassment, violence, assault or rape after dark,	

Fig 2. True or False Game

Understanding and Exploring Healthy Relationships--Intimate partner abuse quiz

Q1: Your girlfriend sees you talking to a new girl who has moved into your street. She starts shouting at you, saying you were cheating on her. You tell her you were just having a friendly chat. She grabs you by the arm and tells you to never talk to her again

A: This is abusive behaviour. You didn't do anything wrong. She had no right to grab you by the arm or otherwise physically hurt you

B: This isn't abusive behaviour. She didn't hurt you. Anyway, it isn't a big deal, you talk to your friends like that all the time. And, she's a girl, there's no way she could really hurt you - besides it just shows she really likes you

C: This isn't abusive behaviour. What you did upset your girlfriend, that's why she got angry with you. You shouldn't make her angry like that.

Q2: Girls aged between 13 and 17 are more likely to talk to a parent or supportive adult if they are experiencing abuse or coercive behaviour in a relationship than those aged 18 or above?

True **False**

Q3: Spreading lies about an ex-partner, in person or on social media, is a form of abuse?

True **False**

Q4: Alcohol causes partners to be abusive, coercive or manipulative in intimate situations?

True **False**

Q5: The Safeguarding Teenage Intimate Relationships (STIR) project found that young women with partners who were 2 or more years older than them were significantly more likely to experience intimate partner abuse or violence?

True **False**

Fig 3. Understanding Abuse

Understanding abuse

Everyone has arguments, and everyone disagrees with their partner, family members and others close to them from time to time. And we all do things that we regret, and which cause unhappiness to those we care about. This is just part of being human.

Remember, you can be in an unhappy relationship without it being abusive. Maybe you're hurting each other's feelings by playing around with other people and making each other jealous – and making each other miserable.

An indication of domestic abuse is when one person begins to feel scared because of a pattern of controlling behaviour, or confused because of being told they're loved but only if certain conditions are met. Love shouldn't be conditional - especially if those conditions are to change key aspects of you.

These are the types of unhealthy behaviour to look out for:


- gets really jealous when you spend time with your friends
- tells you what to wear and what not to wear
- tell you what to do and who you can talk to
- accuses you of flirting or cheating when you're just being friendly
- has frequent temper outbursts
- accuses you of stuff that isn't true
- criticises you or puts you down in front of your mates
- makes you feel like you can't do anything right
- makes you feel nervous all the time, like you're walking on eggshells
- forces you to do sexual things that you don't want to do
- stops you from working or going to school/college/university
- takes your money away or controls it
- threatens to hurt you if you do not behave in a certain way
- checks what you are posting on social media – Instagram, Twitter, Facebook
- threatens to break or damage your stuff e.g. your phone or tablet
- threatens to post up naked or dirty pictures of you unless you do what they want
- says they can't live without you.

This sort of behaviour is not loving. This behaviour is deliberately selfish and controlling. It is about the other person, not you. All of this behaviour will make you feel bad about yourself.

Fig 4. Spotting the warning signs

Look at the story you have been asked to focus on.. As you read through, underline or highlight things you consider to be warning signs. If you saw or heard about these in a friend's relationship, what would you do?

Understanding and Exploring Healthy Relationships—spotting the warning signs



Callum's story:

My mate James told me that Izzy, a girl I'd never met, was obsessed with me. He told me that she had seen me on the bus and had started asking James' sister all about me. It was cool when she messaged me asking to meet up. We met up twice on the same weekend. She was 15, pretty and fun, and I remember thinking that this is how relationships must be. Soon Izzy started being controlling. She would get jealous about me going out with my friends. Even if I was doing stuff with my family she would say I was pissing our time away. Izzy logged into my Facebook account, reading my private messages from my ex. I expected her to end it, but instead she using her forgiveness as a weapon to control me even more. She demanded all my passwords as she said it would help her to feel more secure, she made me give up my female friends, she even wanted me to block my cousins and sent them abusive messages from my account. There were loads of different rules for me and everything was about keeping her happy. I would have to think through everything I said to her, as no matter what I said, she would twist it around. If I disagreed with anything, she would scream, swear and shout at me. She would put me down and tell me that I wasn't a real man. Although she was tiny, she would also pinch, kick and punch me. I realised that I was spending more and more time trying to keep her happy. Trying to stop her kicking off all the time. Thinking back, it started with I love you, but it became I own you. Izzy told me that she loved me, but she would also tell me that I was ugly and stupid. I really believed her, which made it even harder for me to end it as I had lost all my confidence

If Callum was our friend we would tell them to...

Fig 5. The Emergency

The Emergency

The females in the couples, are due to meet their partner at 8.30pm (in separate locations). At the last minute something has happened which means that neither girl can make it. *It could be that there has been a family emergency, an accident or even a death.*

In all the confusion, both girls forget to phone ahead to let their partner know what has happened. At 9.15pm both girls suddenly remember that they were due to meet their partner; they look at their phone and see lots of missed calls and texts and they realise that their partner is still waiting for them. **The girl's phone to apologise to their partner.**

Task

Working in groups, work out what happens next? Write a short script that covers the conversation the couple are having. 2 people will need to read the conversation back to the whole group.

Tips

Think about how the **abusive male** deals with this situation?

What will he say to her (think about the words and language he would use)?

How will he say it... (remember they are on the phone, so she isn't going to see his body language, think about his tone of voice, how fast or slowly is he speaking)

Consider using some of the Physical, Emotional or Sexually abusive tactics, we looked at last week.

Fig 6. Teaching Plan

Day 1
4.3.19

- 9.20 Welcome
- 9.25 introduction to Crush and consent to record sessions (whole group)
- 9.35 name badges (individuals)
- 9.40 group agreement (whole group)
- 9.50 Quiz (whole group)
- 10.00 meet the characters (2 groups)
- 10.10 name the characters (2 groups)
- 10.20 traits and characteristics (2 groups)

Break 10.35- 10.50

- 10.50 chemistry (2 groups)
- 11.10 What's important? (2 groups)
- 11.20 Pairing up (whole group)
- 11.35 1st date (2 groups)
- ~~11.40 phone call (2 groups)~~
- 12.05 post-it evaluation/ any questions/ next week
- 12.20 end

Day 2
11.3.19

- ~~9.20 Welcome/ recap/ any problems questions/ safeguarding~~
- 9.30 What is abuse? (Whole group)
- ~~10.00 phone call 2 groups~~
- 10.20 Why do couples stay together? Individual and whole group

Break 10.35- 10.50

- 10.50 keeping secrets. Whole group
- 11.10 head mess. Whole group.
- 11.30 The emergency. 2 groups
- 11.50 warning signs. Whole group
- 12.10 evaluation/ questions/ next week

(20)
- one of
doing
+ one

Fig 7. Crush Character Traits

Crush Character Traits

A trait is the something about you that makes you "you" e.g. gossipier, affectionate and hardworking.

Character name:

Clever		Cruel		Polite		Immature	
Hardworking		Calm		Rude		Impatient	
Selfish		Fair		Affectionate		Disrespectful	
Sly		Faithful		Considerate		Reckless	
Aggressive		Honest		Annoying		Jealous	
Angry		Confident		Kind		Boring	
Arrogant		Moody		Dishonest		Easy-going	
Friendly		Happy		Loyal		Anxious	
Generous		Loving		Shy		Gentle	
Trouble maker		Gossip		Helpful		Sympathetic	
Funny		Grumpy		Know it all		Likeable	
Bossy		Popular		lazy		Friendly	
Are there other character traits you want to add?				Are there other character traits you want to add?			

Fig 8. What keeps couples in unhealthy relationships together

