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ABSTRACT
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Social emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD) is one category of special educational needs that can have potential negative effects on children and young people (CYP) (e.g. Rusch & Chadsey, 1998; Cooper, 1999; Hallahan & Kaufman, 2000; Jull, 2008). One intervention that can be used with CYP with SEBD that draws on cognitive behavioural and solution focused approaches is the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001), US-based studies into which have yielded largely positive effects (Eggett, 2003; Bushnell & Card, 2003; Baker, 2008; Mazzotta-Perretti, 2009; Joye & Alvarez, 2010). To date, there has been no published research into the effectiveness of this intervention in a UK context. The present exploratory process evaluation study aimed to fill this gap in the literature as well as consider implementation issues in order to strengthen the local evidence base for the intervention as part of the wider Targeted Mental Health in Schools Project (Department for Children, Schools and Families, 2008).

Six male secondary age pupils formed the intervention group and three female staff co-delivered the intervention with the researcher. The intervention lasted for eleven weeks. The researcher took a mixed methods approach. Quantitative data in the form of school data and questionnaires administered to pupil participants were gathered pre- and post-intervention and at the follow-up stage. The questionnaires were the WhyTry Measure (WhyTry Organisation website), the Beck Disruptive Behaviour Inventory for Youth (Beck, Beck, Jolly & Steer, 2005) and the Beck Self-Concept Inventory for Youth (Beck et al., 2005). Qualitative data in the form of partial transcriptions of a focus group with the pupil participants and a semi-structured interview with the adult participants were gathered. A research diary was kept throughout the intervention and formed part of the data set. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics. Qualitative data were analysed using thematic analysis.

This research yielded positive findings for the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) with one group of pupils in a mainstream secondary school, as indicated by apparent improvements in pupil participants’ SEBD. This study has also provided detailed information regarding the effective implementation of the intervention in the focus school, which led to the development of a context specific model of effective implementation.

Keywords: SEBD, WhyTry Program*, group intervention, process evaluation, program* implementation, critical realism, thematic analysis
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Synopsis of previous relevant projects undertaken as part of the Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology prior to the thesis

Year 1: Assignment 1 – An investigation into the effectiveness of a school-based social skills programme (2010)

Brief summary:

A mixed methods design was used to investigate the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in leading to pupil adjustment, in this case, increased attendance, improved behaviour, improved self-concept and improved resilience. The intervention took place in a mainstream secondary school. Four pupils identified as having SEBD were selected to participate. The researcher collected pre- and post-data using self-report questionnaires and attendance data from school records. The questionnaires used were the Beck Disruptive Behaviour Inventory for Youth (Beck, Beck, Jolly & Steer, 2005); the Beck Self-Concept Inventory for Youth (Beck et al., 2005); and the Resiliency Scales (Prince-Embury, 2007). Pre- and post-measures were analysed using descriptive statistics. Partial transcriptions of a focus group with pupils and a semi-structured interview with the programme co-deliverer, a teaching assistant, were analysed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) led to positive effects on aspects of pupil adjustment. Key aspects of the programme emerged as being instrumental in relation to pupil adjustment. There also emerged several facilitators and barriers to programme implementation. This research went some way to strengthening the research base for the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001).
Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Thesis rationale

The local authority (LA) in which this research takes place, hereafter referred to as the focus LA, is located in North West England within an area of high deprivation; it is amongst the 10 LAs in England with the highest proportion of Lower layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs)\(^1\) in the most deprived five per cent nationally (McLennan, Barnes, Noble, Davies, Garratt & Dibben, 2011).

The focus LA is a phase 2 pathfinder for the Targeted Mental Health in Schools (TaMHS) Project (Department for Children, Schools and Families [DCSF\(^2\)], 2008). TaMHS is a government-funded project which aims to bring more professionals with mental health expertise into schools and instil within school staff key skills in supporting children and young people (CYP) who may have mental health needs. According to the DCSF (2008), those CYP identified as having mental health needs include CYP experiencing or at risk of experiencing social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD). The term SEBD can be applied to CYP displaying externalising behaviours, such as disruption and challenging behaviour, as well as CYP displaying internalising behaviours, such as being withdrawn (Jull, 2008). It is difficult to estimate the prevalence of SEBD/mental health difficulties in the child and adolescent population and the researcher refers the reader to the following chapter for a broader discussion of this issue. The government devolved funding to LAs participating in the TaMHS Project to develop a local approach to meeting the mental health needs of CYP in their schools (DCSF, 2008).

The focus LA joined the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) in April 2009. The TaMHS Project manager, the commissioner of the research and the principal educational psychologist of the Educational Psychology Service in the focus LA, utilised a proportion of this funding to develop a local evidence base for interventions in the focus LA and the programme featured in the present research – the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) – is one such intervention. Prior to the present research being commissioned, the focus LA’s Behaviour and Education Support Team, part of the focus LA’s response to SEBD in schools and other settings, implemented the

---

\(^1\) LSOAs are homogenous small areas of relatively even size (around 1,500 people) of which there are 32,482 in England (McLennan et al., 2011).

\(^2\) The Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) was known as the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) prior to July 2007 and the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) prior to 2001. Since 2010 it has been referred to as the Department for Education (DfE). References to DCSF, DfES, DfEE and DfE are used synonymously throughout this thesis.
WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in TaMHS settings, therefore, the intervention was already part of the LA’s response to SEBD. As an evidence-based intervention, the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) fits with recommendations in the TaMHS Project guidance (DCSF, 2008). The commissioner of the research was keen for the present researcher to study the implementation of the programme in the focus LA, not only to add to the local practice-based evidence of the intervention, as suggested by the TaMHS Project guidance (DCSF, 2008), but also to support the sustainability of the project in the focus LA once funding for the project extension ceased in August 2012. The present research is intended to contribute to the local evidence base by providing evidence on the process of implementing the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) at a local level. The current study is intended to support the sustainability of the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) by up skilling staff in a local mainstream secondary school in the delivery of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) and facilitating staff at a strategic level in planning for the wider implementation of the programme once the research ceases.

The researcher is a trainee educational psychologist (TEP) at the University of Manchester, working within the Educational Psychology Service and as part of the TaMHS team in the focus LA. The research took place in one mainstream secondary school in the focus LA. The training and interests of the researcher influenced the nature of this research to some extent. The researcher previously trained as a mainstream secondary school teacher and worked within a mainstream secondary school prior to joining the doctoral training course in 2009. Therefore, the researcher is experienced in working with this population of CYP and familiar with the systems common to mainstream secondary schools. These factors were influential in the researcher taking the decision to base the present research in a mainstream secondary school as opposed to a specialist secondary school or the primary sector, although there is evidence for the success of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in other settings, such as specialist provisions (e.g. Eggett, 2003). In Year 1 of the doctoral training course, the researcher co-delivered the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) alongside a teaching assistant in a mainstream secondary school (see Synopsis on p.17). Therefore, the researcher has some familiarity with the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001). Again, this was influential in the researcher’s decision to select this intervention to form the basis of this research over any other intervention being delivered in the focus LA as part of the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008).
The focus school within which the research took place is a mixed mainstream secondary school with a sixth form catering for pupils aged 11 – 18. The researcher obtained a small sample of six male Year 8 pupils (aged 12 – 13) to become part of the intervention group. These pupils had been identified by a screening tool and school based assessment processes as having or being at risk of having SEBD. Three pupil participants were identified as experiencing externalising SEBD and three pupil participants were identified as experiencing internalising SEBD. Three members of school staff were recruited to co-deliver the intervention with the researcher. The intervention lasted for 11 weeks. Pre-/post-intervention and follow-up measures were taken to assess the effectiveness of the intervention for this group of pupils in the focus school. A focus group with pupil participants and a semi-structured interview with programme co-deliverers (CDs) were carried out to ascertain the facilitators and barriers to the implementation of the intervention and to establish recommendations for future delivery within the focus school. A research diary was also kept throughout the duration of the research, which formed part of the data set.

There now follows an overview of each chapter contained herein in Table 1.1 below.

Table 1.1: Thesis Overview

<p>| Chapter 2: Literature Review | This chapter aims to evaluate critically the relevant literature pertaining to CYP with SEBD; the interventions currently used in schools with CYP with SEBD; the Why Try Program (Moore, 2001) group intervention; and programme implementation. Having reviewed the literature in relation to these topics, the aims of the current research will be given with a view to demonstrating how the present research builds on and extends existing research. The researcher will then pose research questions pertaining to the present research. |
| Chapter 3: Methodology | This chapter describes the research design implemented in this study, an exploratory process evaluation design, beginning with the rationale for this approach including an exploration of the researcher’s epistemological, ontological and axiological position. The critical realist stance taken by the present researcher led to the use of a mixed methodological approach, whereby the researcher gathered both quantitative and qualitative data. Data access, data gathering methods and data analysis methods will also be described. The researcher will present a critique of the present research methodology and ethical considerations will be explored. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 4:</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This chapter begins with a description of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) intervention delivery as it evolved throughout the course of the research. The chapter will then go on to detail information regarding the participants in the present study, including both the pupil participants and the CDs, before reporting participant attendance. The researcher will explore any changes to delivery and data collection that occurred as the research unfolded. The results will then be presented in two parts. Firstly, the findings from the quantitative data analysis will be described followed by findings from the qualitative data analysis. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary of the results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 5:</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This final chapter restates the research aims and questions before discussing key findings in relation to each research question. The findings are considered in relation to the literature and previous research. The chapter includes an evaluation of the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) with one group of pupils in the focus school. It also presents facilitators and barriers to the implementation of the intervention in the focus school and makes recommendations for future implementation in the focus school. A model of effective implementation specific to the focus school will be proposed. The chapter concludes with a consideration of the implications of the present research, its limitations and recommendations for future research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Chapter Outline
This literature review aims to evaluate critically the relevant literature pertaining to children and young people (CYP) with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD); the interventions currently used in schools with CYP with SEBD; the Why Try Program (Moore, 2001) group intervention; and programme implementation. The aims of the current research will then be given with a view to demonstrating how the present research builds on and extends existing research. The researcher will then pose research questions pertaining to the present research.

2.1.1 Literature search strategy.
This review of the literature draws on theory, research and guidance from a range of sources, including journal articles, edited books and government publications. The literature was accessed via a number of methods (see Appendix A for details regarding the search strategy employed in the present research).

2.2 Social Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties
There is debate in the literature over the terminology of special educational needs (SEN) involving SEBD. In the SEN Code of Practice (Department for Education and Skills [DfES], 2001) and the Targeted Mental Health in Schools (TaMHS) Project guidance (Department for Children Schools and Families [DCSF], 2008) these difficulties are collectively referred to as behavioural, emotional and social difficulties. However, Cole (2007) argues for a need to address the social and emotional difficulties of young people in order to influence their behaviour. Therefore, he highlights a preference for “social, emotional and behavioural difficulties” (Cole, 2007, p.12) as appropriate terminology. This is how the present researcher will refer to this type of special educational need henceforth, unless quoting another author.

The term emotional and behavioural difficulties first appeared in policy documents in the 1990s (Department for Education and Employment [DfEE], 1994). It was at this time that SEBD came to be recognised as a special educational need due to the fact that CYP with SEBD face barriers which can cause them to experience significantly greater difficulties in their learning in comparison to the majority of their peers (Welsh Office, 1994).

There are many definitions put forward for SEBD. The following is taken from the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) and describes pupils with SEBD:
Children and young people…who are withdrawn or isolated, disruptive and disturbing, hyperactive and lack concentration; those with immature social skills and those presenting challenging behaviours arising from other complex special needs (p.87).

According to the above definition, the term SEBD can be applied to CYP displaying externalising behaviours, such as being disruptive and presenting with challenging behaviours, as well as CYP displaying internalising behaviours, such as being withdrawn (Jull, 2008). Externalising and internalising behaviour difficulties are thought to be highly co-morbid (Liu, 2004).

It is thought to be the severity and pervasiveness of behaviours displayed that determine whether a pupil is considered to have SEBD, rather than the behaviours themselves (Fovet, 2011). Jones, Dohrn and Dunn (2004) state that “students with emotional and behavioural problems differ from other students only in the frequency, intensity, and duration of their behaviours” (p.71).

Although a distinction has been made between SEBD and more entrenched mental health problems, which require psychiatric intervention (Atkinson & Hornby, 2002), the SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) has acknowledged a cross over between CYP with SEBD and CYP with mental health problems. This is a link which has been further emphasised by the TaMHS Project guidance (DCSF, 2008) (see Section 2.3.1). Thus, SEBD appears to lie on a spectrum ranging from “unacceptable behaviour” at one end of the spectrum to “mental illness” at the other end of the spectrum (Fovet, 2011, p.250). This could prove problematic in terms of accessing accurate data because some researchers may not acknowledge this crossover. This is an issue that is not fully resolved in the literature and makes it difficult for researchers to study this area. The present researcher took this issue into consideration when selecting pupil participants for inclusion in the present study by using a valid SEBD measure to screen pupils (see Section 3.3).

2.2.1 Prevalence.
It is difficult to estimate how many young people experience SEBD because a “substantial portion” (Visser, Daniels & Macnab, 2005, p.43) of CYP who are not on roll at an educational setting have SEBD that have not been identified. Mihalas, Morse, Allsopp and Alvarez-McHatton (2009) suggest that even pupils who access the education system experience SEBD that are unidentified.
As highlighted in the previous section, the TaMHS guidance (DCSF, 2008) states that CYP defined as having SEBD within a school context are experiencing mental health problems. In the United Kingdom (UK), 20 per cent of CYP have been found to experience a mental health problem at some time in their development with 10 per cent experiencing these problems at a level representing a clinically recognisable mental health disorder (British Medical Association, 2006).

Several authors claim that the number of young people with SEBD is on the increase (e.g. Ryan, Reid & Epstein, 2004; Pierce, Reid & Epstein, 2004). Considering the prevalence of CYP experiencing SEBD, research into this area is beneficial not only in order to better understand this population of CYP, but also to gain further understanding of what type of interventions are effective for this group so as to mitigate against the potential poor outcomes.

2.2.2 Aetiology.

Cooper and Jacobs (2011) state that SEBD is associated with risk factors, which include social deprivation, low income, family dysfunction and early life trauma. Barnardo’s (2006) found a strong association between social disadvantage and SEBD. Supporting this to a certain extent, Patterson, Reid and Dishion (1992) highlight common features of the life histories of 206 males they studied intensively, whom they refer to as anti-social adults. These features are social disadvantage; ineffective parental discipline; lack of parental supervision; parental use of physical punishment; parental rejection; peer rejection; membership of deviant peer group; academic failure; and low self-esteem, which together suggest a social learning model for the aetiology of SEBD. However, Patterson et al. (1992) studied males only and, although they generalise their theory to encapsulate the female population, one cannot say with certainty whether Patterson et al.’s (1992) theory of the aetiology of SEBD is generaliseable to females. However, strengthening the social learning model for the aetiology of SEBD further, Patterson (1993) found that association with deviant peers in early adolescence was uniquely associated with an increase in problem behaviour in individuals.

If the social learning model for the aetiology of SEBD is accurate, this could prove problematic for the present research, as the inclusion of SEBD pupils within one intervention group may have negative effects on pupils. Dishion, McCord and Poulin (1999) suggest that some intervention strategies that are designed to reduce problem behaviours can actually have negative, or iatrogenic, effects on youth. However, it was hoped that the inclusion of a balance of pupils presenting with
externalising and internalising SEBD in the present research would dilute the iatrogenic effects to an extent.

There are other theories suggested for the aetiology of SEBD. Such theories include those arising from an attachment perspective. Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969; 1973; 1980) proposes that CYP who have their needs satisfied consistently from birth develop a secure attachment to their carer(s) and make expected developments both emotionally and socially (Bomber, 2007). Securely attached CYP perform well in terms of their self esteem, autonomy, resilience, impulse control, emotional control, social relationships, social skills, behaviour and academic performance (Levy & Orlans, 1998). Conversely, CYP who have not had their needs satisfied from birth, either consistently or at all, are thought to develop an insecure attachment and their emotional and social development is compromised. Such CYP may have been exposed to risk factors including neglect, emotional abuse, sexual abuse and physical abuse (Bomber, 2007). They may present with some of the following difficulties:

- poor sense of self;
- fidgety;
- over-reactive responses to difficulties or conflicts resulting in aggressive behaviours;
- verbally abusive;
- difficulties with social relationships;
- concentration difficulties;
- academic difficulties.

(Bomber, 2007, p.25).

The above list is not exhaustive (see Bomber, 2007, p.25 for a more comprehensive list). SEBD interventions with a psychotherapeutic underpinning can help support CYP with attachment difficulties (see Section 2.4.2).

Ecological, or systemic, models of the aetiology of SEBD have also been proposed. These models assume that socio-cultural factors are influential in determining individuals' behaviour and that behaviour is a product of the interaction between the individual and their environment (Evans, Harden & Thomas, 2004). Arguably the most prominent theory in this domain is Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological model of human development.
2.2.3 Co-occurring difficulties. SEBD and speech, language and communication difficulties (SLCD) are thought to overlap considerably (Benner, Nelson & Epstein, 2002). This has implications for performance both academically and socially. Some CYP have SLCD that have not been detected and, consequently, are untreated (Walker, Schwarz, Nippold, Irvin, & Noell, 1994). The link between SEBD and SLCD may serve to provide another model of the aetiology of SEBD other than the social learning model (see Section 2.2.2); it could be the case that CYP’s SLCD underlies, or perhaps leads to, their SEBD. However, the literature in this area is not conclusive. Rescorla and Achenbach (2002) did not find a relationship between SEBD and SLCD in preschool children. This may indicate a lack of a relationship or it may suggest that the relationship becomes more marked with age.

Miles and Stipek (2006) have highlighted an increased incidence of literacy difficulties in CYP with SEBD. They claim that CYP’s behaviour can have an impact on their learning and CYP’s academic performance may have implications for their
behaviour. Thus, as with SLCD, the link between SEBD and learning difficulties may provide an alternative model of the aetiology of SEBD to the social learning model (see Section 2.2.2); CYP’s learning difficulties could underlie, or perhaps lead to, their SEBD.

The potential presence of underlying SLCD and/or literacy difficulties in the SEBD population provides an argument for the use of visual and kinaesthetic approaches with this population of CYP, which is the approach taken in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001).

2.2.4 Outcomes.
Research suggests that CYP with SEBD have the poorest educational, behavioural and social outcomes of any other SEN group with no apparent improvements over time (Bradley, Doolittle & Bartolotta, 2008).

Rusch and Chadsey (1998) propose that around 64 per cent of CYP with SEBD drop out of school. Early school leaving amongst pupils who present with disruptive behaviour has been corroborated by James and Lawlor (2001). Hallahan and Kaufman (2000) suggest that young people with SEBD are less likely to gain employment as they progress into adulthood due to their lack of academic and social skills. Cooper (1999) suggests that SEBD are likely to impair CYP’s ability to function effectively in school and, later, the work place as well as their ability to form stable relationships or be effective parents. Furthermore, a national longitudinal study in the United States (US) (US Department of Education, 2006) found that 11 per cent of students identified as having SEBD were involved in the criminal justice system. In the UK, many CYP with SEBD leave school with few or no qualifications and low aspirations (Casey, Davies, Kalambouka, Nelson & Boyle, 2006; Farrell, Critchley & Mills, 1999).

Jull (2008) asserts that SEBD appears to be the only category of SEN that leaves a pupil open to an increased risk of exclusion as a result of the SEN acknowledged as necessitating special provision. He focuses his argument on pupils with SEBD who present with externalising behaviours. Hayden (1997) found primary school pupils with SEBD to be overrepresented in exclusion figures. Secondary school pupils with SEBD are also overrepresented in exclusion figures (DCSF, 2009).

The researcher asserts that the potential negative effects associated with both externalising and internalising SEBD provided a mandate for the inclusion of pupils
presenting with internalising SEBD as well as pupils presenting with externalising SEBD in the present study.

2.3 Guidance
There is a range of guidance in existence for working with CYP with SEBD and their families. This literature review will focus on the main area of guidance influencing the research: the Targeted Mental Health in Schools (TaMHS) Project (DCSF, 2008).

2.3.1 Targeted Mental Health in Schools Project.
The TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) implemented a phased approach, with 25 pathfinder LAs beginning the project when it launched in April 2008, 55 additional LAs joining in April 2009 and a further 71 LAs joining in April 2010, each of which was funded to develop and deliver an innovative model of mental health support for CYP aged 5 to 13 years (DCSF, 2008). The TaMHS model consists of two key elements: strategic integration, where those involved in the delivery of mental health support to CYP work together strategically to deliver effective intervention; and evidence informed practice, including the delivery of interventions planned according to local need and grounded in an increasing knowledge of what works.

The DCSF (2008) adopt the Mental Health Foundation’s (1999) definition of mentally healthy CYP as those who:

- develop psychologically, emotionally, intellectually and spiritually; initiate, develop and sustain mutually satisfying personal relationships; use and enjoy solitude; become aware of others and empathise with them; play and learn; develop a sense of right and wrong; and resolve problems and setbacks and learn from them (DCSF, 2008, p.8).
The TaMHS Project intervention model is based on the three waves model depicted in Figure 2.2 below (DCSF, 2008):

![Figure 2.2: The TaMHS wave model for intervention (DCSF, 2008, p.5)](image)

As depicted in Figure 2.2, the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) builds upon the pre-existing Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) Programme (DfES, 2005; DCSF, 2007) (see Section 2.4.1). It also builds on the recommendations of the National Institute for Clinical Excellence on promoting social and emotional well-being in primary schools (National Institute for Clinical Excellence, 2008). In addition, the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) aims to bring those with mental health expertise into schools to build the capacity and confidence of school staff in supporting the mental health needs of CYP; fund additional therapeutic services; and embed effective working practices and relationships between all services supporting CYP’s mental health.

The TaMHS wave model advocates the use of interventions that are grounded in research based evidence because this is ethical, adds to our understanding of what is effective and leads to maximum benefit for service users (DCSF, 2008). The TaMHS Project guidance (DCSF, 2008) highlights a need for practice based evidence alongside research based evidence. Practice based evidence is based on service user and practitioner experiences (see Simons, Kushner, Jones & James,
In 2011, a national evaluation of the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) commissioned by the DfE was published (DfE, 2011a). Two studies were undertaken as part of this evaluation: a longitudinal study and a randomised controlled trial. The longitudinal design allowed researchers to study changes in levels of mental health problems in the same sample of pupils across three academic years (2008 – 2010) and explore what factors were associated with those changes. In the randomised controlled trial, researchers studied whether TaMHS provision had a significant impact on CYP’s mental health outcomes compared with areas where TaMHS was not operational.

At the start of the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008), around 10 per cent of CYP were experiencing adverse levels of SEBD (DCSF, 2010). The TaMHS evaluation (DfE, 2011a) found that there was a wide range of activities taking place in schools to target these difficulties at all three waves of intervention. Activities included creative and physical activity for pupils; group therapy for pupils; and training for staff. Generally, schools used locally developed programmes as opposed to adhering to strict manualised programmes. Mental health support in schools was found to be mainly provided by school staff, increasingly with some training. Educational psychologists (EPs) were cited as a crucial point of contact in schools for specialist input for both emotional and behavioural problems. School staff were generally enthusiastic about the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) and identified examples of positive change, which they attributed to the project. They cited having TaMHS workers based in school that could be easily accessed by school staff as being key to this positive change. Other important factors considered to improve the implementation of the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) included having projects that showed an awareness of the context. Parents and pupils also valued the TaMHS initiative. A number of barriers to implementation were identified (see DfE, 2011a) and concerns were expressed about the sustainability of the project, given that funding would cease in 2011.

TaMHS provision resulted in a statistically significant decrease in problems in primary – but not secondary – school pupils who had behavioural problems at the outset, but had no statistically significant effect on primary or secondary school pupils who had emotional difficulties at the outset. In terms of the findings on behavioural problems, the DfE (2011a) suggests that the difference between
primary and secondary schools may reflect the fact that behavioural difficulties have become more entrenched by the time the pupil makes the transition to secondary school and, therefore, are harder to influence. The DfE (2011a) concludes that programmes may need more time to embed before the full impact on child outcomes can be detected.

The DfE (2011a) makes several recommendations based on the outcomes of their report, including prioritising mental health work for primary schools and schools adhering more closely to manuals and protocols for evidence-based interventions, as these have been found to have the greatest impact, though the DfE acknowledges that this needs to be combined with local ownership to aid uptake (see DfE, 2011a, for full list of recommendations).

The guidance outlined above offers a framework within which practitioners can apply interventions in their work with CYP with SEBD. There now follows an exploration of the specific interventions that may be used with CYP with SEBD.

2.4 Interventions

2.4.1 Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning.

A key intervention used in both primary and secondary school settings is the SEAL Programme (DfES, 2005; DCSF, 2007), which aims to develop the social and emotional skills of CYP through the use of direct teaching, adult modelling and positive approaches to behaviour management. The SEAL Programme (DfES, 2005; DCSF, 2007) is the key intervention delivered at waves one and two of the TaMHS model (see Figure 2.2).

The SEAL Programme (DfES, 2005; DCSF, 2007) covers five broad social and emotional aspects of learning: self-awareness; managing feelings; motivation; empathy; and social skills. These aspects are similar to Goleman’s (1996) emotional competencies and are thought to underpin effective learning, positive behaviour, regular attendance and emotional well-being (DfES, 2005).

The SEAL Programme (DfES, 2005; DCSF, 2007) is delivered in three waves of intervention, similar to the wave model underpinning the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008):
In the tiered model depicted in Figure 2.3 above (DfES, 2005), the first tier depicts the first wave of intervention, which is whole school development work. This work is designed to create the ethos within which social and emotional skills can be effectively fostered. The second tier depicts the second wave of intervention, which is small group intervention with CYP requiring additional support. The third tier depicts the third wave of intervention, which is individual intervention for CYP who have not benefited from the first and second waves of intervention.

The SEAL guidance (DfES, 2005; DCSF, 2007) details several factors essential to successful implementation of SEAL, including senior management commitment to the principles; positive relationships in the school or setting; and active involvement of children. However, the guidance does not include details on the operationalisation of these factors.

Hallam, Rhamie and Shaw (2006) evaluated the first wave of SEAL intervention and found that the SEAL Programme (DfES, 2005; DCSF, 2007) “had a major impact on children’s well-being, confidence, social and communication skills, relationships, including bullying, playtime behaviour, pro-social behaviour and attitudes towards schools” (Hallam et al. 2006, p.1). However, there were variations in the extent to which schools were implementing the SEAL Programme (DfES, 2005; DCSF, 2007).

Humphrey et al. (2008) looked at the effectiveness of small group interventions, the second wave of the SEAL model of intervention, in primary schools. They found
statistically significant evidence that small group work had a positive impact on CYP. However, the average effect sizes were small. Humphrey et al. (2008) go on to recommend a tentative model of good practice for primary SEAL small group work interventions (see Humphrey et al., 2008) and suggest that small group interventions may benefit from being more intensive with more direct involvement of CYP’s families.

The aim of the SEAL Programme (DfES, 2005; DCSF, 2007) was to develop the social and emotional skills of CYP through the use of direct teaching, adult modelling and positive approaches to behaviour management. According to Hallam et al. (2006) and Humphrey et al. (2008), overall the programme has achieved these aims at waves one and two of the threshold model (see Figure 2.3). The third wave involves intervention on an individual basis with CYP who have not benefitted from intervention at waves one and two. This may include CYP at risk of or experiencing mental health difficulties. Targeted intervention for these CYP is delivered through the TaMHS Project (DSCF, 2008) and findings from the TaMHS Project evaluation (DfE, 2011a) can be viewed in Section 2.3.1.

2.4.2 Other interventions.
Evans et al. (2004) conducted a systematic review of the research to investigate the effectiveness of strategies used to support CYP with SEBD in mainstream primary schools. They found that interventions used with SEBD pupils could be placed within four theoretical models, which are outlined in Table 2.1 below:
Table 2.1: Theoretical models underpinning SEBD interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>Assumes that behaviours can be modified or extinguished through programmes of reinforcement, leading to short term behaviour change, e.g. the use of a time out method to reduce verbalisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive behavioural</td>
<td>Assumes that faulty thought patterns can be modified, leading to a long term behaviour change, e.g. use of self-monitoring within a behaviour management programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic</td>
<td>Assumes that contextual factors are more influential than individual factors in determining behaviour, e.g. disruptive behaviour within the classroom may be affected by classroom layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotherapeutic</td>
<td>Emphasises the complexity of behaviour problems and the importance of personal development and building relationships to effect positive behaviour change, e.g. the use of nurture groups in schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evans et al. (2004) found that most of the evidence supported the efficacy of strategies based on behavioural and cognitive behavioural models. However, improvements in behaviour were limited to the period the strategies were in place and, therefore, these strategies did not appear to yield long term behaviour changes.

Although Evans et al.’s (2004) search yielded studies which detailed some positive findings, only a small number of papers with sound methodology describing positive findings from primary research activity were located and very few of those studies (four out of 28) were based in the United Kingdom (UK). Evans et al. (2004) conclude that further rigorous research is required. Evans et al. (2004) highlighted a further gap in the literature: whether strategies delivered by teachers are more or less effective than those delivered with the support of other professionals. They make several recommendations for further research (see Evans et al., 2004, p.8), including ascertaining the views of participants about the strategies used.

Since Evans et al.’s (2004) study, Cooper and Jacobs (2011) have conducted a review of the international literature on educational models for children with SEBD in both primary and secondary settings. Their review is thorough and detailed and,
therefore, a full summary is beyond the scope of the present literature review. The present author refers the reader to Cooper and Jacobs’s (2011) paper for a full exploration of the findings. There follows a brief summary of the main findings.

Cooper and Jacobs (2011) found high and moderate empirical support for behavioural and cognitive behavioural interventions. Two of the interventions with a high level of empirical support – the Good Behaviour Game (Barrish, Saunders & Wolf, 1969) and FRIENDS (Barrett, Lowry-Webster & Turner, 1999) – are manualised programmes, which Cooper and Jacobs (2011) claim make them suitable for and accessible to educational professionals who work directly with CYP with SEBD, but not necessarily with training or experience in the delivery of psycho-social interventions. Other cognitive behavioural approaches found to have moderate empirical support are self-evaluation, self-regulation, social problem solving and anger management interventions (see Cooper & Jacobs, 2011, for a detailed overview). Behavioural interventions found to have moderate empirical support include kernels, which are evidence-based behavioural strategies (Embry, 2004; Embry & Biglan, 2008). These strategies can be embedded in more elaborate interventions. Embry and Biglan (2008) suggest that if used competently, frequently and sometimes concurrently, kernels can produce significant and lasting behavioural change (see Appendix B for an overview of kernels and associated research).

A high level of empirical support was found for career academies, a small scale US provision where at-risk students take a more vocational curriculum linked to a career theme (Cooper & Jacobs, 2011).

Cooper and Jacobs (2011) found moderate empirical support for nurture groups, which are located within a psychotherapeutic model. Nurture groups were originally set up by Marjorie Boxall in the 1970s (Bennathan & Boxall, 2000). They are discrete classes of small numbers of pupils (approximately 10 - 12) typically staffed by a teacher and a specially trained teaching assistant. Nurture groups are underpinned by attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969; 1973; 1980) and the view that CYP with SEBD experience emotions and exhibit behaviours more typical of CYP of a younger chronological age. Nurture groups aim to provide the experiences necessary for CYP to progress to social competence in order to provide the social and psychological foundations necessary for learning. Group balance is thought to be important within such groups and teachers are careful not to overwhelm the
group with too high a proportion of those who externalise or those who internalise (Cooper & Jacobs, 2011). Cooper and Jacobs (2011) cite several studies indicating the effectiveness of nurture groups, including a study by Cooper and Whitebread (2007), which compared the progress of CYP attending a nurture group with that of four comparison groups over a two year period. Cooper and Whitebread (2007) found that nurture groups added significantly to the positive work that mainstream schools do with CYP with SEBD, even seeming to have a positive impact on those pupils in a mainstream school who do not attend the nurture group when compared to pupils in a mainstream school which does not have a nurture group on site.

Other approaches highlighted by Cooper and Jacobs (2011) as having moderate empirical support are student peer support; whole school approaches, such as Success for All, School Wide Positive Behavioural Support and Coping Power; parent management training; and the Fast Track programme, a multi agency intervention. Unfortunately, a full exploration of these approaches is beyond the scope of this research (see Cooper & Jacobs, 2011 for further details).

Cooper and Jacobs (2011) acknowledge that their systematic selection of studies meant that they have highlighted those approaches that have received the most attention from researchers. It follows that there may be other approaches used with CYP with SEBD which may be just as effective if not more so, but which have not received the same attention from researchers. Cooper and Jacobs (2011) also acknowledge that they have given greatest weight to those approaches with empirical evidence of their generalisability and that most of the interventions included in their review that were rated with low level empirical support have not been subjected to the most rigorous forms of evaluation. They concede that these approaches should not be dismissed on this basis, but rather highlight the need to rigorously evaluate these approaches to establish their efficacy.

To briefly summarise the research in relation to interventions with the SEBD population, empirical support has been found for cognitive behavioural interventions (Evans et al., 2004; Cooper & Jacobs, 2011), although it would appear that these interventions may not yield long term effects (Evans et al., 2004). Support has been found for the utilisation of manualised programmes with this population (Cooper & Jacobs, 2011). In light of these findings, the present researcher used a manualised intervention programme with SEBD pupils underpinned by a cognitive behavioural approach, amongst other approaches. The present researcher included follow-up
measures as well as pre- and post-measures to ascertain whether the intervention yielded any longer term benefits for the group of pupils within this study.

2.5 Psychological Approaches
Practitioners use a number of interventions when working with CYP with SEBD, which are underpinned by various psychological approaches. The present researcher has selected two of the more widely used and widely researched approaches to explore in further detail: cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) and solution focused brief therapy (SFBT). A further rationale for focusing on these approaches is that they underpin the intervention that is the focus of this research, the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001). There follows a description and brief review of the literature for CBT and SFBT.

2.5.1 Cognitive behavioural therapy.
CBT originates from the work of Beck and colleagues (Beck & Emery, 1979; Beck, Emery & Greenberg, 1985; Beck, Rush, Shaw & Emery, 1979) and its initial application was with anxious or depressed adults. It is a therapeutic model that aims to “reduce psychological distress and maladaptive behaviour by altering cognitive processes” (Greig, 2007, p.20). CBT assumes that thinking precedes feelings and behaviour and the appraisal that a person makes of a situation leads to affective and behavioural reactions. Appraisals can be influenced by inappropriate beliefs, cognitive distortions and automatic thoughts (see Figure 2.4, adapted from Squires, 2001).

![Figure 2.4: Thoughts, feelings and behaviour pattern (adapted from Squires, 2001, p.319)](image)

CBT asserts that by challenging the way an individual thinks about a situation, one can have an impact on the way they behave in this situation (Toland & Boyle, 2008). During CBT, clients are encouraged to explore alternative ways of thinking and learn problem solving strategies that can aid them in interpreting their thoughts, feelings and behaviours in more rational ways. The client has an active role in identifying their goals for the therapy and in monitoring their performance as the
therapy progresses. The client is encouraged to practise skills leading to alternative patterns of thinking and behaviour outside the context of the therapy.

Applications of CBT have grown steadily and it is now applied to the child and adolescent population. Durlak, Fuhrman and Lampman (1991) conducted a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of CBT for maladapt ing children. They found that children’s cognitive developmental level was the most important indicator of outcome. For those studies that included a control group, CYP undergoing CBT showed clinically meaningful gains, whereas controls showed little change over time. Durlak et al. (1991) conclude that CBT appears to be effective for CYP aged 11 to 13, assuming that they are operating at an age-appropriate cognitive level. Durlak et al.’s (1991) meta-analysis includes a comprehensive literature search. However, as the time frame of their literature search was between 1970 and 1987, one might argue that a more contemporary meta-analysis is required.

More recent findings indicate variable effectiveness of CBT with CYP. For example, King et al. (1998) found positive effects of using CBT with a group of school refusers when compared to a waiting list control group and these effects were maintained three months later. However, Last, Hansen and Franco (1998) found no difference between a CBT group and a control group in treating school phobia; both groups showed post treatment gains which were maintained at a four week follow-up. However, as Last et al.’s (1998) follow-up was at four weeks, one cannot be certain that the treatment gains for both the treatment and the control groups is as enduring as the treatment gains for the treatment group in King et al.’s (1998) study, in which the follow-up was at three months.

Squires (2001) studied the effectiveness of group CBT delivered to three groups of six to nine pupils from Year 5 to Year 8 (age nine – 13). An EP delivered a series of sessions rooted in a CBT framework, which produced significant effects when measured on self-rating scales of self-control and teacher ratings of classroom behaviour. This provides some evidence for the effectiveness of the use of CBT when delivered to groups of CYP with SEBD. Squires (2001) provides an overview of the sessions in the appendices of his paper, which allows for future replication of his study. However, he notes a methodological weakness in his study is that he did not measure the long term gains of the CBT sessions and, therefore, one cannot state whether the use of CBT with groups of CYP with SEBD has a long term impact.
A study carried out by Ruttledge and Petrides (2011), which aimed to investigate the efficacy of a cognitive behavioural group intervention based on Squires’s (2001) model with 22 CYP aged 13 – 14 years presenting with disruptive behaviour found evidence for a reduction in disruptive behaviour, as reported by participants, teachers and parents, an increase in self-reported self-concept and an increase in self-reported emotional intelligence. Improvements in behaviour and self-concept were maintained at a six month follow-up, according to participant and teacher ratings. This provides further support for the efficacy and long term impact of CBT-based interventions for groups of CYP with SEBD.

2.5.2 Solution focused brief therapy.

SFBT evolved out of the clinical practice of Steve de Shazer, Insoo Kim Berg and colleagues (de Shazer, 1982, 1985, 1988; de Shazer et al., 1986). SFBT is a strengths-based therapeutic approach (DfE, 2011b) that places emphasis on solutions as opposed to problems in order for the client to reach their preferred future. Solution focused therapists hold basic assumptions of their clients: that they want to change, that they have the capacity to envision change and that they are doing all they can to create change. The treatment is brief, with clients usually requiring approximately six sessions before therapy ceases (Gingerich & Eisengart, 2000).

Although researchers have criticised the lack of homogeneity of CBT approaches (e.g. Stallard, 2002), there exist several core techniques of SFBT, which are designed to facilitate solution focused thinking in clients (see Figure 2.5, Kim, 2008). One of these techniques is scaling where the client identifies on a scale of one to 10 where they think they are in terms of the problem they are experiencing. This type of scaling is returned to several times throughout the course of the therapy and can be used to measure client progression towards their preferred future.

| 1. Therapist’s use of the “miracle question” |
| 2. Use of scaling questions |
| 3. A consulting break and giving the client a set of compliments |
| 4. Assignment of homework tasks |
| 5. Looking for strengths or solutions |
| 6. Goal setting |
| 7. Looking for exceptions to the problem |

Figure 2.5: SFBT techniques

However, currently there is not full agreement regarding the use of these techniques. A systematic literature review carried out by the DfE (2011b) was
unable to reach any firm conclusions regarding what an SFBT intervention should include and did not find a relationship between the number of core elements included in an SFBT intervention and outcomes. However, its flexibility as a therapeutic tool could be seen as a strength of the approach as it can be implemented with a range of client groups for a wide range of presenting problems.

During the early development of the SFBT model, de Shazer (1985) and de Shazer et al. (1986) conducted follow-up surveys of clients six to 18 months after treatment to ascertain whether they had met their treatment goals or felt that progress had been made. These surveys indicated 82 per cent and 72 per cent success rates amongst 28 clients and 400 clients respectively. However, the lack of experimental control of these studies renders drawing causal inferences difficult, as Gingerich and Eisengart (2000) highlight in their review of the literature on SFBT. They conclude that well controlled studies showed positive outcomes although effect sizes were small. This was confirmed in a more recent meta-analysis, where “small but positive treatment effects” were found (Kim, 2008, p.113). These meta-analyses included some studies where the treatment population was CYP.

The systematic literature review carried out by the DfE (2011b) provides a comprehensive analysis of the SFBT evidence base. Their focus was on the effectiveness of SFBT in relation to work with children and families. The DfE (2011b) found a number of studies evaluating the use of SFBT with groups (e.g. Newsome, 2004). Several studies in the DfE (2011b) review report success in the use of SFBT in combination with other approaches (e.g. Violeta & Dafinoui). Positive results were found for children with internalising and externalising difficulties. For example, Franklin, Moore and Hopson (2008) found that a school-based SFBT intervention led to decreases in teacher reports of externalising and internalising behaviour problems, which was maintained one month post-intervention.

Overall, the DfE’s (2011b) systematic review of the literature provides support for the use of SFBT with children presenting with internalising and externalising behaviour problems in school settings and with their families. The majority of studies in the review indicate that SFBT might be most effective when utilised as an early intervention where problems are at a mild to moderate level. Many interventions were successfully delivered in groups, either school-based or family-based. The review studies indicate that for many children with moderate levels of internalising or
externalising difficulties, a school or family group programme delivered over five to 10 weekly sessions has the potential to be effective. These interventions can be delivered by a range of professionals with therapeutic skills who have had appropriate training, ensure fidelity to SFBT guidelines and receive appropriate supervision. However, although the current review assessed fidelity of the SFBT provided and types of supervision, the evidence did not enable the review team to reach any firm conclusions regarding what an SFBT intervention should include or how it should be supervised. It recommended that details of core elements of SBFT intervention programmes and supervision should be included in future research reports in order to be able to inform our understanding of the contribution of these aspects to effective SFBT. The DfE (2011b) highlight the need for more rigorous research into the effectiveness of SFBT. They also highlight a need for research that seeks to address gaps in the SFBT literature, for example, the use of SFBT by teachers to improve behaviour difficulties in CYP.

The psychological approaches outlined in this section are two of the approaches that underpin the intervention that is the focus of this research – the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001). The researcher will now explore the research in relation to the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) specifically.

2.6 The WhyTry Program
The WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) is a school-based intervention designed to teach social and emotional principles to CYP in order to improve outcomes in a range of areas including truancy, behaviour and attainment (WhyTry Organization website). It is underpinned by several evidence-based approaches including CBT and SFBT. The programme uses a multi sensory approach to engage CYP, including visual analogies, music and experiential activities, thus appealing to a range of learning styles (Moore, 2001). Ultimately, the programme provides a framework for teaching CYP the skills to answer the question “Why try?”. Throughout the programme, CYP are guided to develop an insight into the core concepts being taught, make connections with their personal lives and learn how to apply the concepts in their daily lives and the challenges they face.

In total there are 10 visual analogies, each estimated to take approximately 45 minutes to one hour to teach. There are also kinaesthetic experiential learning activities to embed the principles presented in the visual analogies further, each estimated to take approximately one hour to complete. Therefore, the programme takes approximately 17.5 – 20 hours to implement.
A summary of the 10 visual analogies and core concepts is presented in Appendix C. The types of skills taught through the programme include developing positive coping mechanisms, problem solving and developing positive relationships (Moore, 2001). The suggested number of pupils participating in a group is five to 12 with six to eight being the optimal number as this allows for open communication whilst still providing adequate numbers to complete the experiential activities (Joye & Alvarez, 2010).

Although the theory underlying the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) is not explicitly stated in the programme manual, the manual does highlight the components which are key to the intervention. These are as follows:

- **Attention getter**: any quick activity that will grab pupils’ attention, introduce the concept being taught and build relationships among the pupils and between the pupils and the deliverers.
- **Visual analogy**: the deliverers teach the visual analogy using some or all of the materials provided – posters, 8x10 pictures and/or PowerPoint.
- **Music**: the deliverers use music to reinforce the session content. Deliverers can either use the music provided in the programme pack or any other relevant music.
- **Experiential activities**: the deliverers lead pupils through the experiential activities to reinforce the concept taught through the visual analogy. The deliverers then process the relevance of the experiential activity to the core concept of the analogy with the pupils.
- **Journal activities**: extra-programme activities that can be used within or outside the session to reinforce the session content.
- **Praise and affirmation**: throughout the session, deliverers are required to acknowledge pupils’ contributions through verbal and/or written expression.

Overall, the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) advocates the use of interactive activities, positive feedback and a solution-focused approach over 10 sessions.

Although not explicitly referenced in the programme manual, the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) is underpinned by several evidence-based approaches, which can be recognised within the session content (see Moore, 2001). For example, a solution-focused approach is taken in the Reality Ride session, where pupils are asked to describe their preferred future in detail, and in the Tearing off your Label session, where pupils are invited to respond to a scaling question. In addition, a cognitive-
behavioural approach is taken, for example, in the Defence Mechanisms session pupils are encouraged to see the links between their thoughts, their feelings and their behaviours. Throughout the entire programme, a positive psychology approach is taken whereby programme deliverers are required to give positive feedback to pupils’ contributions and to highlight pupils’ strengths.

The intended proximal outcomes of the intervention are that pupils learn key skills to support them in a range of areas, including avoiding negative peer pressure, using positive coping strategies in pressure situations and connecting with supportive people. The intended distal outcomes of the intervention are that pupils experience improvements in a range of social, emotional and behavioural domains, including presenting with improved behaviour and having a more positive sense of self.

2.6.1 The WhyTry Program research.
Investigations into the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) have mainly taken place in the US as this is an intervention developed in the US and is widely used in US settings. According to Joye and Alvarez (2010), over 5,000 schools in the US are currently using the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001). It is also used in schools in Canada, Australia and the UK, but to a lesser extent and it is not as widely researched in these settings. Published research into the effectiveness of the programme has thus far been restricted to the US to the best of the present author’s knowledge and is located within the grey literature.

Eggett (2003) conducted an investigation into the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in an alternative education site for pupils with behaviour and/or attendance issues in grades nine to 12 (aged 14 – 19). A total of 20 students were selected for participation in the study and were randomly assigned to the WhyTry group or to the control group. WhyTry sessions were conducted twice weekly for 50 minutes per session. The inclusion of a control group in Eggett’s (2003) study helped to increase its validity.

Attendance data indicated a significant positive change in attendance for the WhyTry group, whereas the control group had fewer attendance problems at the beginning of the study. Detentions decreased for both groups, with the sample group displaying the greatest change. Students rated their own motivational qualities and teachers rated students’ motivational qualities weekly throughout the duration of the intervention using a points system; students were required to self-rate their motivational qualities on a student rating form and teachers were also
required to rate students’ motivational qualities on a teacher rating form (see Eggett, 2003). Overall, scores increased from pre- to post-intervention for both groups, but at a higher rate for the WhyTry group. However, not all students in the WhyTry group experienced this increase. The researcher was only able to provide a tentative explanation for these differences.

CYP in the study completed the Behavioural Assessment System for Children (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 1992) post-intervention only. The Attitude Toward School and Teachers and the Locus of Control scales were selected for analysis. CYP in the control group had a higher locus of control scores indicating a more external locus of control. This would indicate a more problematic motivational underpinning as they are more likely to believe that rewards and punishments are controlled by external events or other people. The sample group had lower scores on the Attitude Toward School and Attitude Toward Teacher scales indicating fewer problematic attitudes. As the Behavioural Assessment System for Children (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 1992) was not administered pre- and post-intervention, it must be accepted that differences between groups may have existed pre-intervention and, therefore, scores cannot be attributed solely to the intervention itself.

Maths and English grades were analysed pre- and post-intervention. Both groups made statistically significant improvements. However, there was an unexpected finding in that the control group made more progress in their grades than the sample group. A possible explanation given by Eggett (2003) is that the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) took almost two hours of academic input out of the school week, which may have affected grades. However, the reduction in academic input for the WhyTry group was inevitable and known to the researcher from the outset and so a disadvantage in this area for the sample group could have been anticipated.

Eggett (2003) acknowledges that some CYP in both groups did not make any progress at all from pre- to post-intervention, when one would have expected progress to be made for CYP in the WhyTry group. However, an interview with one pupil in the WhyTry group who did not make progress indicated an understanding of the core concepts of the programme, even if the principles were not yet being applied by this pupil and, in this sense, he is further along the behaviour change continuum than prior to the intervention. However, it is possible that this pupil could have had this knowledge pre-intervention and, therefore, this cannot be reliably attributed solely to the intervention.
Bushnell and Card (2003) studied the effects of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) by studying grade point average, attendance and graduation rates in 114 students who participated in the intervention at one high school in the US. A matched control group consisting of 88 students was used as a comparison, which added to the methodological validity of this study. The intervention group in Bushnell and Card’s (2003) study attended the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) for one class per week and there was a follow-up programme in which students who had completed the class were invited back to act as mentors or to teach concepts. Bushnell and Card (2003) found that the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) appeared to have a positive effect on grade point average, attendance and graduation rates when compared to a control condition.

Bushnell and Card (2003) cited a concern for the validity of their data in that students were able to opt out of the intervention. This might have left the researchers with only those pupils who were motivated to make behavioural changes. However, Bushnell and Card (2003) were able to randomise the sample in other ways, such as including scheduling conflicts that prevented some pupils from taking the class.

Baker (2008) looked at effects of the programme for CYP living in group homes, receiving residentially based services and attending a non-public school. An experimental group and a control group from matched schools were included in the study. CYP in the experimental group received weekly WhyTry sessions over a 16 week period. There were approximately 75 students in the experimental group ranging from 12 to 18 years, who received the WhyTry intervention in groups of six.

The main finding from this study was a significant increase in the self-efficacy of CYP in the experimental group post-intervention as measured by the Generalised Self-Efficacy Scale (Jerusalem & Schwarzer, 1995). However, Baker (2008) highlights a limitation of his study as one of external validity. He acknowledges the difficulty in generalising the findings of his study to other populations of CYP due to the sample size and the unique characteristics of the sample.

Mazzotta-Perretti (2009) conducted an investigation into the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) delivered twice weekly over a period of 10 weeks in a private middle school (grades six – eight, ages 11 – 14) located in a New York suburb. Forty CYP with attendance problems, negative attitudes towards teachers and school and external locus of control were selected for participation in the study.
The Behavioural Assessment System for Children (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 1992) and the Terra Nova standardised test assessing achievement (CTB/McGraw-Hill LLC, 2007) were administered pre- and post-intervention and results were compared with national norms. As in the Eggett (2003) study, Mazzotta-Perretti (2009) focused on the Attitude Toward School and Teachers and the Locus of Control scales of the Behavioural Assessment System for Children. CYP’s motivation was rated weekly via self-report and teacher report throughout the duration of the intervention. Behavioural rating forms were administered to teachers and parents pre- and post-intervention.

The main findings from this study were a positive correlation between the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) and CYP’s attendance, academic performance, positive behaviour and scores on the Behavioural Assessment System for Children (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 1992) Locus of Control scale and a negative correlation between the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) and CYP’s suspension and time spent in detention. However, the lack of a control group in this study negatively affects its validity and makes it difficult for one to draw reliable conclusions regarding the outcome.

Joye and Alvarez (2010) provide a case example of the use of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in US schools with CYP who were experiencing academic and behavioural difficulties. The programme was co-facilitated by a school social worker and a school psychologist with CYP in grades four and five. There were two groups that formed the basis of this case study, with three CYP in one group and five in the other. The groups met weekly for 15 weeks. They utilised the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) fidelity checklist (WhyTry Organization website) (see Appendix D) to systematically guide programme delivery. The frequency of unsafe behaviours, such as fighting, was measured daily and CYP’s progress within the school’s discipline system, referred to in the case study as a level system, was also measured along with their academic progress. The level system awards points to pupils for engaging in positive behaviours.

Taken together, CYP involved in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) showed a 66.4 per cent decline in unsafe behaviours over the course of the intervention. CYP receiving the WhyTry intervention showed increasing amounts of positive behaviour as measured by the school’s level system. The present researcher could not find any reference to the impact on academic data.
Joye and Alvarez (2010) include qualitative data from both the CYP involved in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) and from programme deliverers. CYP reported that they enjoyed the kinaesthetic activities and the Climbing Out analogy (see Appendix C). CYP commented that they learnt the most from the Jump Your Hurdles and the Lift the Weight analogies (see Appendix C). CYP were asked about situations where they had used a skill they had learnt during the WhyTry intervention and CYP responded with examples that indicated they had learnt some concepts from the programme, particularly from the Defence Mechanisms and Get Plugged In analogies (see Appendix C). Finally, CYP were asked about group composition. They reported that they did not like it when other CYP were coming in and out of the group, which Joye and Alvarez (2010) perceived as a threat to the trust built up within the small group of CYP. However, this latter point is Joye and Alvarez’s (2010) interpretation and not necessarily the views of the CYP themselves.

The programme deliverers reported their enjoyment of the multimodal interactive model of the programme, which captured the CYP’s and the deliverers’ interest. Some deliverers also commented that the programme encouraged pupils to self-monitor their behaviour and facilitated the generalisation of skills learnt during the intervention to the “outside world” (Joye & Alvarez, 2010, p.105). However, the programme deliverers also reported on the challenges to implementing the intervention. One challenge was the issue of conflicts with classroom time, which meant altering the delivery of the intervention. However, Joye and Alvarez (2010) note that this did not appear to affect the fidelity of the intervention. Joye and Alvarez (2010) conclude that the WhyTry intervention as presented in the case study was successful, but note that anticipating barriers to implementation is key to protecting programme fidelity. It is not clear from their report whether Joye and Alvarez (2010) used a model of implementation to systematically guide their qualitative data collection and they do not provide a list of questions they asked the participating pupils and programme deliverers. This has implications for the validity of the qualitative data collection and the replication of the study as a whole.

The present researcher acknowledges that most of these examples are doctoral dissertations and, therefore, have not been subject to full peer review. Even so, they suggest positive findings for the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001). However, the evidence base is not yet fully established, particularly in a UK context. There remain several gaps in the evidence base for this intervention and the present research aimed to go some way to addressing these gaps.
Firstly, the studies outlined above were carried out in the US and one cannot assume that these findings will be generalised to the UK context due to societal, cultural and educational differences between the two countries. Davies, Nutley and Smith (2000) have highlighted the importance of context and environment and have called into question the transferability of data from other countries. Therefore, the present researcher highlights the need for research into the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) to be conducted in the UK in order to build a UK evidence base and to consider implementation issues in a UK context. Further to this, the present research aimed to develop an evidence base at a local level, specific to one setting in the focus LA, to support the development of a local evidence base for this intervention, in line with TaMHS guidance (DCSF, 2008).

Secondly, the US studies mainly yield quantitative data and there is comparatively little explicit discussion of qualitative data, with the exception of the Joye and Alvarez (2010) case study. Although the present researcher acknowledges the importance of quantitative data in investigating the effectiveness of an intervention, she argues for a need for qualitative data in drawing out the details of the programme’s effectiveness, which the present research aims to provide. Also, most of the US studies focus on programme effectiveness only, whereas the present researcher highlights a need for further investigation into facilitators and barriers to programme implementation and how barriers can be overcome because, although the programme is manualised, the programme developer suggests adaptation to suit the group of CYP undertaking the programme (Moore, 2001). It was anticipated that investigation into why and how these adaptations are made would be useful, particularly at a local level, and may inform future practice.

Thirdly, although some of the US studies accessed pupil voice in the form of self-report questionnaires, there have been few published studies accessing CYP’s views of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) more explicitly through qualitative means. The present research aimed to address this gap by attempting to acquire CYP’s views on the effectiveness of the intervention as well as the programme’s strengths and weaknesses as perceived by the CYP through a focus group and subsequent thematic analysis.

2.7 Programme Diffusion
Building an evidence base for an intervention is only the first step towards supporting CYP with SEBD who may receive the intervention. Transferring effective programmes to real world settings and ensuring their maintenance is a complex
process dependent upon numerous factors including how well information about a programme and its value is disseminated (dissemination), whether an organisation or group decides to try the programme (adoption), how well the programme is conducted during a trial period (implementation) and whether the programme is maintained over time (sustainability) (Durlak & DuPre, 2008). This process in its entirety can be referred to as diffusion (Rogers, 2003). Previous research suggests that as the process of the diffusion of an intervention unfolds, its success decreases. This can be due to a number of factors. For example, many interventions may encounter implementation problems that can negatively affect an intervention’s impact (Rogers 2003).

The present study focused on the implementation phase of the diffusion of the intervention that is the focus of this piece of research – the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001). The researcher also sought to support the sustainability phase of the diffusion process following cessation of the delivery of the intervention through the development of an implementation framework specific to the focus school, although the outcome of this was not directly measured.

**2.7.1 Programme implementation.**

Implementation refers to what a programme consists of when it is delivered in a particular setting (Durlak & DuPre, 2008). As Berman and McLaughlin (1976) state, “the bridge between a promising idea and its impact on students is implementation”; however, “innovations are seldom implemented as planned” (p.349). This pertains particularly to the implementation of school-based programmes (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976). It is important to consider implementation issues carefully if we are to draw meaningful conclusions from the outcomes of an intervention because accurate interpretation of outcomes depends on possessing knowledge in relation to which aspects of an intervention were delivered and how well they were delivered (Durlak & DuPre, 2008).

In total, there are eight aspects to implementation. Dane and Schneider (1998) describe five of these (see Figure 2.6 below):
1) **Programme fidelity**: This refers to the extent to which the delivered programme corresponds to the originally intended programme.

2) **Programme dosage**: This refers to how much of the original programme has been delivered.

3) **Programme quality**: This refers to how well the programme has been delivered.

4) **Participant responsiveness**: This refers to how well the programme stimulates the participants.

5) **Programme differentiation**: This refers to the extent to which a programme’s theory and practices can be distinguished from other programmes.

Figure 2.6: Aspects to implementation (1)

In addition to these, there are a further three aspects to implementation highlighted by Durlak and DuPre (2008) (see Figure 2.7 below):

6) **Monitoring of control/comparison conditions**: This refers to any services received by these groups.

7) **Programme reach**: This refers to the rate of involvement and representativeness of programme participants.

8) **Adaptation**: This refers to changes made to the original programme during implementation.

Figure 2.7: Aspects to implementation (2)

Durlak & DuPre’s (2008) meta-analysis indicates that positive results can be obtained with around 60 per cent implementation. There are relatively few studies that have attained implementation levels greater than 80 per cent and no study contained in the Durlak and DuPre (2008) review achieved 100 per cent implementation. That said, Durlak and DuPre (2008) found strong support for their conclusion that programme implementation is an important determinant of programme outcome. However, this conclusion is based on the assumption that details given about programme implementation by the authors of the papers studied were accurate. They conclude that without sufficient data on implementation, research cannot document precisely which programme was implemented or how outcome data should be interpreted. This is supported to some degree by Petipas, Cornelius, Van Raalte and Jones (2005) who claim that “[i]t is important to describe in detail the specific elements of a program and how they were delivered in order to understand and interpret the results of any outcome analysis” (p.74). Furthermore,
Dusenbury, Brannigan, Falco and Hansen (2003) propose that the study of programme implementation will maintain quality and ensure programme objectives are achieved.

Knoche, Sheridan, Edwards and Osborn (2010) highlight the reasons why careful measurement of implementation fidelity is important. For example, failure to accurately measure programme fidelity may lead to an incorrect conclusion that an intervention is ineffective when it is effective (known as Type III error) or, conversely, that an intervention is effective when it is ineffective. In addition to this, failure to accurately measure programme fidelity could potentially lead to further implementation of an ineffective intervention if it was the case that a programme had been incorrectly judged to be effective. Also, failure to accurately measure programme fidelity may not reveal that an intervention was delivered in an uncontrolled way, which would inhibit further replication. Further to this, Dusenbury et al. (2003) suggest that another reason to measure fidelity is that it helps to explain why innovations succeed and fail and it helps to identify how adaptations affect outcomes. Finally, measuring fidelity of implementation reveals important information about the feasibility of an intervention, that is how likely it is that the intervention can and will be implemented with fidelity.

### 2.7.1.1 A note on adaptation.

Several surveys and studies suggest that programme deliverers frequently modify programmes during their implementation (Berman & McLaughlin 1976; Rogers, 2003; Ringwalt et al., 2003) and Durlak and DuPre (2008) report that adaptations made by programme deliverers can improve programme outcomes. Although Greenberg, Domitrovich, Graczyk and Zins (2005) claim that without high levels of fidelity to the original programme, positive results are less likely to be replicated, Durlak and DuPre (2008) conclude that as long as programme deliverers are knowledgeable about their communities, they should be able to adapt a programme in order to make it more effective in a specific context providing that they carefully measure what is happening during implementation. This more moderate position would argue that the more flexibility allowed for the modification of a programme to meet those needs, the greater the likelihood that the programme will be adopted, implemented and have positive results (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976). Durlak and DuPre (2008) argue that the focus should be on finding the right mix of fidelity and adaptation and that each of these dimensions must be measured during implementation.
The fidelity-adaptation debate has been argued in the programme implementation literature and, over time, the debate has shifted somewhat from whether or not adaptation is acceptable to which approaches to adaptation are acceptable and which may undermine programme effectiveness (O’Connor, Small & Cooney, 2007). Blakely et al. (1987) suggest acceptable approaches to adaptation – or “reinvention” (p.262) – namely addition, where the activity/material/facility is not described in the existing fidelity components, and modification, where the activity/material/facility is described in the existing fidelity components, but is not delivered as described. Blakely et al. (1987) describe omissions, where an activity/material/facility described in the existing fidelity components is deleted from programme delivery, as “unacceptable variation” (p.259).

Extending this further, O’Connor et al. (2007) have suggested acceptable, surface-level and risky/unacceptable, structural types of programme adaptation (see Figure 2.8).

![Types of program adaptations](Figure 2.8: Types of programme adaptations (taken from O’Connor et al., 2007, p.2))

It remains unclear as to exactly what mix of fidelity and adaptation will lead to optimal results. Hall and Loucks (1978) argue that adaptation is acceptable up to a
point, beyond which further adaptation may compromise the effectiveness of the programme. However, it is difficult to say where this point lies as this is likely to alter depending upon the programme and the context. Supporting this assertion, Berman (1981) suggests that there exists no global, best fidelity-adaptation strategy. The present researcher made only surface-level adaptations to the present intervention and avoided structural adaptations altogether. In terms of the types of adaptation described by Blakely et al., 1987), the present researcher endeavoured to make additions and modifications over omissions. Where omissions were made, the researcher ensured that as few essential components, as described by the fidelity monitoring checklist (see Appendix D), were omitted as was possible. All adaptations were measured throughout the course of implementation.

Out of the eight aspects to implementation, the ones that are of particular pertinence to the present study are programme fidelity, programme dosage, programme quality, participant responsiveness and programme adaptation. A full exploration of programme implementation was either not possible due to methodological constraints, i.e. in the case of monitoring of control/comparison conditions, or was beyond the scope of the present research. The present research used the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) as a framework and adapted the programme in order to develop a model that best fits with the context in which it is delivered, drawing on the knowledge of those working in the context, in line with suggestions by Durlak & DuPre (2008). This is also in accordance with advice in the programme manual, which advocates the adaptation of the programme to meet the needs of recipients (Moore, 2001). Any adaptations were carefully documented so that it is clear which aspects of the programme were utilised or changed, thereby documenting the balance of fidelity and adaptation as well as programme dosage. The fact that the researcher was a programme deliverer in the present research can be considered a strength as she was able to document this information carefully rather than relying on self-report from school staff. The researcher used a semi-structured interview with programme co-deliverers (CDs) and a focus group with pupil participants to discuss the other aspects of implementation under investigation in the present study: programme quality and participant responsiveness.

2.7.1.2 A framework for successful programme implementation.
Durlak and DuPre (2008) have suggested a framework for successful implementation following their review of the literature (see Figure 2.9, Durlak & DuPre, 2008).
The prevention delivery system concerns organisational capacity and the prevention support system concerns training and technical assistance. Both systems are integral to effective programme implementation, according to Durlak and DuPre (2008). They argue that organisational capacity is necessary in order to guide the implementation of a new programme, but that organisations cannot do this without support in the form of training and technical assistance provided by outside parties. Factors related to the prevention delivery system include effective leadership, shared decision making and the existence of at least one programme champion, particularly one who has high status amongst staff, who can orchestrate the entire diffusion process. Durlak and DuPre (2008) also describe factors related to the prevention support system concerned with training and technical assistance. Initial training aims to prepare programme providers effectively for delivery, but also address matters related to expectations, motivation and self-efficacy regarding their delivery of the programme as these factors can affect future delivery and support. Technical assistance refers to the resources available to providers once the intervention begins. The goals of technical assistance are to maintain motivation and commitment; improve skill levels where necessary; and support local problem solving.

Durlak and DuPre (2008) hypothesise that an organisation’s success in implementing an intervention is dependent upon three other factors: community
factors, such as policy and funding; provider characteristics, such as perceptions of the need for intervention, belief in the intervention and perceptions of self-efficacy; and innovation characteristics, such as adaptability and compatibility. Variables in all of these categories are thought to interact, providing an “extended ecological context for implementation” (Durlak & DuPre, 2008, p.335).

As Durlak and DuPre (2008) suggest, the conditions that are specifically required for effective implementation depend on a collection of factors due to the fact that local contexts differ. It is essential to develop sufficient capacity for implementation in order to support local providers in implementing programmes effectively. However, ultimately, the success of the programme is dependent upon the interaction of numerous ecological factors specific to the local context. The present research aims to support implementation by creating or capitalising on the optimum ecological context, as described by Durlak and DuPre (2008). However, as local contexts differ, what might be successful in one context may not be in another. Therefore, the present research aims to ascertain what successful implementation looks like in one secondary school in the focus LA. The present researcher devised a framework for successful implementation specific to the focus school, which she hopes will support sustainability, as she seeks to address some of the factors thought to affect sustainability through the implementation phase, such as quality training, a champion within the organisation and ongoing fidelity monitoring (Swain, Whitley, McHugo & Drake, 2009).

2.7.1.3 Potential barriers to implementation and suggested guidelines.
As highlighted by the literature (e.g. Durlak & DuPre, 2008), the implementation of programmes in general poses somewhat of a challenge to programme deliverers due to the complexity of implementation and contextual factors affecting implementation. Reddy and Newman (2009) suggest that the complexity of implementation is increased when working with the SEBD population.

Langley, Nadeem, Kataoka, Stein and Jaycox (2010) suggest several barriers to implementation in their exploration of factors that affect the implementation of a cognitive behavioural intervention in US schools. These barriers are presented in Figure 2.10 below:
• Competing responsibilities of the programme deliverers, including having multiple duties other than implementing the intervention and experiencing difficulties in scheduling and coordinating with school staff.

• Lack of parent engagement, including difficulties in contacting parents and engaging parents in treatment.

• Logistical barriers, including acquiring space and finding time to conduct the intervention.

• Lack of support from school administrators and teachers, especially those with perceived power within the school organisation, such as school principals.

Reddy and Newman (2009) suggest guidelines for practitioners to overcome barriers to designing, implementing and evaluating programmes with CYP with SEBD specifically. The present researcher will now present those particularly pertinent to the implementation phase of programme delivery in Figure 2.11 below:
The present researcher remained mindful of the potential barriers to implementing the current intervention (e.g. Langley et al., 2010) and guidelines to overcoming barriers to implementation (e.g. Reddy & Newman, 2009) throughout the course of the present research.

2.8 The Educational Psychologist’s Role
Evaluating outcomes is considered to be a key aspect of the EP role and a requirement of accountable and ethical professional practice (Frederickson, 2002). This is becoming increasingly the case as EP services are commissioned more frequently within the developing social and political context of public services (Fallon, Woods & Rooney, 2010). The commissioning of EPs’ work is likely to include the following:

- **Adopt a consumer perspective:** Programme design and evaluation should be directly linked to the consumers’ needs. Consumers can be pupils, parents and teachers. Reddy and Newman (2009) suggest conducting a needs assessment of consumers in order to guide programme design and evaluation to increase their investment and engagement in the programme.

- **Conduct resource mapping:** This involves assessing what resources are currently available within the community, in this case the school, and determining what resources the community is lacking. The process of resource mapping would then find resources in the wider community to supplement any absent resources in order to fulfil consumers’ needs. Examples of resources may include key staff members, parents/guardians, other pupils, building space and equipment.

- **Recruit key stakeholders:** According to Reddy and Newman (2009), effective programme development and implementation requires a commitment from all constituents of the community. Stakeholders in the development of school programmes should ideally include children and their families who will often have their own ideas about how programmes should meet their needs.

- **Utilise what works:** School-based programmes should detail their active treatment ingredients, training procedures and evaluation methods to allow for easier replication. Therefore, programme deliverers should note the parts of the programme they believe to have been particularly effective and prioritise these elements for future delivery.

---

**Figure 2.11: Practitioner guidelines (Reddy & Newman, 2009)**
increase the importance of EPs evaluating the outcomes of their work for CYP (Baxter & Frederickson, 2005) in order to demonstrate their effectiveness to commissioners of their services (Fallon, et al., 2010).

EPs have the requisite knowledge and skills in research design, implementation and analysis in order to evaluate interventions (Frederickson, 2002; Greig, 2001) and many EPs have evaluated programmes in schools previously (e.g. Liddle & Macmillan, 2010; Marsh, 2011). Therefore, as a trainee educational psychologist (TEP) in the focus LA, the present researcher was well placed to evaluate the outcomes of the intervention that is the focus of the present study.

EPs frequently work with and around CYP with SEBD as part of their day-to-day role and, therefore, EPs are well placed to support this population of CYP, either directly or indirectly. Liddle and Macmillan (2010) report positive effects of EPs delivering a group intervention, although they acknowledge evidence supporting the programme’s efficacy when delivered by non-mental health professionals, such as teachers (Barrett & Turner, 2001; Stallard, et al., 2007). Previous research has indicated that SEBD interventions may be as effective when delivered by a teacher as when delivered by a psychologist (see Cooper & Jacobs, 2011) and that interventions can be delivered by a range of professionals with therapeutic skills who have had appropriate training, ensure fidelity to guidelines and receive appropriate supervision (DfE, 2011b). Therefore, it does not appear to be essential that EPs deliver intervention programmes, but that they are able to facilitate training and supervision of staff to understand the underpinning philosophy of the programme and successfully embed the programme within their school systems.

The present researcher sought to facilitate school staff in skilling up on the delivery of the intervention with a view to school staff embedding the intervention within the focus school system following cessation of the research, thus supporting sustainability. Previous studies have looked at the effects of EPs training school staff over a period of time and found favourable results (see Cline, 2012; Willey Holliday & Martland, 2007). Willey et al. (2007) looked at the effects of EPs training school staff and found not only positive results for pupil participants in their study, but also for the adult participants – teachers and teaching assistants – who claimed that they had developed their knowledge, skills and confidence as a result of the training.
The present researcher evaluated the process of implementing an intervention through the adoption of a mixed methodological approach (see Chapter 3). In doing so, the researcher sought to synthesise applied and academic educational psychology and support this synthesis within the EP role generally. This supports Lane and Corrie’s (2006) conceptualisation of the EP role as that of scientist-practitioner, which involves EPs utilising scientific principles and methods within the context of EP practice to extend the knowledge base of the profession (Lane & Corrie, 2006).

2.9 Summary
The literature highlighting the potential negative academic and social outcomes for CYP with SEBD (e.g. Rusch & Chadsey, 1998; Cooper, 1999; Hallahan & Kaufman, 2000; Jull, 2008) provides a mandate for further investigation into what works for this population of CYP, particularly as TaMHS guidance advises practitioners to use evidence-based practice and develop practice-based evidence (DCSF, 2008).

Existing literature into what works for CYP with SEBD provides positive evidence for the TaMHS Project (DfES, 2008) (DfE, 2011a), the SEAL Programme (DfES, 2005; DCSF, 2007) (Hallam et al., 2006; Humphrey et al., 2008) and interventions that draw on two main psychological approaches: CBT and SFBT (e.g. Durlak et al., 1991; King et al., 1998; Gingerich & Eisengart, 2000; Kim, 2008; Newsome, 2004; Ruttledge and Pettrides, 2011; Squires, 2001).

One intervention that draws on both of these psychological approaches is the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001), US-based studies into which have yielded largely positive effects (Eggett, 2003; Bushnell & Card, 2003; Baker, 2008; Joye & Alvarez, 2010; Mazzotta-Perretti, 2009). There is currently a dearth of research into the effectiveness of the programme in a UK context and Cooper and Jacobs (2011) highlight a need to rigorously evaluate less well evidenced approaches, such as the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2011), to establish their efficacy.

Transferring effective programmes to real world settings and ensuring their maintenance is a complex process dependent upon numerous factors, including effective implementation (Durlak & DuPre, 2008). Durlak and DuPre (2008) have suggested that as long as programme deliverers are knowledgeable about their communities, they should be able to adapt a programme in order to make it more effective in a specific context providing that they carefully measure what is happening during implementation. The present researcher drew on the CDs’
knowledge of the focus school context and the pupil participants when adapting the programme in order to better address the individual needs of participants. Several barriers to programme implementation with the SEBD population have been highlighted (Langley et al., 2010) as well as guidelines for overcoming barriers to design and implementation (Reddy & Newman, 2009). These were considered by the researcher throughout the planning and delivery of the intervention in the present research.

EPs possess the requisite knowledge and skills to evaluate interventions (Frederickson, 2002; Greig, 2001). The researcher sought to facilitate school staff in skilling up on the delivery of the intervention with a view to school staff embedding the intervention within the focus school systems following cessation of the research. In doing so, the researcher followed recommendations from DfE (2011a) to consider the context within which the intervention is delivered when planning the intervention and to model close adherence to the programme as it is described in the programme manual (Moore, 2001) during delivery, combining this with local ownership to aid uptake (DfE, 2011a).

2.9.1 Expected contribution to knowledge and current research aims.
The present research aimed to provide UK-based evidence for the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) with one group of pupils in one focus secondary school and add to the relatively small body of quantitative data on the intervention. Further to this, the present research aimed to consider various implementation issues, such as facilitators and barriers to programme implementation and adaptation of the programme to meet the needs of its recipients and considered recommendations for future implementation leading to the development of a framework for implementation tailored to the focus school.

The present researcher is unaware of any other studies that have rigorously evaluated the implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in a UK context in the manner described herein. It was hoped that by using a mixed methods approach combining both qualitative and quantitative methodology, the present research would yield a robust, albeit small scale, process evaluation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in a UK context, providing a detailed rich picture of what works in terms of programme implementation in the focus school. Therefore, the present research aimed to evaluate both the effectiveness, characterised by an improvement in pupils’ SEBD, and the implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in a UK context.
2.10 Research Questions
This study aimed to achieve these aims through addressing the following research questions (RQs):

RQ1. To what extent is there evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) for pupils in a mainstream secondary school and are any gains sustained three months post-intervention?

RQ 2. Which factors appear to support or hinder the implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in one mainstream secondary school?

RQ 3. Which suggestions do pupil participants and programme deliverers make for future implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001)?
Chapter 3: METHODOLOGY
The review of the literature around the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) revealed a dearth of research that has rigorously evaluated the implementation of the intervention and that has provided a detailed rich picture of what works in terms of programme implementation in a UK context. Therefore, the present research aimed to evaluate both the effectiveness and the implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in a UK context. It is acknowledged that the data set is too small to consider generalisability of findings of this study to the wider population. Therefore, the present research restricts the study of the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) and the study of implementation factors pertaining to the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) to the delivery of the intervention to one group of pupils in the focus school. It is intended that this will facilitate sustainability of the programme in the focus school beyond the present research and the roll out of the programme across the Local Authority (LA), thus helping to support the sustainability of the Targeted Mental Health in Schools (TaMHS) Project (Department of Children Schools and Families [DCSF], 2008) in the focus LA.

In order to achieve these research aims, the study aimed to answer the following research questions (RQs):

RQ1. To what extent is there evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) for pupils in a mainstream secondary school and are any gains sustained three months post-intervention?

RQ 2. Which factors appear to support or hinder the implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in one mainstream secondary school?

RQ 3. Which suggestions do pupil participants and programme deliverers make for future implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001)?

3.1 Chapter Outline
This chapter describes the research design implemented in the present study, beginning with the rationale for this approach including an exploration of the researcher’s epistemological, ontological and axiological position. Data access, data gathering methods and data analysis methods will also be described. The researcher will present a critique of the present research methodology and ethical considerations will be explored.
3.2 Design
A researcher’s views and beliefs they hold about the world around them will inevitably influence not only their choice of research topic and research questions, but also the methodology they choose to adopt in order to explore these. It is therefore important to consider the researcher’s ontological, epistemological and axiological position in the present study.

3.2.1 Ontological and epistemological position.
Ontology concerns the nature of reality and considers the perspective(s) from which the research is viewed. Epistemology concerns the methods and limits of human knowledge; data validity and the uses of knowledge. In terms of the ontological and epistemological position taken by the present researcher, a critical realist position is favoured, which draws together elements of positivist and relativist traditions. Positivism and relativism will now be explored and there follows an exploration of a critical realist stance.

3.2.1.1 Positivism.
Positivism, which has been termed the “standard view” of science (Robson, 2002, p. 19), assumes that objective knowledge can be gained from direct experience or observation. According to the positivist view, that which can be observed is considered the only knowledge available and that which cannot be observed, such as theories or invisible entities, is rejected. Positivism also assumes that science is based on data gathered via quantitative methodologies, which are used to test hypotheses and establish cause and effect relationships (Robson, 2002).

However, positivism has come under criticism in terms of its underlying philosophy as well as its application to social research. Philosophically speaking, the positivist view does not take into account the fact that what is observed is influenced by the characteristics and perspectives of the observer, thus two different observers could observe the same entity in different ways and therefore reach differing conclusions regarding the knowledge and facts about the same entity. In terms of its application to social research, positivism regards participants as objects from which the researcher must remain distant so as to maintain objectivity. However, participants hold valuable knowledge and information relevant to the context and in treating them as objects, this information cannot be obtained (Sarantakos, 1998). Thus, a disadvantage of the adoption of a purely positivist approach is that it may result in the omission of important information from the data set.
3.2.1.2 Relativism.
In contrast to positivism, relativism maintains that there is no reality separate from the conceptual systems employed by people (Trigg, 1989) and, therefore, no external reality that exists outside of human consciousness (Robson, 2002). Relativism views the world as being seen through subjective experience and, therefore, assumes that there is no objective reality. The role of language is emphasised in relativist approaches, both as an object of study and as the central instrument by which the world is represented and constructed, and it follows that qualitative methodologies are used (Robson, 2002). In contrast to a positivist approach, a relativist approach views the research process as generating working hypotheses rather than empirical facts and places importance upon viewing the meaning of experience and behaviour in context (Robson, 2002).

As with positivism, relativism is not without its critics. It has been argued that accounts obtained utilising a relativist perspective are not true, but rather an invitation to view things from a particular perspective (Robson, 2002). Also, since relativism assumes that reality is dependent upon the views and perspectives of the individual, it follows that relativism deems it possible for there to exist multiple realities, which is a notion that the present researcher does not accept.

3.2.1.3 Critical realism.
As it is the present researcher’s view that neither a purely positivist nor a purely relativist approach would provide an ontological and epistemological position suitable for real world research, the researcher sought to adopt a more balanced stance: that of critical realism.

The work of Bhasker has been particularly influential in the field of realism (e.g. Bhasker, 1978). Bhasker asserts that “any position can be nominated ‘realist’ which asserts the existence of some disputed kind of entity” (Bhasker, 1986, p.5). In contrast to a positivist stance, the realist stance postulates that there are no scientific facts that are beyond dispute; that knowledge is a social product; and that facts are theory-laden. Thus, researcher and participant theories or views are upheld as important when working within a realist paradigm. This is the case in the present research, as participant and researcher views will be sought and represented.

The realist stance views the task of science as being to suggest theories to explain the real world, which can then be tested. The realist stance, therefore, incorporates
some of the more appealing features of the relativist approach, such as acknowledging the values and beliefs of participants, whilst still allowing for reference to be made to a reality that exists and, therefore, providing a basis for choice amongst different theories (Robson, 2002).

Furthermore, realism allows the integration of subjectivist and objectivist approaches in social research. A relativist approach suggests that the researcher and researched cannot be separated whilst a positivist approach suggests that the researcher is separate from whatever is being researched (Biesta & Burbules, 2003). However, it is the belief of the present researcher that the two approaches can co-exist and are not separate epistemologies. Thus, a realist approach allows one to conduct research with a grounding in scientific research whilst at the same time acknowledging the influence of the researcher.

The critical realist approach incorporates the perspectives of the participants (Robson, 2002) and can be useful in revealing what works for some people in some contexts (Matthews, 2010). Thus, research taking a critical realist stance will reveal local, tentative explanations of why things happen in the way that they do as opposed to overarching theories. This is in line with TaMHS guidance on developing a local evidence base for interventions (DCSF, 2008).

The stance taken by the researcher, that being the critical realist stance, inevitably dictates the methodology adopted because, as Robson (2002) states, “[f]or realists there are social objects which can be studied scientifically, but the methods chosen must fit the subject matter” (p.35). This is compatible with a pragmatic approach, which advocates the use of whatever methodological approach works best to answer the research questions (Robson, 2002). The methodology adopted by the present researcher will be discussed further in Section 3.2.4.

The present researcher sought to ascertain and explore the views of pupil and adult participants regarding their experiences of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) within the epistemological and ontological stance of critical realism. Thus, whilst participant views were sought and accurately represented, the research will inevitably be influenced by the researcher’s own experiences and, therefore, the researcher acknowledges that an absolute truth cannot be defined within the context of the present research.
3.2.2 Axiological position.
Axiology is concerned with the role of values in research. It is acknowledged that a researcher’s values will influence the selection of research topic; the way in which the research is conducted; and the way findings are interpreted and reported. It is therefore important for the present researcher to be clear on her values and beliefs.

An influential belief of the researcher that underpins this research is that children and young people’s (CYP’s) social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD) have wide reaching and pervasive negative effects on CYP at a number of levels, as revealed by previous research (e.g. Rusch & Chadsey, 1998; Cooper, 1999; Hallahan & Kaufman, 2000; Jull, 2008) and, therefore, the researcher believes that research into what works for this vulnerable group of CYP is important and valuable and has sought to investigate one intervention that claims to support CYP with SEBD – the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001).

A further belief underpinning this research is that CYP’s views are important. Therefore, the researcher sought to gather pupil participant views regarding the intervention through both quantitative and, arguably more importantly, qualitative means to ensure that they are fully represented.

Another belief that underpins the research is that school personnel are best placed to support CYP’s SEBD in the setting. This led to the researcher including adult participants, who are members of staff in the focus school, in the planning and delivery of the intervention being studied and ascertaining their views through qualitative means. This belief was the main driver behind the researcher’s intention to provide school staff with a model of delivery specific to the focus school in the hope that this will enable further delivery, thus assisting school staff in supporting the SEBD of the CYP in their setting.

One final belief underpinning this research is that educational psychologists (EPs) should be involved in the dissemination of knowledge to and the development of skills of those working with CYP with special educational needs (SEN), including SEBD, which is a further reason for the present researcher choosing to include school staff in the planning, delivery and evaluation of the intervention currently being studied.
3.2.3 Process evaluation design.
This research utilises an exploratory process evaluation design in order to evaluate an intervention programme with one group of participants and consider implementation issues in a single mainstream secondary school.

Originally, the researcher had intended to run two WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) group interventions in the focus school. After running group one, the researcher would have engaged pupil participants and co-deliverers (CDs) in separate focus groups to explore facilitators and barriers of programme implementation before analysing partial transcriptions and making adaptations to the programme in light of the findings. The researcher would have then externally supported the delivery of the intervention to a second group of pupil participants. This design would have allowed the researcher to incrementally address implementation issues, initially at a group level and latterly at a systemic level. Furthermore, through taking pre-/post-intervention and follow-up measures from both groups, the researcher could have looked at programme effectiveness for two groups of pupils in the focus school. However, due to time delays, the researcher was unable to carry out the present research in this way. Instead, the researcher was only able to include one intervention group in the present research. Therefore, whilst the present research design allows the researcher to evaluate programme effectiveness for one group of pupils in the focus school, the main focus of the research will be on the evaluation of the process of initial implementation of a group intervention in the focus school.

The traditional view of evaluation is focused on outcome, which involves measuring to what extent an intervention meets its objectives (Robson, 2002). Process evaluation looks at how an intervention operates, which is important as “the discrepancy between the ‘official’ view of what should be going on and what is actually taking place may be substantial” (Robson, 2002, p.208). Process evaluation is seen as being complementary to outcome evaluation as one cannot reliably study the outcome of an intervention without having a systematic understanding of the process involved in leading to the outcome. As Cline (2012) states, “[a] full understanding of ‘what works’ involves a clear-sighted view of the conditions that are necessary for success” (p.16) in order to be able to state with any conviction “what it is about a programme which works for whom in what circumstances” (Pawson & Tilley, 1997, p.217).
Process evaluation monitors operations so that faults in the design are identified and guidance for alterations is provided. This type of evaluation allows for a full account of the nature of implementation to be recorded and requires regular feedback meetings between the process evaluator, i.e. the researcher in the present research, and others involved, i.e. the CDs in the present research and the pupil participants themselves (Stufflebeam et al., 1971; Popham, 1975; Stufflebeam, 1983).

Robson (2002) suggests that “the purpose of evaluation is not to prove but to improve” (p.209) and this is the case in the present research. The researcher does not purport to draw conclusions from the present study regarding the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in general terms, as the sample size contained within the present research is too small to allow consideration of generalisability. Rather, the researcher hopes to consider effectiveness for the group of participants included in the present study as well as how the intervention is implemented and how the implementation of the intervention can be improved upon for future delivery. In this sense, the present research is concerned with formative evaluation (Scriven, 1967) and will be used for the improvement of an ongoing intervention. In the interests of utility to practitioners and policy makers, evaluative research should ideally be both formative and summative in nature (Cline, 2012). However, the present researcher must first of all ascertain how to implement the intervention effectively in the focus school before attempting to draw any inferences through summative objectives.

3.2.4 Mixed methodology.
The present researcher gathered both quantitative and qualitative data to allow for the exploration of both programme effectiveness and programme implementation. This is described as a mixed methods approach or mixed methodology. The mixed methods approach within research has been steadily growing in popularity since the 1960s (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2009). Mixed methods research involves gathering, analysing and drawing conclusions from quantitative and qualitative data in a single study. Powell, Mihalas, Onwuegbuzie, Suldo and Daley (2008) suggest that “[m]ixed methods research should be used when the research question suggests that combining quantitative and qualitative approaches is likely to provide superior research findings” (p.292), which the present researcher believes to be the case for RQ1 in the present research.
Quantitative research traditionally deals with numerical measurements and is the favoured approach by those researchers taking a positivist stance. In contrast, qualitative research aims to produce a rich picture through the gathering of non-numerical data and is the favoured approach by researchers taking a relativist stance. Although there has been a long-standing debate regarding the utility of each approach in isolation (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998), Bryman (1988) argues for a compatibility between the two approaches and thus argues for a pragmatic approach, such as that taken in the present research, whereby the researcher chooses whichever methods work best to answer the research questions. This supports Johnson and Onwuegbuzie’s (2004) view that “research approaches should be mixed in ways that offer the best opportunities for answering important research questions” (p.16) and is in keeping with a critical realist stance, as those adopting such a stance do not view quantitative and qualitative methodologies as being irreconcilable (Scott, 2007).

Approaches to research can be considered to be on a continuum from mono-method designs, employing one of either quantitative or qualitative methods, at one end of the continuum to fully mixed methods at the other end of the continuum (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson 2004), with partially mixed methods lying somewhere in between. Whereas a fully mixed methods approach involves mixing quantitative and qualitative data gathering within one or more stages of the study, in a partially mixed methods approach the quantitative and qualitative data gathering is not mixed. Instead, quantitative and qualitative data gathering are conducted either concurrently (at the same point in time) or sequentially (at different time points) and later mixed at the interpretation stage (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2009). Qualitative and quantitative phases of research can have approximately equal emphasis with respect to addressing the research question(s) (equal status) or one component has significantly higher priority than the other with respect to addressing the research question(s) (dominant status) (see Figure 3.1, Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2009).
The present researcher utilises a partially mixed concurrent dominant status methodological design as she uses multiple methods in an attempt to confirm, cross validate and corroborate findings within a single study (Greene, Caracelli & Graham, 1989; Morgan, 1998; Steckler, McLeroy, Goodman, Bird & McCormick, 1992) and data are mixed at the interpretation stage. The qualitative data represents the dominant phase of the research as it is considered by the present researcher to contain the richest data in the data set. Also, the group of participants in the present research is not considered large enough from which to draw any conclusive findings from the quantitative data. The purpose of combining the quantitative and qualitative
data is to lend more meaning to the quantitative data by including contextual data and add a more objective and complementary quantitative layer to the qualitative data. The researcher took the decision to combine the data from the focus group, semi-structured interview and research diary, representing the pupil participants’, CDs’ and researcher’s views respectively, in one thematic analysis so as to avoid lending weight to one set of data over another. The researcher considered pupil voice to be just as relevant and important as the voice of the adults within this research and, therefore, saw no advantage in separating out the data. This is in keeping with the researcher’s ontological, epistemological and axiological positions (see Section 3.2.1 and Section 3.2.2) and was an approach favoured by Lyons (2011) in her evaluation of a school-based intervention.

As Robson (2002) suggests, an advantage of employing a mixed methods approach is triangulation, which he describes as “a method of finding out where something is by getting a ‘fix’ on it from two or more places” (p.371). Similarly, Denzin (1978) has defined triangulation as “the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon” (p.291). Robson (2002) suggests the use of methods that are very different from one another to gain a better estimate of the answer. For RQ1, which investigates the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) for one group of pupils in the focus school, the present researcher sought to triangulate the quantitative data gathered in the form of questionnaires and discipline data with qualitative data in the form of a focus group with pupil participants, a semi-structured interview with CDs and observations.

Robson (2002) cites a further advantage of employing multiple methods as allowing the researcher to address different RQs. The present researcher used both quantitative and qualitative methods to address RQ1 (as described above) and qualitative methods in the form of a focus group, semi-structured interview and observations to address RQ2, which looked at barriers and facilitators to implementation, and RQ3, which considered recommendations for future delivery, thus meeting the study’s broad aims to investigate the effectiveness of the programme and implementation issues related to the programme. An overview of the data gathering and analysis methods in relation to each of the three RQs is provided in Table 3.1 below:
### Table 2.1: Data gathering and analysis methods in relation to RQs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Gathering Method (and date of collection)</th>
<th>Data Method</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. To what extent is there evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) for pupils in a mainstream secondary school and are any gains sustained three months post-intervention? | - Discipline data  
- WhyTry Measure  
- Beck Disruptive Behaviour Inventory for Youth  
- Beck Self-Concept Inventory for Youth (September 2011, December 2011, March 2012)  
- Focus Group with pupils (December 2011)  
- Semi-structured interview with codeliverers (December 2011)  
- Research diary (September – December 2011) | Descriptive statistics  
Descriptive statistics/qualitative description | Descriptive statistics  
Descriptive statistics  
Thematic analysis |
| 2. Which factors appear to support or hinder the implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in one mainstream secondary school? | - Focus Group with pupils (December 2011)  
- Semi-structured interview with codeliverers (December 2011)  
- Research diary (September – December 2011) | Thematic analysis | Thematic analysis  
Thematic analysis  
Thematic analysis |
| 3. Which suggestions do pupil participants and programme deliverers make for future implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001)? | - Focus Group with pupils (December 2011)  
- Semi-structured interview with codeliverers (December 2011) | Thematic analysis | Thematic analysis |

### 3.3 Data Access
The research took place in one mainstream secondary school in the focus LA, which is located in the Northwest of England in an area of low socio-economic status. The focus school within which the research took place is a mixed mainstream secondary school with a sixth form catering for pupils aged 11 – 18. At the time of the research taking place, there were approximately 909 pupils on the
school roll. The number of pupils eligible for free school meals was just above the national average. The vast majority of pupils were from White British heritage. The proportion of pupils identified as having SEN was in line with the national average (Office for Standards in Education [Ofsted], 2009). This school was selected as it was one of two secondary schools involved in the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) in the LA, the other secondary school being a specialist provision.

The researcher engaged in an initial set up meeting with the TaMHS link person in the focus school to enable preliminary discussion about the principles of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) as well as pupil selection and CD selection (see Appendix E for a list of questions and probes). It was not intended that this discussion would form part of the data set, but that it would inform the researcher about the context in which the research was taking place and it would facilitate the selection of adult and pupil participants.

Six children from one year group were invited to form the intervention group. Children identified as having or being at risk of having SEBD were invited to participate and were selected based on a screening tool and school based assessment processes. The screening tool used was the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) (Goodman 1997; 1999), which had already been administered to Key Stage 3 pupils at the focus school as part of the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008). This is a valid measure of SEBD that is commonly used by practitioners in the focus LA. The present researcher accessed the details of the pupils who scored within or close to the ‘borderline’ range on the SDQ and approached the TaMHS link with these names. The TaMHS link person, in consultation with the Head of Year for the targeted year group, selected participants based on advice given by the researcher on what types of pupils were likely to benefit from this intervention, taking into account programme guidelines (Moore, 2001) and previous research findings (Cooper & Jacobs, 2011; Eggett, 2003; Bushnell & Card, 2003; Baker, 2008; Mazzotta-Perretti, 2009; Joye & Alvarez, 2010). Those pupils who scored within the ‘abnormal’ range on the SDQ and, therefore, presented with potentially clinical levels of difficulty were signposted for individual intervention/referral to outside agencies.

The group selected comprised a mix of pupils identified by the TaMHS link person and Head of Year as displaying externalising SEBD and internalising SEBD as the main presenting issue. The researcher advised school staff to organise the group in
this way following advice from an educational psychologist (EP) colleague who suggested that a group made up of CYP displaying externalising SEBD as the main presenting issue might prove difficult to manage, whereas it might be difficult to generate discussion in a group made up of CYP displaying internalising SEBD as the main presenting issue. This is in line with suggestions in the research (e.g. Cooper & Jacobs; Dishion, McCord & Poulin, 1999). All pupil participants included in the intervention group were male, from White British heritage and at the School Action Plus stage of the graduated response to SEN (DfES, 2001). All pupils were 12 years old at the start of the intervention in September 2011. Further details regarding the pupil participants obtained from discussions with co-deliverers and observations during group delivery are summarised in Section 4.3.1.

Parental permission was obtained for all pupil participants prior to the start of the intervention and was not withdrawn for any of the pupil participants once the study had begun.

The researcher requested at least one CD. This was following the findings of an earlier research project carried out by the present researcher, which indicated that having two deliverers of the programme was facilitative of programme delivery (Kay, 2010). Furthermore, having one or more CDs would support another of the research's aims, which was to upskill school staff on the delivery of the intervention, thereby supporting sustainability of the intervention and of the wider TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008). The TaMHS link provided the researcher with three CDs – one raising aspirations coordinator and inclusion support person (CD1) and two level 3 teaching assistants (CD2 and CD3). It was initially felt by the researcher that a 4:6 adult to pupil ratio might be too high; however, the inclusion of three CDs mitigated against the potential negative effects of drop out, which unfortunately occurred in the present study (see Section 4.5).

Parental consent and child assent was requested prior to the pupil participants becoming part of the group, in line with ethics procedures (see Appendices F – G for parental consent form/information sheet and child assent form). The TaMHS link person selected three staff members to become CDs, having ascertained their interest in the project. The researcher then obtained informed consent from the CDs to participate in the research (see Appendix H for CD consent form).

The programme was then delivered by the researcher, who accessed training in delivery of the programme in July 2011 and supervision from Health Professions
Council registered practitioners throughout the course of the intervention. The researcher was supported in the delivery of the programme by the CDs and liaised closely with them throughout the course of the research on matters regarding planning, delivery and evaluation. This allowed the researcher to be supported in delivery and also to model the delivery of the programme to school staff with a view to upskilling staff for future implementation once the research had ceased.

3.4 Data Gathering Methods
The researcher utilised both quantitative and qualitative methods to investigate programme effectiveness for one group of pupils in the focus school (RQ1). The researcher also sought to explore factors associated with programme implementation using qualitative methods (RQ2 and RQ3). The researcher will now explore the methods that were employed for quantitative data collection followed by those that were employed for qualitative data collection. It should be noted that all forms of data collection were anonymised according to a coding system known only to the researcher and kept securely throughout the research process, in accordance with ethical procedures described herein (see Section 3.7).

3.4.1 Quantitative data collection.
The researcher gathered pre-intervention data from the pupil participants prior to the programme starting in September 2011; post-intervention data were gathered following cessation of the programme in December 2011; and follow-up data were gathered in March 2012. All of the data gathering tools were selected based on previous research and the intended outcomes of the intervention (see Section 2.6).

There follows a summary of the quantitative data gathered.

3.4.1.1 Discipline data.
The researcher liaised with the CDs when obtaining discipline data from the school administration system. This comprised information regarding achievement points obtained (awarded for positive behaviours), behaviour points obtained (given for negative behaviours) and the number of times a pupil had been placed on a report card (usually a response to persistent negative behaviour). These data were obtained to see what effect, if any, the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) had had on pupil behaviour.

The pre-intervention discipline data covered the term prior to the start of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) delivery, i.e. the Summer term of the 2010/11 academic year; the post-intervention discipline data covered the term in which the intervention
was delivered, i.e. the Autumn term of the academic year 2011/12; and the follow-up discipline data covered the term following cessation of the delivery of the intervention, i.e. the Spring term of the 2011/12 academic year.

3.4.1.2 Questionnaire design.

The present research utilised questionnaires as part of the methodological design. Although in many cases the researcher need not be present when the questionnaire is completed (Munn & Drever, 1990), in the present study, the researcher supported completion of the questionnaire so as to mitigate against the effects of any potential literacy difficulties within the participants, as suggested by previous literature (e.g. Miles & Stipek, 2006).

The main advantages common to all questionnaires are that they are a quick and relatively cheap way of gathering information; are fairly easy to analyse if the questionnaire consists of closed questions, as in the case of the present research; and support a standardised design, as all respondents are asked the same questions (Munn & Drever, 1990).

3.4.1.2.1 WhyTry Measure.

The WhyTry Measure (WTM) (WhyTry Organization website) is a pre-post test designed to measure constructs such as CYP’s knowledge of the WhyTry curriculum, positive self-concept and access to support systems. It is suitable for use for CYP aged eight to 18 (see Appendix I).

The WTM was selected as it is a recommended measurement tool for practitioners delivering the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) (WhyTry Organization website). The measure is non-standardised and has a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .86, indicating good internal consistency (WhyTry Organization website). The WTM’s original items were piloted in a large cross-cultural urban school district in the US. Input from teachers, social workers, psychologists, counsellors and other staff was gathered regarding the acceptability, readability and necessity of the original items to leave 27 items on the current version of the measure. These items describe people and are specific to the objectives of WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001). Respondents are required to indicate to what extent each item describes them by circling a response on a Likert-type scale, where 1 represents strongly disagree, 2 represents disagree, 3 represents undecided, 4 represents agree and 5 represents strongly agree.
The WTM (WhyTry Organization website) was administered to each pupil participant by the researcher in a private one-to-one setting. Although the measure is designed to be read and understood by children, the researcher read the items to pupil participants so as to mitigate against the effects of any potential literacy difficulties and to ensure a thorough understanding of each item. This was done with all pupil participants, regardless of literacy ability, so as to ensure consistency of approach.

3.4.1.2.2 Beck Youth Inventories.
The Beck Disruptive Behaviour Inventory for Youth (see Appendix J) and Beck Self-Concept Inventory for Youth (see Appendix K) (Beck, Beck, Jolly & Steer, 2005) were selected for use as they are different and complementary measures to the other measures described herein. They are easily accessible and are already widely used measures of CYP’s behaviour and self-concept within the focus LA. Each scale consists of 20 items regarding things that happen to people and the way that people think or feel. Respondents are required to indicate to what extent the item applies to them by circling a response on a Likert-type scale from 0 (never), through 1 (sometimes), through 2 (often), to 3 (always).

The Beck Youth Inventories (Beck et al., 2005) are standardised, broader measures of mental health and key areas of social and emotional well-being than the WhyTry Measure (WhyTry Organization website). The Beck Youth Inventories (Beck et al., 2005) have Cronbach’s alpha coefficients ranging from .86 to .96, indicating good internal consistency for all age groups on all scales. Test-retest reliability ranges from .74 to .93 for all age groups and genders on all scales (Beck et al., 2005). The present researcher considered it important to utilise measures of pupils’ internalising as well as externalising SEBD, given the inclusion of pupils experiencing each type of SEBD in the present research.

The Beck Youth Inventories (Beck et al., 2005) were administered to each pupil participant by the researcher in a private one-to-one setting. As with the WhyTry Measure (WhyTry Organization website), although the inventories are designed to be understood by children, the researcher read the items to the participants so as to mitigate against the effects of any potential literacy difficulties and to ensure a thorough understanding of each item. This was done with all six pupil participants, regardless of literacy ability, so as to ensure consistency of approach across all participants.
3.4.2 Qualitative data collection.
Patton (2002) claims that participants' qualitative reflections strengthen the face validity and credibility of the research. The researcher gathered qualitative data with a view to triangulating the findings of RQ1 and to address RQ2 and RQ3.

3.4.2.1 Focus group.
The researcher ran a focus group with pupil participants following cessation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) delivery in December 2011.

Focus groups are a very popular method of data collection in applied social research (Robson, 2002). A focus group, often referred to as a focus group interview, is “a qualitative data collection method in which one or two researchers and several participants meet as a group to discuss a given research topic” (Mack, Woodsong, MacQueen, Guest & Namey, 2005, p. 51). Open ended questions are asked throughout to encourage in-depth responses (Mack et al., 2005). It is in keeping with the critical realist perspective taken by the present researcher as it seeks to ascertain and explore the views of participants. Opinion varies on the optimum group size for a focus group; between eight and 12 participants is thought to be suitable (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990). Morgan (1988) suggests that four is the smallest size for a focus group and 12 is the upper limit, with the usual size being somewhere between six and ten participants.

The focus group was selected as a data gathering tool in the present research due to its ability to gather rich data efficiently, since it is possible to gather data from more than one person at a time and it is relatively quick and easy to set up. It can also empower participants as their views are upheld as important and valued; this is in keeping with the critical realist approach adopted in the present research. A reason for adopting a focus group over several semi-structured interviews with individual pupil participants, aside from a time factor, is that group dynamics can facilitate richer discussion, as group members can prompt one another to share their views. Also, “the explicit use of the group interaction to produce data and insights that would be less accessible without the interaction found in a group” is considered to be the “hallmark of focus groups” (Morgan, 1988, p.12). Finally, the fact that the focus group centred around a discussion meant that any literacy difficulties pupil participants may have had were adequately supported.
The focus group was semi-structured in nature (see Appendix L for focus group schedule). It was intended that the semi-structured nature would allow for flexibility in the exploration of the topics under discussion.

In designing the focus group schedule, the researcher used key aspects of programme implementation identified by previous researchers as a structure (see Appendix M). This provided a source of validity for the focus group schedule. The focus group schedule included questions on programme effectiveness and some aspects of programme implementation, including programme quality, participant responsiveness and programme reach. It also included questions linked to delivery system barriers and facilitators and future adaptation. It was intended that the focus group may inform future adaptations the school makes to the programme to increase the relevance of the programme to the context in which it is being delivered.

It was acknowledged that there was a potential for bias in the phrasing of questions posed throughout the focus groups since the focus group schedule was designed by the researcher. To help diminish this risk and to ensure the questions included in the schedule were clear and unambiguous, the focus group schedule was independently checked by the researcher’s university tutor.

Mack et al. (2005) suggest conducting focus groups in a location which affords a maximum degree of privacy to participants and that this is a decision that should be taken by someone familiar with the context. Therefore, the researcher asked the CDs to organise a private room within the school in which to conduct the focus group that would be free from interruption throughout the duration of the interview.

It was important for the researcher, as the facilitator of the focus group, to utilise effective communication skills to ensure a full and frank discussion of views. Mack et al. (2005) suggest that building rapport between group members is important and suggest some ways in which rapport can be built, one of which is establishing ground rules at the start of the focus group. This was done explicitly with pupil participants as the ground rules used during the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) sessions were adopted (see Appendix N for a photograph of the ground rules displayed during the WhyTry sessions). During the focus group, the researcher was mindful of group dynamics and ensured each group member had an opportunity to express their views and that no group member dominated. However, the building of rapport between group members had already been achieved to an extent.
throughout the duration of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) and was not of primary concern to the present researcher in this instance.

The focus group was audio-recorded using a digital voice recorder, thus allowing the researcher to focus on guiding the group interview rather than making detailed notes. However, the researcher made brief notes of key points during the focus group to help guard against potential technological malfunction. These notes also allowed the researcher to check with focus group members that key points had been noted down at the end of the focus group.

**3.4.2.2 Semi-structured interview.**

A semi-structured interview was used to obtain the views of the CDs within the present research. This was conducted in December 2011, following cessation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) intervention.

Interviews typically involve the researcher asking questions and receiving answers from those being interviewed. Interviews are commonly one-to-one, but they can take place in group settings, as in the case of the present research. The decision to conduct one interview with all CDs as opposed to separate one-to-one interviews was largely based on the fact that the researcher had minimal time to gather data in the context of other data gathering methods being utilised. It was also felt that, although the number of interviewees would be considered too small for the method to constitute a focus group, the inclusion of all CDs in the one interview would allow for richer discussion due to group dynamics, albeit a smaller group than would be expected for a focus group (Morgan, 1988).

The researcher in the present study opted to use a semi-structured interview. This has predetermined questions, but the researcher is allowed the freedom to alter the wording of the questions, give explanations and omit or include additional questions as appropriate (Robson, 2002). Semi-structured interview schedules can take the following format:

- introductory comments (probably a verbatim script);
- list of topic headings and possibly key questions to ask under these headings;
- set of associated prompts;
- closing comments.

(Robson, 2002, p.278)
The interview schedule for the present research takes this approximate form and can be viewed in Appendix O.

The main advantages of the interview as a data gathering tool are that it is far more flexible than many other data gathering tools and allows for greater depth of data analysis than many other methods of data collection (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007), such as a questionnaire, due to its potential to provide a rich data set. Furthermore, interviews give interviewees an opportunity to clarify questions and give interviewers an opportunity to probe.

As in the case of the focus group schedule, the researcher used key aspects of programme implementation identified by previous researchers as a structure for the semi-structured interview with CDs (see Appendix M). This provided a source of validity for the interview schedule. The interview schedule included questions on programme effectiveness; some aspects of programme implementation, including programme quality, participant responsiveness, programme reach; delivery system barriers and facilitators; future adaptation; and programme sustainability. It was intended that the interview may inform future adaptations the school makes to the programme to increase the relevance of the programme to the context in which it is delivered.

**3.4.2.3 Research diary.**

Robson (2002) describes it as “good practice to keep a full and complete record of all the various activities with which you are involved in connection with the project” (p.1). Nadin and Cassell (2006) suggest that a reflexive stance – where the researcher reflects on the way in which research is carried out – is required in order to identify and understand the influences on research and the research diary is a tool that can be used for such reflexive analysis.

Robson (2002) suggests a flexible approach to keeping a research diary, but suggests the inclusion of, amongst other things, the researcher’s thoughts relevant to the project and a reflective account of the process of the research.

The present researcher included the following in the research diary utilised in the present research:

- detailed information on aspects of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) which were delivered, omitted or adapted;
- contextual information at individual, group and systemic levels;
• researcher thoughts and observations during the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) sessions (written retrospectively);
• researcher reflections outside the context of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) sessions;
• CD comments during planning/evaluation meetings, which took place after each WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) session;
• fidelity checklist (WhyTry Organization website) in relation to each session (see Appendix D).

It was intended that the more practical elements of the research diary would support the researcher in exploring methodological issues as well as supplementing the content of the focus group and semi-structured interview data. Researcher reflections should allow for exploration of how the researcher’s assumptions, values and beliefs impacted upon the research as a whole.

It is acknowledged that there is a threat to the reliability of data gathered from the research diary as, in keeping with the critical realist stance, what is observed and experienced, and therefore noted down in the research diary, was subject to individual interpretation. Therefore, there was a risk that the researcher may inadvertently note down observations and comments that support their theories and neglect to note down observations and comments that negate their theories. In order to mitigate against this, the researcher engaged in continual self-reflection and self-questioning about the relevance of any included and omitted data. Reflection also took place during tutorials with the researcher’s university tutor and with EP colleagues, which helped to mitigate against the effects of any biased reporting.

3.5 Data Analysis
There follows a description of how the quantitative data in the present research were analysed followed by a description of how the qualitative data were analysed.

3.5.1 Quantitative data analysis.
Due to the small sample size (n=6) quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics. The raw scores from the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) and the Beck Youth Inventories (Beck et al., 2005) were compared pre-intervention, post-intervention and at the follow-up stage. Raw data from the discipline data were analysed in the same way. Trends are reported at the group and individual levels and data are described in Chapter 4.
In contrast to inferential statistics which seek to draw conclusions from data, the aim of descriptive statistics is to show what the data is (Gray, 2004). A summary picture of the sample will be created in Chapter 4 and the researcher will draw conclusions in Chapter 5.

3.5.2 Qualitative data analysis.
The focus group data were partially transcribed and analysed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

3.5.2.1 Partial transcription.
The act of transcription itself can be viewed as a way of a researcher familiarising him/herself with their data (Reissman, 1993). Some authors have gone as far as to claim that transcription should be seen as a key phase of analysis (Bird, 2005).

According to Braun and Clarke (2006), as there is no set way in which to conduct thematic analysis, it follows that there are no set guidelines to follow when producing a transcript. They suggest that thematic analysis does not require the same level of detail as other forms of analysis, such as discourse analysis. Therefore, the present researcher opted for partial transcription as a method of transcription in the present study. This involved the omission of detail regarding non-verbal communication, unless the inclusion of such detail supported the reader’s understanding of the transcript; detail regarding speech, such as the use of intonation and pauses; and any irrelevant, off-topic conversation. The fact that the transcription was not verbatim has led the researcher to consider it partial in nature. Once partial transcription had been completed, the researcher deleted the audio version of the focus group and semi-structured interview discussions in accordance with information given at the time of gaining informed consent from both the pupil and adult participants.

3.5.2.2 Thematic analysis.
The researcher analysed partial transcriptions of the focus group and semi-structured interview and the research diary using thematic analysis. The data were analysed together as a complete data set (Lyons, 2011). The rationale for analysing the data in this way was to avoid the scenario where one set of data would be given more emphasis than another set of data. For example, if the pupil focus group and the co-deliverer semi-structured interview were analysed separately, some readers might interpret the co-deliverer themes as holding more weight, as these themes were derived from adult opinion as opposed to child views. However, it was important to the researcher that all data were viewed as having equal importance.
and, therefore, the researcher pooled the data together and analysed this as a complete data set. Thematic analysis is “a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.79). It is a tool that can be used to organise and describe one’s data set in rich detail. The approach appealed to the researcher as it is not underpinned by any theoretical framework; therefore, it is possible to use thematic analysis within different frameworks, including critical realism whereby the researcher is able to acknowledge the ways in which participants make meaning of their experience and the ways in which the context impinges on those meanings whilst retaining a focus on the data. Whilst conducting the thematic analysis, the researcher followed the six phase process described by Braun and Clarke (2006), which is detailed in Figure 3.2 below and expanded upon later in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description of the process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Familiarizing yourself with your data:</td>
<td>Transcribing data (if necessary), reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Generating initial codes:</td>
<td>Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Searching for themes:</td>
<td>Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reviewing themes:</td>
<td>Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2), generating a thematic ‘map’ of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Defining and naming themes:</td>
<td>Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Producing the report:</td>
<td>The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.2: Phases of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.87)

A theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question(s) (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Braun and Clarke (2006) claim that there are no guidelines as to what proportion of the data needs to show evidence of a theme for it to be considered a theme and that it is largely down to researcher judgement as to what a theme is. The qualitative data analysis described herein shows how themes are supported by extracts, or quotations, from the raw data to ensure a focus of data interpretation on the actual words of the participants.

When conducting thematic analysis, one can either take an inductive or a theoretical approach. In inductive analysis, themes are identified in a “bottom-up” way (Braun & Clarke, 2006. p.83) whereby themes are strongly linked to data and the analysis is not driven by the researcher’s interest in the area or preconceptions regarding the topic under analysis. Inductive thematic analysis is, therefore, data driven. In
contrast, theoretical analysis is a deductive, “top down” approach (Braun & Clarke, 2006. p.83) which is driven by the researcher’s interest and involves coding the data for specific research questions, as in the case of the present research. The research questions emerged from the literature review and not from the data, as would be the case if one were to adopt an inductive approach.

A further decision one needs to make when using thematic analysis is in relation to the level at which themes are identified. Themes can either be identified at a semantic, explicit level or a latent, interpretative level (Boyatzis, 1998). When analysing data at a semantic level, the analyst identifies themes at a surface level, focusing on the explicit meaning of the data. In contrast to this, analysing data at a latent level involves attempts to identify underlying ideas contained within the data and, thus, involves a level of interpretation on the part of the analyst. The present researcher attempted to identify themes at a semantic level before making interpretations at a later stage (see Chapter 5). This approach is in keeping with the critical realist stance adopted by the present researcher.

A criticism of thematic analysis is that there does not exist a clear explanation of how it should be carried out (Attride-Stirling, 2001). Therefore, it is essential that researchers describe explicitly the process they use to analyse their data when using this approach. Braun and Clarke (2006) describe a six phase process for conducting thematic analysis (see Figure 3.2) which the present researcher adhered to. This approach is described in Table 3.2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2: The thematic analysis process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase One: Familiarising yourself with your data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase Two: Generating initial codes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the analyst and involves organising the data into meaningful groups (Tuckett, 2005). As the thematic analysis in the present study took a theoretical approach, the researcher approached the data with the RQs in mind and coded around these. The coding was completed manually, with the researcher underlining and annotating key sections of the data by hand (see Appendix P for a photograph of pages from the focus group and semi-structured interview). Initial codes were then written onto colour coded paper (see Appendix P for a photograph of initial codes).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Three: Searching for themes</th>
<th>Once the data had been initially coded, the researcher began the process of sorting the codes out into potential themes. The researcher experimented with combining the codes in different ways to see how they fit together into themes (see Appendix P for photographs of codes organised into potential themes). The researcher then collated the extracts of the data relating to the themes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase Four: Reviewing themes</td>
<td>At this phase of analysis, the researcher sought to refine the themes devised. Some themes were discarded as it was decided that there were not enough data to support them, other themes were collapsed into one another and some themes were broken down further into separate themes. The researcher tried to ensure that data within each theme fit together meaningfully whilst ensuring clear distinctions between themes. During this phase, the researcher returned to the data set to ensure the themes accurately reflected the data set as a whole (see Appendix P for a photograph of reviewed themes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Five: Defining and naming themes</td>
<td>Once the themes had been reviewed, the researcher identified the “essence” (Braun &amp; Clarke, 2006, p. 92) of each theme and what aspect of the data each theme captured. This involved a process of ongoing analysis in which each theme was refined and defined further. At this stage, the researcher returned to the data extracts for each theme and sought to ensure that each theme had a concise name, which would immediately give the reader a sense of what the theme was about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Six: Producing the report</td>
<td>This stage provided the final opportunity for analysis of the data. It involved the researcher “telling the complicated story of [the] data in a way which convinces the reader of the merit and validity of [the] analysis” (Braun &amp; Clarke, 2006, p. 93) and providing data extracts to support the themes (see Chapter 4). The researcher sought to relate the analysis to the research questions (see Chapter 5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.2.2.1 Thematic networks.

The process of thematic analysis produces a thematic network, which is a web-like illustration allowing themes to be organised and classified as basic themes, organising themes and global themes (Attride-Stirling, 2001). This provides a way of organising a thematic analysis and, as such, is a tool for analysis rather than being the analysis itself (Attride-Stirling, 2001).

A basic theme is the lowest order theme and contains basic ideas derived directly from the text. On its own, a basic theme says very little about the text and must be read within the context of other basic themes in order to make sense beyond its immediate meaning. When taken together, basic themes represent an organising theme. An organising theme is a middle-order theme that organises basic themes into clusters of similar points. Organising themes are more abstract and more revealing of what is going on in the text. A group of organising themes come together to form a global theme. A global theme is a super-ordinate theme and presents an assertion about an issue. Global themes provide a summary of the main ideas in the data and a revealing interpretation of the text (Attride-Stirling, 2001).

The researcher followed Step 3 of analysis employing thematic networks (see Attride-Stirling, 2001, p.392 – 393) in order to create thematic networks. The
researcher first of all grouped the themes based on similarities between them. This resulted in several groupings. The themes that were assembled into groups became the basic themes. The researcher then created clusters of basic themes centred on larger, shared issues, thus producing organising themes (see Appendix P for a photograph of basic themes clustered into organising themes). Taking the basic themes together, the researcher then sought to summarise the assertion suggested by the organising themes. This assertion became the global theme of the network. This process was repeated for each grouping of themes derived from Step 3(a). The researcher then illustrated the basic themes, organising themes and global themes into thematic networks (see Chapter 4). Attride-Stirling (2001) presents thematic networks as non-hierarchical, web-like representations; the present researcher chose to use SmartArt (Microsoft Office, 2010) to create thematic networks. These produce hierarchical forms, but the researcher views her data as non-hierarchical. The hierarchical forms are merely a representation of the data and had no effect on the analysis. Finally, in discussions with a co-analyst, who was an EP colleague, the researcher verified and refined the networks by reviewing the text segments and ensuring the data support the themes, making any adjustments deemed necessary.

3.6 Critique of Method

3.6.1 Design.
The researcher acknowledges that the inclusion of a control group would have increased the validity of the present research. However, it is often incorrectly assumed that participants in the control condition do not receive any services, but this is almost never the case in school-based studies (Durlak, 1985). Furthermore, the effectiveness aspect of the research was not the sole aspect of the study; the researcher considered implementation issues and the omission of a control group, given time constraints, enabled the researcher to collect a richer data set than if two groups had been run.

3.6.2 Context.
As only one school was involved in the present research, school contextual factors such as behaviour policy and procedures; ethos; and the pastoral support network are likely to have had an impact upon the findings. Information regarding these factors was gathered during an initial set up meeting with the TaMHS link person and throughout the intervention utilising a research diary.
3.6.3 Quantitative data.
Questionnaires and other data gathering methods were selected based on what the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) manual states that the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) has an impact on and previous research into the effects of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) (e.g. Eggett, 2003; Bushnell & Card, 2003; Baker, 2008; Mazzotta-Perretti, 2009; Joye & Alvarez, 2010). In supervision with registered practitioner psychologists, it was verified that the measures selected are used in clinical practice with CYP with SEBD.

Other measures were considered for use, but discarded. The researcher noted that the Behavioural Assessment System for Children (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 1992) is a quantitative data gathering tool that has been utilised in previous research into the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) (Eggett, 2003; Mazzotta-Perretti, 2009). However, after careful consideration, the present researcher opted not to utilise this data gathering tool. The main reason for this, as well as the fact that the tool was not readily available to the researcher, was that this questionnaire is lengthy in nature and since the pupil participants would be completing the questionnaires three times – at the pre-intervention, post-intervention and follow-up stage – the researcher opted for the shorter Beck Disruptive Behaviour Youth Inventory (Beck et al., 2005) as an alternative, which assesses similar constructs to the Behavioural Assessment System for Children (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 1992).

Like all techniques, questionnaires have their limitations. For example, the information collected tends to describe rather than explain what the questionnaire is measuring, especially when questionnaires include closed questions and, as such, the information gathered is likely to be superficial. However, the questionnaires utilised in the present study were triangulated to some extent by external data and other data gathering methods in which the researcher sought to contextualise participant responses and indirectly explore explanations for responses on the questionnaires.

A further limitation of questionnaires is that the measures can only provide respondents’ subjective views. The researcher could have utilised measures with teachers and parents as well as pupils in order to triangulate the quantitative data from the pupil participants and provide a range of views. However, this was not possible in the present research due to time constraints. The researcher sought to mitigate against the potential biased nature of the data by gathering external data in the form of discipline data and triangulating questionnaire data with CDs’ views in
the semi-structured interview. A further justification for not obtaining parents’ views is that, although the researcher acknowledges that parental views are important, this was a school-based study and the researcher sought to obtain the views of school staff and pupils only. As regards why general school staff’s opinions were not sought, the research’s focus was on process and the school staff with the most valuable insight on this aspect were the CDs in the present research.

There is the risk of a Hawthorne effect within the present study, which is the tendency for people to perform better due to the fact that they are participants in a study. However, the use of follow-up measures taken three months after cessation of the intervention should mitigate against the risk of over estimating any effects of the intervention. A longer follow-up would be preferable, but not possible due to time constraints.

3.6.4 Qualitative data.
Focus groups were used to obtain the views of the pupil participants in this study. Ideally, researchers should seek to conduct a pilot focus group prior to the main focus group in order to test out the questions to establish whether they are likely to elicit the data required (Barbour, 2007). The researcher was not able to set up a pilot focus group for the focus group schedule specific to the present research prior to the focus group taking place. However, the researcher had utilised a similar focus group schedule in a piece of research conducted in the first year of doctoral training (Kay, 2010) so the researcher was confident that the focus group schedule used in the present research would elicit appropriate data and that the questions contained therein would be comprehensible to young people of a similar age range to the pupil participants in the present study.

There are several limitations to using a focus group methodology that the researcher needed to be mindful of. For example, participants’ views can be misinterpreted and misrepresented by the researcher. However, the researcher attempted to overcome this by asking for clarification of statements perceived to be ambiguous during the focus group. The researcher also met with participants once the transcript had been analysed in order to check that the outcomes were a true representation of their views. This is referred to as member checking (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). Focus groups can lead to a lack of researcher control because the discussion is largely dominated by the group itself (Morgan, 1988). However, this could be viewed as increasing ecological validity as if the discussion is left open to the group, the researcher will be drawing on their beliefs, thoughts...
and opinions. A further limitation of focus groups is that there is potential for the discussion to be dominated by more vocal group members, leading to potential bias in the data (Robinson, 1999). However, the skills of the researcher as the facilitator of the focus group discussion should have mitigated against this, particularly as the researcher had built a relationship with pupil participants throughout the 11 weeks over which the programme was delivered. Also, the ground rules established for the group intervention, including the stipulation that all group members should have an opportunity to express their views, was brought to the context of the focus group.

A semi-structured interview was used to obtain the views of the CDs in the present study. Like focus groups, interviews also have their limitations. For example, they can be time consuming. However, the researcher designed a relatively short semi-structured interview, agreed with the interviewees how long the interview should last and remained within these parameters. A further limitation of interviews is that they can be inconvenient for interviewees. To resolve this, the researcher arranged a time that was convenient to the interviewees so as to minimise any inconvenience caused. Unlike a questionnaire design, it can be difficult to ensure anonymity with an interview and, therefore, it has the potential to be less reliable (Cohen et al., 2007). However, the researcher was able to anonymise the partial transcription of the interview and explained this to the interviewees prior to commencement of the interview. The researcher acknowledges that interviews are typically less reliable and less valid data gathering tools. For example, the interviewees may say what they believe the interviewer wants to hear or the interviewer may interpret what the interviewees say incorrectly. The researcher in the present study attempted to resolve this by member checking in order to check that the outcomes were a true representation of participants’ views.

3.6.5 Practitioner-researcher dual role.
A practitioner-researcher is someone who works in a particular area whilst carrying out research which is relevant to the job. This is the case in the present research as the researcher worked as a trainee educational psychologist (TEP) in the LA in which the research was carried out at the time of the present research taking place. Furthermore, the researcher delivered the intervention that is the focus of the present research. The present researcher acknowledges that their dual role as both a researcher and a deliverer of the intervention could be considered a limitation of the present study. However, there also exist several advantages to the dual
practitioner-researcher role. The disadvantages and advantages to the practitioner-researcher role will now be considered.

One disadvantage to this role is concerned with time; the present researcher had work-related responsibilities outside the context of the research, which placed additional demands on the researcher. However, the present researcher was on a bursary contract with the LA at the time of carrying out the research, which allowed for protected time in which to carry out the research, mitigating against this potential disadvantage to some extent. A further disadvantage is what Robson (2002) refers to as “insider problems” (p.535), whereby the researcher may have preconceptions about issues and/or solutions, and there may also exist hierarchy difficulties. In terms of researcher preconceptions, the researcher engaged in reflection both independently and within supervision to help mitigate against the impact of any preconceptions they may have held on the research. In terms of hierarchy difficulties, the researcher was aware that their role as TEP may have meant that they were perceived by participants as high status and this may have resulted in them asserting the views they thought the practitioner-researcher wanted to hear, especially in the questionnaires, focus group and semi-structured interview. Indeed, the Health Professions Council recognises this as a potential ethical issue facing EPs, as one of the standards of proficiency for EPs is to “understand the power imbalance between practitioners and service users” (Health Professions Council, 2009, p.6). However, the researcher was not the named TEP for the focus school and so staff may not have perceived the researcher as being high status due to this fact. Also, the researcher was careful to explicitly state that the participants had equal expertise; this was done throughout the intervention, as surrendering the one-up relationship is a feature of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) itself, and in the set up of the focus group and the semi-structured interview. This hopefully helped to diminish the effects of any perceived status advantage of the practitioner-researcher.

An important advantage to the dual practitioner-researcher role is that the practitioner-researcher often has pre-existing knowledge and experience of the context and the people involved. Although the present researcher was not the named TEP for the focus school, she had prior experience of working within that context and with one of the CDs through her involvement in the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) and the knowledge and experience obtained through this experience were facilitative of their involvement in the present research. A further advantage to
the dual role, which is particularly pertinent to the present research, is the fact that there is likely to be a substantial reduction of difficulties with implementation as the practitioner-researcher was able to control the implementation of the intervention in the present research.

3.6.6 The role of parents.
The views of parents have been highlighted as important (e.g. British Psychological Society, 2006) and, therefore, it would have been desirable to include parents’ views in the present study. However, time constraints meant that this was not possible, but informed consent was sought and parents were debriefed following the intervention.

3.7 Ethical Considerations
The researcher consulted the School of Education’s ethical practice policy and guidance (University of Manchester, 2010) when making ethical considerations in relation to the present research. Ethical considerations are outlined in Appendix Q.

The researcher adhered to recommendations made by the University’s Ethics Committee following a rigorous process which allowed for detailed consideration of ethical issues in relation to the present research. The research was initially given ethical approval on 3rd May 2011 (see Appendix R for letter of ethical approval) and amendments were later given approval on 27th September 2011. There follow some ethical considerations that have shaped the research.

The researcher obtained informed consent from pupil participants’ parents and informed assent directly from pupil participants (see Appendix F – G parental consent form/information sheet and child assent form). She also obtained informed consent from the adult participants in the study, the CDs of the intervention (see Appendix H for CD consent form). Participants were informed of the nature of the research and what would be required of them if they gave their permission to be included in the research project. All participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the research at any time and were reminded of this right at key points throughout the research, for example, prior to the focus group and semi-structured interview. Pupil participants were in no way coerced into participating in any of the activities in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001).

The present researcher ensured confidentiality of data collected during the research by anonymising questionnaires and storing them securely. Transcriptions of the focus group and semi-structured interview were also anonymised and the original
recordings were destroyed. Electronic forms of the data were held securely on an encrypted data stick. The protection of confidentiality was particularly important in the present research, given the small sample size and potential for identifiability of adult and pupil participants. Verbal feedback was given to participants following cessation of the research and feedback was offered to parents and other interested parties once the research had been written up.

3.8 Time Line, Time Budget and Risk Analysis
A time line and time budget pertaining to the present research can be viewed in Appendix S.

Potential risk to participants and the research as whole have been considered and steps have been taken to mitigate these risks and build in contingencies. See Appendix T for the risk analysis.
Chapter 4: RESULTS

4.1 Chapter Outline
This section will begin with a description of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) intervention delivery as it evolved throughout the course of the research. The section will then detail information regarding the participants in the present study. The researcher will then explore any changes to delivery and data collection that occurred as the research unfolded. The results will then be presented in two parts. Firstly, the findings from the quantitative data analysis will be described followed by findings from the qualitative data analysis. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary of the results.

4.2 Intervention Delivery
Previous research has highlighted that keeping detailed information on aspects of programme implementation, including programme adaptation, is important when studying programme implementation (e.g. Petipas et al., 2005; Durlak & DuPre, 2008). The present researcher carefully documented which aspects of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) were omitted and which aspects were adapted throughout the implementation phase of the research, as well as documenting aspects of programme delivery the deliverers included that were additional to the WhyTry Program as it is described in the WhyTry Program manual (Moore, 2001). This information was documented in the research diary. Intervention delivery as it occurred in the present research can be viewed in Appendix U. Unless detailed in Appendix U, the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) delivered in the present research was implemented as per the WhyTry Program manual (Moore, 2001). The Youtube clips were suggested at the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) facilitator training course attended by the researcher in July 2011. The intervention took place in the same room each week. This was with one exception; the experiential activity in Session 5 took place in a dance studio in another part of the school as it was felt by programme deliverers that additional space offered by the dance studio would facilitate this activity.

It is difficult to give the exact implementation level achieved in the present study. Although there were omissions and adaptations made to the original programme, the content of the programme remained largely the same and all of the programme objectives were covered. Omissions and adaptations occurred mainly in relation to experiential activities, the purpose of which is to embed the principles of the programme further. Overall, the programme was implemented with a high degree of
fidelity, although it is not possible to give an exact figure. The researcher asserts that the fidelity levels were well above 60 per cent, which Durlak and DuPre (2008) claim is required for positive effects to take place. See Appendix V for an exemplar session plan as delivered in the implementation phase of the present research and see Appendix W for adaptations made to the original WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001).

4.3 Participant Information
In order to maintain confidentiality, the researcher has allocated a number to each pupil participant and each co-deliverer (CD).

4.3.1 Pupil participants.
Six Year 8 pupils (aged 12 – 13) were selected for inclusion in the intervention. Pupils identified as having or being at risk of having social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD) were selected based on a screening tool and school based assessment processes (see Section 3.3). The group was a mix of pupils identified by the TaMHS link and Head of Year as displaying externalising SEBD and internalising SEBD as the main presenting issue. All pupil participants included in the intervention group were male, from White British heritage and at the School Action Plus stage of the graduated response to SEN (DfES, 2001). All pupils were 12 years old at the start of the intervention in September 2011. Further details regarding the pupil participants obtained from discussions with CDs and observations during group delivery are summarised in Table 4.1 below.
### Table 4.1: Pupil participant characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dominant SEBD type</th>
<th>Further details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pupil 1 | Externalising | • Attended all 11 sessions and participated in the focus group.  
• An articulate group member who took an active role in most sessions, although he did have a tendency to become distracted at times. |
| Pupil 2 | Internalising | • On the LA’s Child Protection register due to social care issues.  
• Attended all 11 sessions and participated in the focus group.  
• A quieter group member, although he appeared to become more confident as the intervention went on. |
| Pupil 3 | Externalising | • Attended 10 out of 11 sessions and participated in the focus group.  
• An articulate group member who took an active role in most sessions and presented as a role model to some of the other pupils. |
| Pupil 4 | Internalising | • Attended all 11 sessions and participated in the focus group.  
• A quieter group member, although he presented as more confident as the intervention went on. |
| Pupil 5 | Internalising | • Attended all 11 sessions and participated in the focus group.  
• An articulate group member who took an active role in most sessions and presented as a role model to some of the other pupils. |
| Pupil 6 | Externalising | • Attended 10 out of 11 sessions and participated in the focus group.  
• Took less of an active role in most sessions and often presented as distracted.  
• Between five and 20 minutes late to most sessions. |
4.3.2 Adult participants.
One female raising aspirations coordinator and inclusion support person, hereafter referred to as Co-deliverer 1 (CD1), and two female level 3 teaching assistants, hereafter referred to as Co-deliverer 2 and Co-deliverer 3 (CD2 and CD3) were recruited to co-deliver the intervention with the researcher.

4.4 Participant Attendance
Table 4.2 summarises attendance rates for pupil participants.

Table 4.2: Pupil participant attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pupil 1</th>
<th>Pupil 2</th>
<th>Pupil 3</th>
<th>Pupil 4</th>
<th>Pupil 5</th>
<th>Pupil 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>21.09.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>28.09.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>06.10.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>12.10.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>19.10.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>02.11.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td>10.11.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 7</td>
<td>15.11.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 8</td>
<td>21.11.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 9</td>
<td>02.12.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 10</td>
<td>09.12.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ✓ = present   × = absent

Table 4.3 summarises attendance rates for the CDs.

Table 4.3: Co-deliverer attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CD1</th>
<th>CD2</th>
<th>CD3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>21.09.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>28.09.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>06.10.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>12.10.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>19.10.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>02.11.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td>10.11.11</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 7</td>
<td>15.11.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 8</td>
<td>21.11.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 9</td>
<td>02.12.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 10</td>
<td>09.12.11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ✓ = present   × = absent
4.5 Factors Affecting Planned Intervention Delivery and Data Collection
Due to the fact that the present research was real world research (Robson, 2002),
the researcher anticipated that there may be unforeseen occurrences that could not
be planned for that may affect the research. A number of factors evolved throughout
the course of the research that affected the planned delivery of the intervention and
data collection.

Firstly, as outlined in Section 4.4 above, there were some pupil absences, which
meant that not all pupil participants received the full dose of the intervention. Pupil 3
missed Session 10 and Pupil 6 missed Session 4. This will need to be taken into
account when analysing and interpreting the data.

Additionally, CD3 became ill partway through programme delivery. This meant that
she was not present for Sessions 7 – 10 or for the CD semi-structured interview.
Therefore, she did not observe the full programme delivery and also did not have an
opportunity to share her views on the programme. Therefore, CD3’s views are not
represented in the data set.

4.6 Quantitative Analysis
Pre- and post-intervention and follow-up quantitative data gathered from the WhyTry
Measure (WTM) (WhyTry Organization website); the Beck Disruptive Behaviour
Inventory for Youth (BDBI-Y) (Beck et al., 2005); the Beck Self-Concept Inventory
for Youth (BSCI-Y) (Beck et al., 2005); and the discipline data gathered at the same
time points were analysed in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the WhyTry
Program (Moore, 2001) with one group of pupils in the focus school, thus
addressing research question (RQ) one:

RQ1. To what extent is there evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of
the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) for pupils in a mainstream secondary
school and are any gains sustained three months post-intervention?

Due to the small sample size included in the present study, descriptive statistics
were used to analyse the data. There follows an analysis of the data from each of
the data gathering tools.

4.6.1 Discipline data.
Discipline data were obtained from the school administration system. This
comprised information regarding achievement points obtained (awarded for positive
behaviours), behaviour points obtained (given for negative behaviours) and the
number of times a pupil had been placed on a report card (usually a response to persistent negative behaviour). These data were obtained to see what effect, if any, the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) had on pupil behaviour. Due to the fact that behaviour points, achievement points and report cards are given by school staff, they cannot be considered objective data. However, it was hoped that these data would triangulate the subjective quantitative data from the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) and the subjective qualitative data from the focus group with pupils, semi-structured interview with CDs and research diary to some extent.

Programme success would be indicated if achievement point figures increased from pre-intervention to post-intervention and follow-up and if behaviour point figures and report card figures decreased from pre-intervention to post-intervention and follow-up. The discipline data were to some extent arbitrary as these relied upon individual staff perceptions of what warranted a behaviour point or an achievement point. Given the nature of the data it is difficult to specify what might constitute a meaningful measure of change. However, within this context and the timescales for potential change, a shift of 20 per cent seemed of sufficient magnitude to constitute a meaningful measure of change.

It was decided in conversations with the university tutor during supervision that a change of 20 points or more in achievement point figures would be considered

![Figure 4.1: Pre-/post-intervention and follow-up achievement point data](image-url)
meaningful. This was due to the fact that 20 points represents a fifth of the range within the achievement point data set, which was considered to be a reasonable shift considering the time scale over which the intervention took place.

Figure 4.1 indicates that there was an increase in the number of achievement points awarded to Pupil 1 from pre- (n=51) to post-intervention (n=56), indicating that Pupil 1 was displaying more positive behaviours throughout the term in which the intervention ran than the previous term, according to school staff perception, although this change was not considered meaningful. At the follow-up stage, there was a slight decrease in achievement points received (n=53), resulting in the number of achievement points received returning to approximately the same level as pre-intervention. Again, this change was not considered meaningful. Achievement points awarded to Pupil 1 were mainly in relation to his effort and attainment in classroom activities.

Figure 4.1 indicates that there was an increase in the number of achievement points awarded to Pupil 2 from pre- (n=74) to post-intervention (n=77), indicating that Pupil 2 was displaying more positive behaviours throughout the term in which the intervention ran than the previous term, according to school staff perception, although this change was not considered meaningful. This was not maintained at the follow-up stage (n=61), as achievement points awarded at this stage fell below the figure obtained at the pre-intervention stage. However, this was not a meaningful shift. Achievement points awarded to Pupil 2 were mainly in relation to his effort and attainment in classroom activities.

Figure 4.1 indicates a meaningful increase in the number of achievement points awarded to Pupil 3 from pre- (n=33) to post-intervention (n=128), indicating that he was displaying more positive behaviours throughout the term in which the intervention ran than the previous term, according to school staff perception. There was a decrease in the number of achievement points awarded at the follow-up stage (n=76), although this figure remained higher than that at the pre-intervention stage and remained at a meaningful level. Achievement points awarded were mainly in relation to Pupil 3’s effort and attainment in classroom activities and manners. For the term in which the intervention ran, Pupil 3 also received achievement points for being a good ambassador for the school.

Figure 4.1 indicates that there was a meaningful increase in the number of achievement points awarded to Pupil 4 from pre- (n=50) to post-intervention
(n=125), indicating that Pupil 4 was displaying more positive behaviours throughout the term in which the intervention ran than the previous term, according to school staff perception. This was maintained at the follow-up stage (n=128), indicating that this improvement in behaviour was maintained three months post-intervention. Achievement points awarded to Pupil 4 were mainly in relation to his effort and attainment in classroom activities.

Figure 4.1 indicates that there was no meaningful change in the number of achievement points awarded to Pupil 5 from pre- (n=90) to post-intervention (n=91), indicating that Pupil 5 was displaying about the same number of positive behaviours throughout the term in which the intervention ran as in the previous term, according to school staff perception. There was a reduction in the number of achievement points awarded at the follow-up stage (n=58), indicating that Pupil 5 displayed fewer positive behaviours throughout the term following cessation of the intervention as in the previous two terms. This was a meaningful shift. The types of positive behaviour displayed by Pupil 5 included effort and attainment in class, good manners, excellent uniform and being a good ambassador for the school by doing a good job as duty pupil.

Figure 4.1 indicates that there was a meaningful increase in the number of achievement points awarded to Pupil 6 from pre- (n=30) to post-intervention (n=78), indicating that Pupil 6 was displaying more positive behaviours throughout the term in which the intervention ran than the previous term, according to school staff perception. There was a further meaningful increase in the number of achievement points awarded at the follow-up stage (n=106), indicating that Pupil 6 was displaying more positive behaviours throughout the term following cessation of the intervention than the previous two terms, according to school staff perception. The types of positive behaviour displayed by Pupil 6 included effort and attainment in class, good manners and excellent homework.

Overall, Figure 4.1 indicates that there was a meaningful increase in the number of achievement points awarded to the group from pre- (n=54.6) to post-intervention (n=92.5), indicating that the group as a whole were displaying more positive behaviours throughout the term in which the intervention ran than the previous term, according to school staff perception. There was a decrease in achievement points at the follow-up stage (n=70.2); however, the group as a whole were displaying more positive behaviours throughout the term following cessation of the intervention than
the term prior to the start of the intervention, although this shift was not considered to be meaningful.

![Graph showing pre-/post-intervention and follow-up behaviour point data](image)

**Figure 4.2: Pre-/post-intervention and follow-up behaviour point data**

It was decided in conversations with the university tutor during supervision that a change of six points or more in behaviour point figures would be considered meaningful. This was due to the fact that six points represents a fifth of the range within the behaviour point data set, which was considered to be a reasonable shift considering the time scale over which the intervention took place.

Figure 4.2 indicates that there was a meaningful decrease in the number of behaviour points given to Pupil 1 from pre- (n=19) to post-intervention (n=12), indicating that Pupil 1 was displaying fewer negative behaviours throughout the term in which the intervention ran than the previous term. Negative behaviours displayed in the term prior to the intervention included damage to property; assault on another pupil; and defiant and disruptive behaviour. Negative behaviours displayed during the term in which the intervention ran were mainly disruptive in nature. Figure 4.2 reveals an increase in the number of behaviour points awarded at the follow-up stage (n=22), indicating that Pupil 1 was displaying more negative behaviours throughout the term following cessation of the intervention than the previous two terms, although this was not a meaningful increase on the figure obtained pre-intervention. The types of negative behaviours displayed in the term following cessation of the intervention were mainly disruptive in nature.
Figure 4.2 indicates that there was no meaningful change in the number of behaviour points given to Pupil 2 from pre- (n=4) to post-intervention (n=3), indicating that Pupil 2 displayed about the same number of negative behaviours throughout the term in which the intervention ran as in the previous term, according to school staff perception. The negative behaviour displayed during the term prior to the intervention was mainly failure to complete homework. Negative behaviours displayed during the term in which the intervention ran were disruptive in nature. Figure 4.2 indicates that there was no meaningful change in the number of behaviour points given to Pupil 2 from pre-/post-intervention to the follow-up stage (n=5), indicating no substantial change in the number of negative behaviours displayed by Pupil 2 throughout the term following cessation of the intervention when compared with the previous two terms. Negative behaviours displayed during the term following cessation of the intervention were mainly in relation to lack of homework and inadequate work.

Figure 4.2 indicates that there was a meaningful increase in the number of behaviour points given to Pupil 3 from pre- (n=3) to post-intervention (n=12), indicating that Pupil 3 was displaying more negative behaviours throughout the term in which the intervention ran than the previous term. Types of negative behaviour displayed during the term prior to the intervention were mainly insolent/defiant in nature. The types of negative behaviour displayed in the term in which the intervention ran were defiance, disruption and lack of equipment. There was a further meaningful increase in behaviour points given at the follow-up stage (n=33), indicating that Pupil 3 was displaying more negative behaviours throughout the term following cessation of the intervention than the previous two terms, according to school staff perception. The types of negative behaviours displayed during the term following cessation of the intervention included disruption and unpleasant behaviour towards other pupils.

Figure 4.2 indicates that there was a meaningful increase in the number of behaviour points given to Pupil 4 from pre- (n=1) to post-intervention (n=24), indicating that Pupil 4 was displaying more negative behaviours throughout the term in which the intervention ran than the previous term. Pupil 4 was given one behaviour point in the term prior to the intervention, which was for distracting behaviour. In the term in which the intervention ran, the types of negative behaviour displayed by Pupil 4 included lack of equipment, distracting behaviour, defiance and fighting. The number of behaviour points significantly reduced at the follow-up stage.
(n=10), but remained higher than the number of behaviour points given at the pre-intervention stage. The types of negative behaviours displayed by Pupil 4 during the term following cessation of the intervention included lack of equipment and damage to school property.

Figure 4.2 indicates that there was no change in the number of behaviour points given to Pupil 5 from pre- (n=1) to post-intervention (n=1). Behaviour points given in the term prior to the intervention and in the term in which the intervention ran were for lack of homework. There was an increase in the number of behaviour points given to Pupil 5 at the follow-up stage (n=6), indicating that Pupil 5 was displaying more negative behaviours throughout the term following cessation of the intervention than the previous two terms, although this shift was not considered meaningful. The types of negative behaviour displayed by Pupil 5 during the term following cessation of the intervention included lack of homework and poor punctuality.

Figure 4.2 indicates that there was a meaningful increase in the number of behaviour points given to Pupil 6 from pre- (n=16) to post-intervention (n=23), indicating that Pupil 6 was displaying more negative behaviours throughout the term in which the intervention ran than the previous term, according to school staff perception. The types of negative behaviour displayed by Pupil 6 during the term prior to the intervention were unpleasantness towards other pupils and disruptive behaviour. The types of negative behaviour displayed by Pupil 6 during the term in which the intervention ran included poor punctuality, off task/distracting behaviour and truancy. There was a meaningful reduction in behaviour points given at the follow-up stage (n=8), indicating that Pupil 6 was displaying less negative behaviours throughout the term following cessation of the intervention than the previous two terms, according to school staff perception. The types of negative behaviours displayed during the term following cessation of the intervention included distracting behaviour and defiance.

Overall, Figure 4.2 indicates that there was an increase in the number of behaviour points given to the group from pre- (n=7.3) to post-intervention (n=12.5), indicating that the group as a whole were displaying more negative behaviours throughout the term in which the intervention ran than the previous term. This increase was maintained at the follow-up stage. However, the increase is not considered by the present researcher to be meaningful.
Figure 4.3: Pre-/post-intervention and follow-up report card data

It was decided in conversations with the university tutor during supervision that, due to the small number of report cards given across the data set, it was not possible to determine what figure would constitute a meaningful change. The researcher will now describe the changes within this data set.

Figure 4.3 indicates that there were no changes in the number of times Pupil 1 was placed on report from pre- (n=0) to post-intervention (n=0). This was maintained at the follow-up stage (n=0).

Figure 4.3 indicates that there were no changes in the number of times Pupil 2 was placed on report from pre- (n=0) to post-intervention (n=0). This was maintained at the follow-up stage (n=0).

Figure 4.3 indicates a slight increase in the number of times Pupil 3 was placed on report from pre- (n=0) to post-intervention (n=1), indicating a small increase in the number of persistent negative behaviours displayed. Pupil 3 was placed on report for repeated distracting/disruptive behaviour. There was a further increase in the number of times Pupil 3 was placed on report at the follow-up stage (n=4). Again, Pupil 3 was placed on report for repeated distracting/disruptive behaviour.

Figure 4.3 indicates that there were no changes in the number of times Pupil 4 was placed on report from pre- (n=0) to post-intervention (n=0). This was maintained at the follow-up stage (n=0).
Figure 4.3 indicates that there were no changes in the number of times Pupil 5 was placed on report from pre- (n=0) to post-intervention (n=0). This was maintained at the follow-up stage (n=0).

Figure 4.3 indicates that there were no changes in the number of times Pupil 6 was placed on report from pre- (n=0) to post-intervention (n=0). This was maintained at the follow-up stage (n=0).

Overall, Figure 4.3 indicates that there was a slight increase in the number of times the group was placed on report from pre- (n=0) to post-intervention (n=0.2). There was a further increase at the follow-up stage (n=0.7).

### 4.6.2 WhyTry Measure data.
The WTM (WhyTry Organization website) was administered pre- and post-intervention and at the follow-up stage to see what progress, if any, the pupil participants had made against the objectives covered throughout the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001). All scores are out of a possible 135. An increase in scores on the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) from pre-intervention to post-intervention and/or follow-up would indicate that progress had been made against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives.

![Figure 4.4: Pre-/post-intervention and follow-up WTM data scores](image)

It was decided in conversations with the university tutor during supervision that a change of nine points or more in the WTM score would be considered meaningful.
This was due to the fact that nine points represents a fifth of the range within the WTM data set, which was considered to be a reasonable shift considering the time scale over which the intervention took place.

Figure 4.4 indicates that there was an increase in the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) score for Pupil 1 from pre- (n=103) to post-intervention (n=108), indicating that Pupil 1 showed progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives overall post-intervention, as measured by self-report. However, this increase is not considered to be meaningful. Figure 4.4 indicates a meaningful increase in the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) score for Pupil 1 at the follow-up stage (n=131), indicating that Pupil 1’s progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives overall was improved upon at the follow-up stage.

Figure 4.4 indicates that there was a meaningful increase in the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) score for Pupil 2 from pre- (n=87) to post-intervention (n=119), indicating that Pupil 2 showed progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives overall post-intervention, as measured by self-report. This progress was maintained at the follow-up stage (n=116).

Figure 4.4 indicates that there was a decrease in the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) score for Pupil 3 from pre- (n=104) to post-intervention (n=97), indicating that Pupil 3 did not show progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives overall post-intervention, as measured by self-report. This figure was maintained at the follow-up stage (n=97), although it was not considered by the present researcher to be a meaningful shift.

Figure 4.4 indicates a meaningful increase in the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) score for Pupil 4 from pre- (n=102) to post-intervention (n=116), indicating that Pupil 4 showed progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives overall post-intervention, as measured by self-report. This was maintained at the follow-up stage (n=118).

Figure 4.4 indicates that there was no meaningful change in the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) score for Pupil 5 from pre- (n=116) to post-intervention (n=115), indicating that Pupil 5 did not show progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives overall post-intervention, as measured by self-report. However, there was an increase in the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) score for Pupil 5 at the follow-up stage (n=124), indicating that Pupil 5’s progress against
the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives overall was improved upon at the follow-up stage to a meaningful level.

Figure 4.4 indicates that there was a meaningful increase in the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) score for Pupil 6 from pre- (n=107) to post-intervention (n=127), indicating that Pupil 6 showed progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives overall post-intervention, as measured by self-report. There was a meaningful decrease in the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) score for Pupil 6 at the follow-up stage (n=113). However, the follow-up score remained higher than the pre-intervention score, therefore, progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives was shown from pre-intervention to follow-up, although not to a meaningful degree.

Overall, Figure 4.4 indicates that there was an increase in the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) mean score across all pupil participants from pre- (n=103.2) to post-intervention (n=113.3), indicating that the group as a whole showed progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives, as measured by self report. However, this increase was not considered by the present researcher to be meaningful. The progress was maintained at the follow-up stage (n=116.5).

4.6.3 Beck Disruptive Behaviour Inventory for Youth data.
The BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) was administered pre- and post-intervention and at the follow-up stage to see what improvements, if any, pupil participants had made in terms of their self-perceived behaviour following the intervention. A decrease in T scores on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre-intervention to post-intervention and/or follow-up would indicate an improvement in behaviour.
Figure 4.5: Pre-/post-intervention and follow-up BDBI-Y data

Figure 4.5 indicates no change in the T score on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre- (T=44) to post-intervention (T=44) for Pupil 1, according to self-report. There was no change to the severity level from pre- to post-intervention, which remained at average. However, Chart 4.5 indicates a decrease in the T score on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) at the follow-up stage (T=35), indicating an improvement in behaviour. The severity level remained at average.

Figure 4.5 indicates a decrease in the T score on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre- (T=56) to post-intervention (T=46) for Pupil 2, according to self-report. This led to a change in the severity level of Pupil 2’s disruptive behaviour from mildly elevated to average. Overall, these changes suggest an improvement in behaviour for Pupil 2 from pre- to post-intervention and this improvement was maintained at the follow-up stage (T=46).

Figure 4.5 indicates no significant change in the T score on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre- (T=56) to post-intervention (T=55) for Pupil 3, according to self-report. Overall, these changes suggest no substantial change in behaviour for Pupil 3 from pre- to post-intervention. The severity level of Pupil 3’s disruptive behaviour remained at mildly elevated. This was maintained at the follow-up stage (T=57).

Figure 4.5 indicates a decrease in the T score on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre- (T=52) to post-intervention (T=46) for Pupil 4, according to self-report.
Overall, these changes suggest an improvement in behaviour for Pupil 4 from pre- to post-intervention, which was maintained at the follow-up stage (T=45), although this did not lead to a change in the severity level of Pupil 4’s disruptive behaviour, which remained at average.

Figure 4.5 indicates no significant change in the T score on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre- (T=44) to post-intervention (T=42) for Pupil 5, according to self-report. Overall, these changes suggest no substantial change in behaviour for Pupil 5 from pre- to post-intervention. The severity level of Pupil 5’s disruptive behaviour remained at average. This was maintained at the follow-up stage (T=41).

Figure 4.5 indicates a decrease in the T score on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre- (T=56) to post-intervention (T=49) for Pupil 6, according to self-report. These changes suggest an improvement in behaviour for Pupil 6 from pre- to post-intervention, although this did not lead to a change in the severity level of Pupil 6’s disruptive behaviour, which remained at average. There was an increase in the T score on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) at the follow-up stage (T=53), according to self-report. However, the scores at the follow-up stage remained slightly lower than at the pre-intervention stage and the severity level remained at average.

Overall, Figure 4.5 indicates a slight decrease in the T score mean across all pupil participants on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre- (T=52) to post-intervention (T=48), suggesting an improvement in behaviour across all pupil participants, although there was no change to the severity level, which remained at average. This was maintained at the follow-up stage.

### 4.6.4 Beck Self-Concept Inventory for Youth data.
The BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) was administered pre- and post-intervention and at the follow-up stage to see what improvements, if any, pupil participants had made in terms of their self-concept following the intervention. An increase in scores on the BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre-intervention to post-intervention and/or follow-up would indicate an improvement in self-concept.
Figure 4.6: Pre-/post-intervention and follow-up BSCI-Y data

Figure 4.6 indicates no significant change in the T score on the BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre- (T=32) to post-intervention (T=30) for Pupil 1. Overall, these changes suggest no substantial change in self-concept for Pupil 1 from pre- to post-intervention, according to self-report. This meant that the severity level of Pupil 1’s self-concept remained at *much lower than average*. However, Figure 4.6 indicates an increase in the T score on the BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from post-intervention to the follow-up stage (T=65). This led to an improvement in the severity level of Pupil 1’s self-concept from *much lower than average* to *above average*, indicating an improvement in Pupil 1’s self-concept at the follow-up stage.

Figure 4.6 indicates an increase in the T score on the BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre- (T=46) to post-intervention (T=52) for Pupil 2. Overall, these changes suggest an improvement in self-concept for Pupil 2 from pre- to post-intervention, according to self-report, although the severity level of Pupil 2’s self-concept remained at *average*. A further increase in T score was shown at the follow-up stage (T=57), which resulted in an improvement in the severity level from *average* to *above average*, indicating an improvement in self-concept for Pupil 2 from pre-/post-intervention to the follow-up stage.

Figure 4.6 indicates a decrease in the T score on the BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre- (T=56) to post-intervention (T=39) for Pupil 3. This suggests a decrease in self-concept for Pupil 3 from pre- to post-intervention, according to self-report, and
led to the severity level of Pupil 3’s self-concept changing from *above average* to *much lower than average*. At the follow-up stage, Pupil 3’s BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) score returned to approximately what it was at the pre-intervention stage (T=58), suggesting no change in Pupil 3’s self-concept, which remained at *above average*.

Figure 4.6 indicates an increase in the T score on the BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre- (T=28) to post-intervention (T=39) for Pupil 4, indicating an improvement in self-concept, according to self-report, although the severity level of Pupil 4’s self-concept remained at *much lower than average*. There was a further increase in the T score on the BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) at the follow-up stage (T=55), which led to an improvement in the severity level to *average*. These changes suggest an improvement in Pupil 4’s self-concept.

Figure 4.6 indicates an increase in the T score on the BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre- (T=48) to post-intervention (T=56) for Pupil 5. This suggests an improvement in self-concept for Pupil 5 from pre- to post-intervention, according to self-report. The severity level of Pupil 5’s self-concept also improved, changing from *average* to *above average*. This was maintained at the follow-up stage (T=57).

Figure 4.6 indicates no change in the T score on the BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre- (T=63) to post-intervention (T=63) for Pupil 6, according to self-report. There was no change to the severity level from pre- to post-intervention, which remained at *above average*. This was maintained at the follow-up stage (T=65).

Overall, Figure 4.6 indicates no change in the T score across all pupil participants on the BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) from pre- (T=46) to post-intervention (T=46). These results suggest to notable improvement in self-concept across all pupil participants, according to self-report. However, the follow-up mean (T=59) indicates an increase in the T score across all pupil participants and a change to the severity level from *average* to *above average*. This suggests an improvement in self-concept across all pupil participants from post-intervention to follow-up.

### 4.7 Qualitative Analysis

Partial transcriptions of the focus group with pupil participants and the semi-structured interview with the CDs and the research diary were analysed using thematic analysis in order to triangulate RQ1 and address RQ2 and RQ3:
RQ1. To what extent is there evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) for pupils in a mainstream secondary school and are any gains sustained three months post-intervention?

RQ 2. Which factors appear to support or hinder the implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in one mainstream secondary school?

RQ 3. Which suggestions do pupil participants and programme deliverers make for future implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001)?

This section will describe the themes identified from the pupil focus group, CD semi-structured interview and the research diary using the analysis method detailed in Chapter 3 (see Section 3.5.2.2). Quotations from the original transcripts will be provided to support the themes.

The initial codes emerging from the partial transcription of the focus group, interview and research diary were organised into 88 basic themes. These basic themes were organised into clusters representing similar ideas, resulting in 24 organising themes, which were further grouped into four global themes. See Figure 4.7 for an overview of all four thematic networks.
Figure 4.7: Overview of Thematic Networks
Each thematic network will now be presented along with supporting data.

4.7.1 Thematic network for Global Theme 1: Outcomes.
The thematic network for Global Theme 1 is presented in Figure 4.8 below.
This thematic network consists of five organising themes and 24 basic themes. This network represents pupil participants’ and CDs’ responses to direct questions in the focus group and semi-structured interview asking whether the intervention has helped pupils or resulted in any changes in pupils. It also incorporates views expressed in the research diary around changes in pupils over the course of the intervention.

4.7.1.1 Organising Theme: Social, emotional and behavioural gains.
It was evident from the pupil focus group that pupil participants felt they had made a number of improvements in terms of their SEBD as a result of their inclusion in the group. CDs also commented on social, emotional and behavioural gains for pupils as a result of the intervention. Some views of pupils and CDs were supported by comments made by the researcher in the research diary over the duration of the intervention.

4.7.1.1.1 Basic Theme: Increased maturity.
CDs felt that some of the pupil participants had demonstrated a greater level of maturity whilst attending the WhyTry sessions. This was particularly the case for Pupil 3, about whom CD1 said, “looking at [Pupil 3] this time last year, how much he’s come on and how much he’s really grown and matured – it’s unbelievable. He’s a different child to be honest”.

The researcher concurred with these observations and stated in the research diary, “Pupil 3 is very mature – he reads into the programme and understands it. He explains it to the others”. The researcher also noted increased maturity in Pupil 6 throughout the course of the intervention, “Pupil 6 seems more mature now when compared with earlier in the programme”.

Although the pupils themselves did not use the terms mature or maturity during the focus group, they made comments that were indicative of their increased maturity, for example, Pupil 6 stated, “it’s made me learn what to do if I get into trouble with other people – just walk away”. New ways of responding to pressure situations such as this indicate an increased level of maturity in some pupils. Pupils agreed with the assertion that they had become more mature at the member checking stage.

4.7.1.1.2 Basic Theme: Increased confidence.
A further social, emotional and behavioural gain was increased confidence of pupil participants. CD2 shared, “[Pupil 4] started off very quiet and quite subdued really and then, as the sessions went on and on, he was willing to participate more and more”.
The researcher also noted increased confidence in most of the pupils within the research diary, “pupils much more willing to share this session, especially Pupil 4, who seems to be gaining confidence in the group”.

It was particularly pleasing that Pupil 2 and Pupil 4 and Pupil 5 appeared to grow in confidence as these pupils were selected for inclusion in the group due to their internalising SEBD and lack of confidence generally. Although pupils did not allude to their increased confidence directly, they all became more involved in the sessions as the intervention went on and all participated confidently in the focus group following cessation of the intervention. They agreed with the assertion that they had become more confident at the member checking stage.

4.7.1.1.3 Basic Theme: Increased respect for others.
A further social, emotional and behavioural gain was increased respect of pupil participants towards others. CD1 felt that “they’ve all learnt...to be respectful to one another”.

This view was corroborated to an extent by comments made in the research diary, such as, “[the pupils] clearly listen to each other”. The fact that pupils listened to each other showed not only that they had respect for one another, but also that they had respect for the ground rules established at the start of the intervention.

Although the pupils did not use the term *respect* in the focus group in terms of having respect for other people, some of them made comments that were indicative of their increased respect for others. For example, Pupil 5 stated, “[I] know that if a teacher says something then I don’t always have to answer back”. This indicates that he has learnt to be more respectful towards staff. All pupils agreed with the assertion that they had become more respectful towards others at the member checking stage. This was especially important for Pupil 1, Pupil 3 and Pupil 6 who were originally selected for inclusion in the group due to their externalising SEBD and apparent lack of respect for authority at times.

4.7.1.4 Basic Theme: Increased effort.
Throughout the focus group, several pupils indicated that the programme had encouraged them to put more effort into various aspects of their lives. For example, Pupil 6 commented, “put some more effort into it and you can do it”. This has links with perseverance, a key skill developed by some pupils over the course of the intervention (see Section 4.7.1.2.4).
CDs of the present intervention also commented that pupils were showing increased effort since the commencement of the intervention. For example, CD2 shared, “[Pupil 6]’s trying hard”.

The researcher felt that all pupil participants either consistently put effort into the sessions or increased their level of effort as the intervention developed.

4.7.1.1.5 Basic Theme: Increased self-respect.
It was evident from the pupil focus group that some pupils felt their self-respect had improved as a result of their inclusion in the group. For example, Pupil 5 shared that he had gained “a lot more self-respect”. This partially supports some of the findings from the quantitative data suggesting improvements in self-concept for some of the pupil participants. CDs of the intervention in the present study highlighted that Pupil 5 in particular had shown an improvement in his self-concept since his inclusion in the intervention and appeared “comfortable in himself” (CD1) following the intervention. This is particularly pleasing as this is a pupil who was selected for inclusion in the group due to his internalising SEBD.

4.7.1.1.6 Basic Theme: Elevated mood.
Many pupil participants highlighted an improvement in their mood as a successful outcome of the intervention. For example, Pupil 1 shared that the intervention “made [him] happier when [he] was in school”. This is a pleasing outcome of the intervention as it highlights an important emotional gain for the pupils. It is particularly pleasing with regard to Pupil 2, Pupil 4 and Pupil 5, who were originally selected for inclusion in the group due to their internalising SEBD and withdrawn nature.

4.7.1.1.7 Basic Theme: Improved behaviour.
The improvement in pupil behaviour in and around school was a recurring basic theme. For example, Pupil 5 shared that he had “behaved a lot more positively” and Pupil 3 claimed that he hadn’t “been as naughty”. This partially supports some of the findings from the quantitative data suggesting improvements in behaviour for some of the pupil participants and was especially pleasing for Pupil 3 as he was selected for inclusion in the group due to his externalising SEBD. Although improved behaviour was not mentioned directly in the CD semi-structured interview, CDs agreed with this basic theme at the member checking stage.

4.7.1.1.8 Basic Theme: Improved relationships at home.
Part of the programme encouraged pupils to link more with those at home and this emerged as a successful outcome of the programme for Pupil 3 in particular, who
shared, “I don’t go out as much and if the City match is on, I sit down and watch it with my dad”.

Although not discussed by all pupils in the focus group, most pupils shared during the sessions that they already spent time with family members prior to the group starting and it was noted in the research diary that “most pupils spend lots of time with family”. This is an intended outcome of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) generally and the focus of the Get Plugged In session.

4.7.1.1.9 Basic Theme: More helpful.
A further social, emotional and behavioural gain was the fact that pupil participants were helpful towards each other and towards others outside the context of the group. CD1 shared that group members “helped one another” and Pupil 5 claimed that the pupil participants “all helped each other”. Pupil 6 also shared that he had “been helping [his girlfriend] when she gets angry”.

The researcher agrees that pupils supported one another during the intervention and can cite an example during the Tearing Off Your Label session where pupils were required to write positives and strengths about themselves; Pupil 1 was struggling to think of things to write down and Pupil 3 and Pupil 6 noticed this and spontaneously offered to help Pupil 1 with this activity. This was noted in the research diary.

4.7.1.2 Organising Theme: Taught key skills.
A further successful outcome of the intervention was that it taught pupils key skills that they have been able to utilise both in and out of the group.

4.7.1.2.1 Basic Theme: Problem solving.
Several pupil participants highlighted problem solving as a key skill the intervention had taught them. For example, Pupil 3 stated, “it’s…helped me to solve my problems and get out of difficult situations”.

This was corroborated to an extent by the research diary, in which it was recorded that “the experiential activity demonstrated pupils’ effective problem solving skills – all found their own way of completing the maze and accessed help as needed”.

Although problem solving was not mentioned directly in the CD semi-structured interview, CDs agreed with this basic theme at the member checking stage.

4.7.1.2.2 Basic Theme: Choose positive defences.
One of the sessions introduced pupils to the idea of selecting positive defence mechanisms in pressure situations and pupil participants indicated that this was a skill the programme has taught them. For example, Pupil 4 claimed that the intervention
had “helped [him] choose positive defences...try and sort it out before [he] walk[s] away”. It was interesting that pupils were using the terminology from the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001), e.g. positive defences. Although positive defences were not mentioned directly in the CD semi-structured interview, CDs agreed with this basic theme at the member checking stage.

4.7.1.2.3 Basic Theme: Use positive self-talk.
Several pupils mentioned positive self-talk as a useful skill they have been able to implement since participating in the group, which has had a positive impact. For example, Pupil 3 shared, “I’m getting good at positive self-talk”. Pupils were able to give examples of the type of self-talk they have used, such as “I can do it” (Pupil 3) and “don’t give up” (Pupil 4). Although positive self-talk was not mentioned directly in the CD semi-structured interview, CDs agreed with this basic theme at the member checking stage.

4.7.1.2.4 Basic Theme: Perseverance.
Pupils indicated that a successful outcome of the programme was that it encouraged them to persevere with tasks. Pupil 1 shared, “I didn’t give up and just told myself to carry on...persevere”. Perseverance was a recurring theme in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) and this was reflected in pupil responses during the focus group. Although perseverance was not mentioned directly in the CD semi-structured interview, CDs agreed with this basic theme at the member checking stage.

4.7.1.2.5 Basic Theme: Focus on the future.
Some pupils shared that they were focusing on the future more following their inclusion in the programme. For example, Pupil 5 shared that he was more able to “look for the long term benefits”. This emerged as a key skill the programme had taught some of the pupils. This was a key objective of the intervention as the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) encourages pupils to select a goal for their future and focus on this to keep themselves motivated throughout life’s challenges.

Although pupils focusing on the future was not mentioned directly in the CD semi-structured interview, CDs agreed with this basic theme at the member checking stage.

4.7.1.2.6 Basic Theme: Avoid negative peers.
Some pupils highlighted a success of the programme as teaching them how to avoid negative pressure from peers. For example, Pupil 5 shared that he “tried to stop hanging out with the friends that have been causing [him] a bit of trouble”. This was another key objective of the intervention as the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001)
teaches pupils how to recognise positive and negative peers and how to avoid those peers who may be causing them to get into trouble.

Although avoiding negative peers was not mentioned directly in the CD semi-structured interview, CDs agreed with this basic theme at the member checking stage.

**4.7.1.3 Organising Theme: Positive experience.**
A further successful outcome of the intervention was that it was a positive experience for pupil participants.

**4.7.1.3.1 Basic Theme: Pupils developing trust.**
CDs commented during the semi-structured interview that a successful outcome of the intervention was that it enabled pupils to develop trust in one another. CD1 felt that the intervention had “done [Pupil 5] good to express himself and talk freely within the group and it to be done in trust as well”. She shared that all pupil participants had “learnt to trust one another”.

This was corroborated to some extent by the research diary, which stated that Pupil 4 had shared that “he trusts the group and did not mind reading in front of them”. The research diary also documented the assertion that “[the pupils] are starting to see each other as allies”.

**4.7.1.3.2 Basic Theme: Peer support.**
For some pupils, the intervention gave them an opportunity to obtain support from one another. For example, Pupil 4 stated, “when you shared something, people in the group said things to help”. Pupil 3 shared that the intervention had helped him “to help other people”. This highlights the supportive nature of the group intervention as one key to its success from the pupils’ perspective.

**4.7.1.3.3 Basic Theme: Enjoyable experience for pupils.**
It was clear from the pupil focus group that they considered a further success of the intervention to be the level of enjoyment they experienced whilst in the group. For example, Pupil 5 shared, “it’s been really fun...I...have enjoyed myself and I’ve absolutely loved every single minute of it”. The engagement in physical activities throughout the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) seemed to be a contributing factor to pupils’ enjoyment of the programme, as Pupil 2 referred to the “really, really, really good games”. Pupils were able to specify which activities they particularly enjoyed and these included the electric hurdle and the obstacle course activity that was adapted by the CDs.
CDs also commented on the enjoyment of pupils within the group, with CD1 claiming that the pupils “all enjoyed [the intervention]”.

These views were also corroborated to an extent by the research diary. For example, the researcher commented that the pupils “really enjoyed the game at the end” of the Climbing Out session, which was the obstacle course.

4.7.1.3.4 Basic Theme: Opportunity for pupils to focus on strengths.
CDs felt that a successful outcome of the intervention was that it gave pupils an opportunity to share their strengths:

…it gave the kids the freedom to say the things that they liked about themselves and I thought that was really good because lots of kids don’t really like to talk about themselves in a positive way and this kind of prompted them to do that – say the things that they really liked about themselves (CD1).

Due to the nature of the intervention, the pupils also heard positives about themselves because the programme advocates the programme leaders giving participants praise and encouragement (Moore, 2001) and this was done frequently throughout the intervention.

4.7.1.3.5 Basic Theme: Highlighted support available to pupils.
A further successful outcome of the intervention was the fact that the programme highlighted the support that was available to pupils within the school context. For example, CD2 shared that she, “thought [the Get Plugged In session] was good…because not all children know what help is there for them unless they’ve had to use it already. They’re not aware even though [the school staff] do advertise it”.

This was substantiated by the research diary, which stated “by the end of the session, pupils demonstrated their knowledge of the support available to them, both in school and elsewhere, e.g. parents, friends”, suggesting that pupils had also developed an awareness of the support available to them outside the school context.

4.7.1.4 Organising Theme: Academic gains.
An organising theme that emerged from the research was that pupil participants felt they had made academic improvements as a result of their inclusion in the group. CDs also commented on academic gains for pupils as a result of the intervention.

4.7.1.4.1 Basic Theme: Academic improvement.
Several pupils indicated an improvement in their performance academically following their inclusion in the WhyTry group. For example, Pupil 1 shared, “before the group I was in a test and I just gave up half way through…half way through the group I didn’t
give up...and I got a [National Curriculum] Level 8...in science”. Although academic gains were not directly measured, it was pleasing to the researcher to hear that pupils felt they were doing better academically as a result of the intervention.

4.7.1.4.2 Basic Theme: Improved concentration.
Pupils also made reference to their view that the intervention has improved their ability to concentrate on their academic work. For example, Pupil 3 shared that the intervention had “helped [him] a lot more to learn and concentrate on [his] work more”. Improved concentration is likely to result in academic improvement over time and may have contributed to the academic improvement discussed by pupils (see Section 4.7.1.4.1). This was corroborated to a certain extent by the research diary, in which it was claimed that “pupils seemed much more able to focus and concentrate [in later sessions] than in some previous sessions”. This suggests that pupils’ concentration improved within the context of the WhyTry sessions as well as more generally.

4.7.1.5 Organising Theme: Unsuccessful aspects.
Although CDs felt that the programme had led to successful outcomes for most of the pupil participants in the present study, they did not feel that this was the case for all pupil participants.

4.7.1.5.1 Basic Theme: No apparent improvement for Pupil 1.
CD1 did not feel that there had been any significant changes for Pupil 1 since his inclusion in the group and that he’d “been the same” and that she had “not really seen much of a change in [Pupil 1]”. This is apparently at odds with Pupil 1’s personal views and the findings from the quantitative analysis in the present study (e.g. see Section 4.6).

4.7.1.5.2 Basic Theme: Pupil 4 becoming more disruptive during sessions.
It was noted in the research diary following discussing with CDs that Pupil 4 was becoming more “disruptive” as the intervention went on. A possible reason for this unexpected development was discussed and noted by the researcher in the research diary, which stated “… perhaps this is a sign he is growing in confidence – having a voice”. This point will be explored further in Chapter 5.

4.7.2 Thematic network for Global Theme 2: Facilitative factors
The thematic network for Global Theme 2 is presented in Figure 4.9 below.
Figure 4.9: Thematic network for Global Theme 2 – Facilitative factors
This thematic network consists of seven organising themes and 22 basic themes. This network represents pupil participants’ and CDs’ responses to direct questions in the focus group and semi-structured interview regarding facilitators to programme delivery. It also incorporates views expressed in the research diary around facilitators to delivery that emerged over the course of the intervention.

4.7.2.1 Organising Theme: Deliverer aspects.
Several deliverer aspects emerged as facilitative during the present intervention from discussions with pupil participants and CDs and from notes made in the research diary.

4.7.2.1.1 Basic Theme: Listening to pupils.
CDs felt it was important that the deliverers of the programme were good listeners. CD2 shared that she thought “it’s important...that when children are saying something [programme deliverers] pick up on that and expand it so that they know you’re listening”.

This was also highlighted as something that was important to the pupil participants. Some pupils highlighted that facilitative factor of the programme was that they felt that they were being “listened” to and that their views were “understood”.

4.7.2.1.2 Basic Theme: Understanding what works for pupils.
A further facilitative factor of the intervention in the present study is the fact that the CDs had an understanding of the pupil participants and what would work for them in terms of session content and delivery. CD1 felt that it was important that the CDs had an “understanding [of] what [they] think would work well for those kids”.

This was substantiated by the research diary, which stated, “the activity was adapted based on what the co-deliverers felt the boys would respond best to and it worked really well”. It was felt by all deliverers that an understanding of the programme audience is essential.

4.7.2.1.3 Basic Theme: Having a TEP as the main deliverer.
CD2 found it helpful to have a TEP as the main deliverer of the programme because the TEP had an understanding of the programme’s concepts, which was felt to be facilitative of programme delivery. For example, CD2 shared, “I felt it’s important that you know what you’re doing and that you understand the programme”. The present researcher acknowledges that her understanding of the programme built through training and previous experience of delivery facilitated her implementation of the intervention in the present research.
4.7.2.1.4 *Basic Theme: Having more than one deliverer.*
Both CDs interviewed felt that having more than one CD present during session delivery was a key facilitator to programme delivery. CD2 shared that she “thought it helped having more than one person [to run the group]” and CD1 agreed with this assertion.

The researcher agrees that it was important to have more than one deliverer running the group and noted that “it would be quite heavy going for just one facilitator” in the research diary. However, the present researcher acknowledges that four deliverers may have been too many. That said, having three CDs as well as the TEP facilitated the training aspect of this research and also mitigated against the potential negative effects of drop outs, which occurred in the present study (see Section 4.5).

4.7.2.2 *Organising Theme: Pupil aspects.*
Along with deliverer aspects, several pupil aspects also emerged as facilitative during the present intervention.

4.7.2.2.1 *Basic Theme: Having six pupils.*
The present group contained six pupil participants, which is considered to be an optimal number of participants for the intervention (Joye & Alverez, 2010). CD1 felt that “six...children...works well”.

The researcher agreed that “six is a good number of pupils to have [in the group]”. Less pupils may have made group discussion and some of the experiential activities difficult to facilitate and more pupils may have made the group difficult to manage and may have meant that not all pupils had an opportunity to share their views.

4.7.2.2.2 *Basic Theme: Including peer role models.*
Although none of the pupils were chosen as role models, it was acknowledged by all of the deliverers that two of the pupils in the group emerged as such as the sessions went on. These were Pupil 3 and Pupil 5. Both CDs felt that Pupil 3 “gave a lot to the group” and “contributed a lot” and that he was “very grown up...like a bit of a leader”. CD1 also shared that Pupil 5 “used a lot of his own experiences and he was interesting to the others and he’s gained a lot of respect from that”. The researcher also noted that Pupil 3 and Pupil 5 had emerged as role models during the intervention, stating that Pupil 5 was “very articulate and confident, well behaved” and a “possible accidental role model” and that Pupil 3 had also “emerged as a role model”. Although the inclusion of pupil role models was accidental in the case of the present research, it reflects the present researcher’s understanding of common EP practice within the focus LA;
informal discussions with EP colleagues have revealed that many EPs include role models when carrying out group work.

4.7.2.3 Basic Theme: Having a mix of externalisers and internalisers. It was decided from the outset that the present group would contain a mix of pupils who displayed externalising SEBD and internalising SEBD, in line with suggestions in the research on effective interventions for CYP with SEBD (Cooper & Jacobs, 2011; Dishion, McCord & Poulin, 1999). This was acknowledged as a facilitative aspect of the programme delivery by the CDs. CD2 shared, “there was a mix and that was good because if you’d chosen them all for behaviour I think it would have been harder for them all to have got something out of it”. CD1 agreed that having a group of externalisers is not as effective as having a mix of externalisers and internalisers.

4.7.2.4 Basic Theme: Pupils supporting each other. The CDs highlighted the supportive nature of the group as facilitative in the present context. For example, CD1 claimed that “...they worked well as a team. They helped one another and I thought that worked really well”.

This was corroborated by comments made in the pupil focus group. For example, Pupil 4 made the point that “when [he] shared something, people in the group said things to help”.

This was corroborated by the research diary also, which stated that “pupils supported each other”. This has links with the basic theme of pupils becoming more helpful (see Section 4.7.1.1.9).

4.7.2.3 Organising Theme: Planning/reflecting. CDs found that liaising with the researcher prior to the start of the programme and following each individual session was facilitative of programme delivery as it gave them opportunities to plan and reflect.

4.7.2.3.1 Basic Theme: Pre-planning/organisation. Planning and organisation emerged as a key facilitator during the present programme delivery, according to CDs. In response to a question regarding the facilitators to programme delivery, CD1 shared, “we planned it [and] we were quite organised”.

This was corroborated to an extent by the research diary, which stated that “it is important to be organised and ready to go in order to fit everything in”.
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4.7.2.3.2 Basic Theme: Having protected time to plan sessions.
It seemed important to CDs that they had “time to prepare [the sessions]. This has links with one of the barriers to implementation – conflicting demands (see Section 4.7.3.5.1). There will be a fuller discussion of the implications of this in Chapter 5.

4.7.2.3.3 Basic Theme: Debriefing after each session.
CDs appreciated the time taken to debrief after each session. For example, CD1 shared, “discussing it and debriefing after each of the sessions as well made a big difference because we’re all so busy you kind of forget and it was good to have that straightaway”. It seemed important to CDs that this occurred soon after each session.

4.7.2.4 Organising Theme: Session content.
Several aspects of the content of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) sessions were highlighted as facilitators.

4.7.2.4.1 Basic Theme: Simple visual analogies.
The CDs cited the more simple visual analogies as facilitative of programme delivery. The visual analogies that were mentioned by the CDs as simple were Tearing Off Your Label, which was thought to be “simpler to look at than some of the others” (CD1); Climbing Out, which CD 1 thought was “not confusing”; and Get Plugged In, which was described by CD1 as “simple”.

Pupils agreed with this assertion at the member checking stage.

4.7.2.4.2 Basic Theme: Experiential activities.
The CDs recognised the experiential activities as an aspect of the programme that facilitated programme delivery and worked in the present context because pupils “like the activities” and “see that as the fun part” (CD2). Comments were also made about the experiential activities reinforcing the session objectives. For example, CD1 shared, “it’s putting what you’ve learned into something that’s practical so I think that was really useful”.

There were comments made in the research diary regarding the facilitative nature of the experiential activities:

Although the experiential activities can be tricky to set up and time consuming, the pupils do enjoy them and some of them are worth making the effort for – like the one today. The Keys to Staying on Track experiential activity worked really well and seemed to embed the message of the session.

Pupils also commented on the physical activities during the focus group. For example, Pupil 1 shared, “in other groups you’d sit there and you might get bored, but in this
group we did activities that get you up again”. Pupils were able to specify which activities they particularly enjoyed and these included the electric hurdle and the obstacle course activity that was adapted by the CDs.

4.7.2.4.3 Basic Theme: Concrete aids.
For some of the programme sessions, the deliverers provided pupils with concrete aids to support the messages of the session. For example, for the Defence Mechanisms session, the deliverers provided pupils with a laminated picture of a shield on which was printed the steps to selecting a positive defence mechanism and CDs shared that pupils were utilising these. For example, CD1 shared, “I noticed [Pupil 2] went into his pocket to get his [shield] out”. Providing a concrete reminder of strategies covered in the sessions appeared to be utilised by the pupils and was considered by the CDs to be helpful as it was highlighted as a positive aspect of programme delivery.

4.7.2.4.4 Basic Theme: Attention getters.
Another facilitative aspect of the intervention was including the attention getters at the start of every session. Pupils and CDs alluded to these on several occasions:

The activity you did at the beginning about stretching and they didn’t realise they could stretch further and it’s about them believing in themselves and trying a little bit harder. I enjoyed that [activity] and I think they did too (CD1).

The attention getters appeared to serve a purpose; to grab pupils’ attention and introduce the message of each session.

4.7.2.4.5 Basic Theme: The plenaries.
CDs shared that a further facilitative factor of the present intervention were the plenaries at the end of each session where the pupils were asked to teach the main concepts of the session back to the deliverers. For example, CD1 shared that Pupil 5 “taught [the concept] back in a way that [showed] he really, really understood it” This was a key part of the intervention and enabled deliverers to check that the pupils had understood the objectives of the session.

Pupils agreed that the plenaries were a facilitator of the intervention at the member checking stage.

4.7.2.5 Organising Theme: Programme adaptation
It was agreed by all programme deliverers from the outset that the programme would need to be adapted in order to make it more accessible for the pupil participants in the present study and more manageable for the deliverers. This is in line with suggestions in the research on programme implementation (Durlak and DuPre, 2008). CDs in the
present study were very knowledgeable about the school community. For example, CD1 stated, “we know what works well with our kids and we know what doesn’t work well with our kids”.

The researcher carefully measured which aspects of the programme were adapted throughout programme delivery (see Section 4.2). CDs felt that programme adaptation was a facilitator of the delivery of the present programme.

**4.7.2.5.1 Basic Theme: Having an introductory session**

Although the WhyTry Program manual (Moore, 2001) does not include an introductory session, the deliverers in the present research decided to include an introductory session at the start of the programme to help to form the group. This was devised by the researcher and agreed by the CDs prior to delivery. CD1 felt that “it was very important to have an introductory session first so the kids were well prepared”.

This was substantiated by the research diary, in which it was claimed that “an introductory session helped to form the group before the real WhyTry content begins” and that it was “worth doing if there’s time”.

Pupils agreed that the inclusion of an introductory session was a facilitator of the intervention at the member checking stage. CDs discussed how this would feature in future delivery of the programme (see Section 4.7.4.1).

**4.7.2.5.2 Basic Theme: Adapting experiential activities**

CDs suggested that adapting the experiential activities to make them more accessible was helpful in the present context. CD1 refers to the adaptation of the experiential activity in the Climbing Out session:

> it’s a case of just making do with what you’ve got and it’s understanding what you think would work well for those kids and doing something quite simple like the obstacle course. It was very simple, but effective. It had the same effect as the [Pot Experiential Activity].

CD2 agreed that making adaptations to the experiential activities was helpful because “if things are easier and less time consuming, you’re going to make it happen”.

This was corroborated by the research diary to some extent, which stated, “adapting the experiential activity to make it easier and safer was a good idea – pupils really engaged with this task and even stayed through break to complete it”. This was in relation the alternative to the Creative Pyramid experiential activity (see Appendix W).
4.7.2.5.3 Basic Theme: Having a pupil as a guest speaker

Another addition to the present programme delivery that was not a feature of the manualsed WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001), but that was felt to be facilitative of programme delivery by the CDs was the inclusion of a pupil guest speaker in the Get Plugged In session. This was in place of the experiential activity for that session:

I thought that was good because [Pupil Guest Speaker] is one of them, she’s not a grown up like us and so they can relate to that and she related to her past and showed how she’s turned it around...I thought that was really good (CD2).

This was verified by the research diary, which stated, “having a visitor was good, especially the fact that she only turned her behaviour around in Year 9. Allowed our group to see the potential for them to do the same”.

Pupils agreed that the inclusion of a pupil guest speaker was a facilitator of the intervention at the member checking stage. Again, CDs discussed how this would feature in future delivery of the programme (see Section 4.7.4.3.5).

4.7.2.6 Organising Theme: Making links.

The deliverers making links throughout the programme emerged as a facilitative factor of the present intervention.

4.7.2.6.1 Basic Theme: Linking sessions/revisiting concepts.

CDs commented that it was useful to make links between the sessions by revisiting concepts pupils had been introduced to previously because “[the sessions] are all interlinked” and “it’s good to revisit [the concepts]”. CDs thought it was helpful to keep reminding pupils about concepts previously covered, especially considering that many of the sessions have links with other sessions and there is a lot of repetition throughout the programme (see Moore, 2001).

This was corroborated by the research diary, which stated, “pupils listened and made connections to what they’d learnt last week”.

Furthermore, pupils agreed that making links between sessions and revisiting concepts was a facilitator of the intervention at the member checking stage.

4.7.2.6.2 Basic Theme: Linking programme to lives outside sessions.

All of the programme deliverers agreed to discuss pupils’ progress in terms of their achievement and behaviour points during the sessions with pupil assent. It was hoped that this would encourage pupils to link the concepts learnt in the sessions with the wider school context and encourage pupils to start applying the principles of the programme outside the context of the session. CD2 felt that this worked well because
“[the pupils] don’t see [the intervention] as something separate – that it’s got to be linked...that it isn’t separate to anything else they do”.

This was corroborated in the research diary, in which it was claimed that “the group cannot be a stand alone thing and needs to be synthesised with what happens in the school day and at home”.

At the member checking stage, pupils agreed that linking the programme to their lives outside the sessions was a facilitator of the intervention.

4.7.2.7 Organising Theme: External factors.
One external factor emerged as facilitative of the delivery of the programme in the present research.

4.7.2.7.1 Basic Theme: Elevating status of programme.
CD1 made a point that having a TEP in school delivering the programme helped to raise the status of the programme amongst staff in school so that they viewed it as an important intervention and released pupils from lessons. She shared, “if we say ‘Well actually the educational psychologist is coming in to deliver this programme’, they go ‘OK!’”. CDs were of the view that having a TEP to deliver the programme was a facilitative factor in the present study. This theme will be explored further in Chapter 5.

4.7.3 Thematic network for Global Theme 3: Barriers to implementation.
The thematic network for Global Theme 3 is presented in Figure 4.10 below.
This thematic network consists of five organising themes and 14 basic themes. This network represents pupil participants' and CDs' responses to direct questions in the focus group and semi-structured interview regarding barriers to programme delivery. It also incorporates views expressed in the research diary around barriers to delivery that emerged over the course of the intervention.

4.7.3.1 Organising Theme: Session content
Some aspects of the content of the sessions were considered by deliverers and pupil participants to pose a barrier to delivery.

4.7.3.1.1 Basic Theme: Balloon experiential activity
Although most of the experiential activities were seen by CDs as facilitative of programme delivery and were enjoyed by pupils, some experiential activities were less successful and were considered to be a barrier to programme delivery. This was particularly the case for the experiential activity linked to the Motivation Formula session with the balloon which CD1 felt “didn’t work...didn’t really prove any point [and] unsettle[d] the kids”. For part of this activity, pupils were required to list a number of challenges whilst one of the programme deliverers blew up a balloon until it popped; this was designed to represent challenges people face putting pressure on individuals until they ‘explode’. CDs felt that the pupil participants were waiting for the balloon to pop rather than processing the message of the activity. The point that “the balloon
activity didn’t really work” was also made in the research diary. However, although all deliverers concurred that this experiential activity had been unsuccessful, pupil participants did not express the view that the experiential activity posed a barrier to programme delivery and did not agree with this assertion at the member checking stage. However, it is possible that pupils were of this view because they enjoyed the activity rather than having taken anything meaningful from it.

4.7.3.1.2 Basic Theme: Session 4 – Motivation Formula
Many of the pupil participants shared that Session 4 in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) – Motivation Formula – was “hard to understand” (Pupil 1). This session was also considered “difficult” by all programme deliverers. The Motivation Formula was a session containing a lot of talking and difficult language that was challenging for the pupil participants. Also, the visual analogy linked to the Motivation Formula was rather complicated and the session contained a writing activity, which some of the pupils found challenging.

4.7.3.1.3 Basic Theme: Session 8 – Lift the Weight
Another session that was considered by some pupil participants and the CDs to be difficult to understand the Lift the Weight session. Some pupils “didn’t...get [the Lift the Weight session]” (Pupil 4) and CD2 shared that it was “a little bit hard to understand”. CD1 also agreed with this latter point. It is interesting that at the post-intervention stage, four out of six pupil participants either strongly agreed with or were undecided about the statement on the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) which read “I believe that laws and rules make my life more difficult”, which suggests that pupils had not understood the key message of this session – that rules can make us stronger. By the follow-up stage, three out of six participants agreed with this statement, suggesting that a period of reflection may have improved pupils’ understanding of the key concept of the session.

4.7.3.2 Organising Theme: Difficulties with access
As well as pupil participants and CDs sharing their views that some individual sessions were more difficult to access than others (See Section 4.7.3.1.2 and 4.7.3.1.3), they also highlighted more general difficulties with accessing the sessions, which posed a barrier to programme delivery.

4.7.3.2.1 Basic Theme: Difficult language
A barrier thought to negatively affect the accessibility of the programme for the pupil participants was the difficult language used during some of the sessions. CDs referred particularly to Christian Moore’s personal account included in the Motivation Formula session, which CD2 suggested “was not in their language – it wasn’t in children-talk”. 
This was supported by the research diary, which stated, “Christian Moore’s account was quite hard, not sure how much [the pupils] understood”. CDs also felt that the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) used “Americanised” (CD1) language. Throughout delivery, deliverers referred specifically to the American spellings of some words, e.g. defense and behavior, as well as phrases that are used in America but not necessarily used in England, such as surrendering the one-up relationship.

4.7.3.2.2 Basic Theme: Too much talking
CD2 made the point that “some of the sessions are quite lengthy in the speaking” and that she “felt [the deliverers] were losing [the pupils] a little bit”.

This was a point that was also noted in the research diary, which stated “seemed like a didactic session – lots of listening – some pupils started to switch off” in relation the Motivation Formula session.

It was interesting that pupils also seemed to hold this view, although not necessarily in relation to one session in particular. Pupil 1 suggested that he would have liked it if the deliverers had given pupils a “chance to stop and relax because [they’d] been talking and listening to what [deliverers had] been saying”. This has links with the basic theme of including more breaks (see Section 4.7.4.4.5).

4.7.3.2.3 Basic Theme: Complicated visual analogies
Some of the visual analogies were considered by CDs to be too complicated for the pupil participants in the present study. This was felt to be the case for the Motivation Formula session particularly, which was considered “difficult” by the CDs.

Pupil 2 felt that the majority of the visual analogies were “very hard to understand”. This could be because the more complicated visual analogies contained more language than the simpler visual analogies, which pupils may have found difficult to access. Also, the amount of information may have been visually overwhelming for pupil participants and, in much the same way as they did when sessions were aurally demanding, pupils may have switched their attention away from the complicated visual analogies, thus not fully taking them in. Again, this could serve to explain some of the unexpected findings within the present research.

4.7.3.2.4 Basic Theme: Writing activities
Pupil 4 found the writing activities “quite hard”. This was a pupil with literacy difficulties and, despite receiving support from the CDs, he struggled to engage with these tasks.

This was corroborated to an extent by the research diary, which stated, “even though writing activities are kept to a minimum, the pupils don’t seem to enjoy them and much
prefer talking”. This finding was unsurprising, given the prevalence of literacy difficulties in the SEBD population evident in the literature (e.g. Miles & Stipek, 2006). Also, pupils may have preferred talking and physical activities to writing activities because writing is what they are usually expected to do in the vast majority of their lessons and, in this respect, the WhyTry intervention was a novelty to pupils and pupils preferred the more novel aspects, such as the experiential activities, for example.

4.7.3.3 Organising Theme: Pupil factors
Several pupil aspects emerged as posing barriers to delivery during the present intervention from discussions with pupil participants and CDs and from notes made in the research diary.

4.7.3.3.1 Basic Theme: Pupils being tired
CD1 raised the point that some of the pupil participants may have been “tired” (CD1) during the sessions and that this may have affected their engagement with the sessions.

It was also claimed in the research diary that pupils appeared “tired”.

Although pupils did not refer to their tiredness as a barrier to delivery during the focus group, they agreed with this assertion at the member checking stage. Pupils’ tiredness may have had a negative effect on their ability to engage with the sessions and this may have contributed to some of the unexpected findings within the present research.

4.7.3.3.2 Basic Theme: Pupils being late
Even though pupil participants were provided with a session timetable during the introductory session, they sometimes forgot the sessions were taking place and would go to their normal timetabled lesson for that period. As a result, CDs would often have to go to pupils’ lessons to bring them to the session, which often delayed the start of the session. CD1 felt that “lates was a particular problem”.

Pupil 6 would often be late for sessions that took place during Period 1 because he experienced difficulties getting to school on time and CD1 felt that “it hindered [Pupil 6] a little bit that he missed probably 20 minutes of every [morning] session”.

Again, these points were noted by the researcher in the research diary, which stated, “late starting the session because not everyone was there on time”.

The main barrier that lates seemed to pose throughout the present intervention was that it rendered it difficult for deliverers to get through all of the session content.
Although pupil participants did not comment on lateness directly in the focus group, they agreed that it was a barrier to delivery at the member checking stage.

### 4.7.3.3 Basic Theme: Off task behaviour

Pupils and CDs commented on the barrier posed by “silly and off task” (CD2) behaviour of some pupils.

Pupil 4 also commented on other pupils’ off task behaviour during the intervention, stating, “Miss, but sometimes in the group you spent half of the session telling [Pupil 1 and Pupil 6] off”.

This was corroborated to some extent by the research diary, in which it was claimed that “some pupils seemed restless and like they weren’t listening”. This posed a barrier to programme delivery because deliverers would have to interrupt the flow of the session to bring pupils back to task so this affected the amount of the session it was possible to get through. All pupil participants could be off task at times, which was unsurprising given their SEBD and the relatively lengthy nature of the sessions, and this is likely to have affected their engagement with the sessions and, subsequently, how much they learnt within those sessions. However, the pupils who appeared most off task were Pupil 1 and Pupil 6. It is interesting that this is not reflected in the qualitative data for these pupils. However, CDs were of the view that Pupil 1 had not made any progress throughout the intervention and this may be attributed to his off task behaviour.

### 4.7.3.4 Organising Theme: Environmental factors

There were aspects of the physical environment in which the programme was delivered that were highlighted as barriers to programme delivery by the CDs.

#### 4.7.3.4.1 Basic Theme: Initial seating arrangements

The seating arrangements for the first session were recognised as a barrier to programme delivery early on. CD2 shared, “I think initially we changed what we thought was going to be a barrier...those bean bags”.

This was supported by the research diary, which stated that “bean bags [were] a distraction” during the introductory session. However, this barrier was overcome by programme deliverers early on by removing the bean bags and replacing them with chairs, which were far less distracting to pupils, helping them to focus better on the session content. Although pupil participants did not comment on the seating arrangements directly in the focus group, they agreed that it was a barrier to delivery at the member checking stage.
4.7.3.4.2 Basic Theme: Disturbances
A barrier highlighted by CDs was interruptions to group delivery. CD1 referred to “disturbances” to the sessions. Pupils indirectly raised disturbances as a barrier to delivery by suggesting switching to a venue with fewer disturbances for future delivery (see Section 4.7.4.6.1). The room in which the programme was delivered is a space for pupils with Special Educational Needs (SEN) and other additional needs to come to when they require support so sessions were often interrupted by other pupils, which affected the amount of the session it was possible to cover and may have made pupils more self-conscious during discussions.

4.7.3.4.3 Basic Theme: Room too small
Pupil 1 expressed concerns regarding the lack of space for the activities generally and shared that “when [the pupils] were doing the activities, [they] were getting a bit too close to the walls”. There were no accidents or injuries reported during the course of the intervention so these themes reflect the pupil’s concerns as opposed to actual outcomes. However, CDs agreed at the member checking stage that a larger venue – such as the dance studio – would have been preferable.

4.7.3.5 Organising Theme: External factors
One external factor emerged as posing a barrier to programme delivery in the present research.

4.7.3.5.1 Basic Theme: Demands of school life
The demands of school life outside the context of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) sessions often placed restrictions on the CDs because they were “busy doing everything else all week” (CD2).

The researcher noted a point in the research diary regarding CDs responding to such demands during the planning/debriefing time for the intervention:

I noted frustration I felt at one of the CDs dealing with school-based issues during our reflection/planning time. Upon reflection, it is unrealistic to expect school staff to give this research the same level of importance as I do. Ultimately, their concerns lie with the pupils in their school, not with my doctoral research (Research diary, 12.10.11).

This supports the researcher’s experiences of schools as very busy places with numerous competing demands placed on staff.

4.7.4 Thematic network for Global Theme 4: Recommendations.
The thematic network for Global Theme 4 is presented in Figure 4.11 below.
Figure 4.11: Thematic network for Global Theme 4 - Recommendations
This thematic network consists of seven organising themes and 28 basic themes. This network represents pupil participants’ and CDs’ responses to direct questions in the focus group and semi-structured interview asking for recommendations for future programme delivery. It also incorporates views expressed in the research diary around recommendations for future delivery of the programme.

4.7.4.1 Organising Theme: Pupil aspects
Several recommendations were made in relation to the type of pupils the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) is suitable for.

4.7.4.1.1 Basic Theme: Target older children
CDs and pupils suggested that the intervention might be suitable for older pupils. The pupils shared that this was due to the complicated nature of some of the sessions and that older pupils might be more likely to understand the key messages of the programme. For example, in response to the question “What types of pupils do you think [the WhyTry Program] would be most suited to?”, Pupil 4 responded, “Year 11s because they’re gonna be adults soon and adults sometimes have a lot of problems in case they get in debt and they can use positive self-talk and say ‘I can do this’”.

CDs also felt that the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) would be useful for some “older children” (CD2) in the school, particularly “Year 10” (CD1). This was from the point of view of supporting transition, which links with the basic theme explored in Section 4.7.4.1.5.

4.7.4.1.2 Basic Theme: Don’t mix gender
CDs were of the view that the WhyTry groups should either be all boys or all girls and that they “wouldn’t have mixed gender” (CD1) within one group. Pupils agreed with this view at the member checking stage. Unfortunately, the present researcher failed to probe this point and so possible reasons for this view will be explored in Section 5.

4.7.4.1.3 Basic Theme: Don’t mix year groups
CDs were also of the view that the WhyTry groups should contain pupils from one year group and that they “wouldn’t mix year groups” (CD1). Pupils agreed with this view at the member checking stage. Again, the present researcher failed to probe this point and so possible reasons for this view will be explored in Section 5.

4.7.4.1.4 Basic Theme: Suitable for secondary pupils
Pupil participants shared that they felt that the programme was most suitable for “all high school people, so Year 7 and upwards” (Pupil 2). CDs agreed with this assertion at the member checking stage. This supports the fact that the WhyTry Program pack
for secondary pupils (Moore, 2001) has been designed with secondary age pupils in mind. There is an elementary, or primary, version for younger pupils.

### 4.7.4.1.5 Basic Theme: Helpful for transition

Pupil participants also shared that they felt that the programme would be helpful for pupils who were at transition points. For example, pupils transitioning from Year 6 into Year 7 and pupils transitioning from Year 11 to further education, employment or training. Pupil 3 shared that the intervention would be helpful for “Year 7 because they’re newcomers in high school and they might need help to learn to fit in to school”.

Pupil 5 claimed the intervention would be helpful for:

> Year 11s because they’re at the end of school and if they’re low on self-respect then they may not think they can go anywhere, but if they were to do this then maybe they’ll learn that now they’re leaving school, they’ve got the chance to do what they want.

This was corroborated by CDs in the semi-structured interview. CD2 shared that “[Year 10s] would get a lot out of [the intervention] before it’s too late” and CD1 added, “especially as it’s coming up to the world of work and what they want to do in the future”.

### 4.7.4.2 Organising Theme: Deliverer aspects

Several recommendations were also made in relation to the type of person who might deliver the programme in the future.

#### 4.7.4.2.1 Basic Theme: Use of key staff

CDs highlighted themselves and CD3 as the members of staff best placed to roll out the delivery of the intervention in the focus school. This was the researcher’s intention; to up skill CDs on the delivery of the programme so that they would feel confident running future groups.

#### 4.7.4.2.2 Basic Theme: Become confident with the programme

CDs shared that they would require an opportunity to gain “confidence” (CD1) with the intervention before attempting to train any other members of staff on its delivery. The researcher agrees that there is so much in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) that it may take several cycles of delivery for CDs to become confident with delivering the content to the point where they would feel competent enough with delivery to train up other staff members on implementation of the programme.
4.7.4.2.3 Basic Theme: Pupil deliverers
Pupil 1 thought that future sessions could be run by the pupil participants in the present study. He commented, “next year we should teach the group instead of other teachers”. Although this was not mentioned by the CDs in the semi-structured interview, it emerged at the member checking stage that they felt it was a good idea and would help with WhyTry permeating the school ethos (see Section 4.7.4.7).

4.7.4.2.4 Basic Theme: Make notes during debrief
Although the researcher kept a research diary throughout this intervention, she did not explicitly share this with the CDs. Both CDs shared that it would facilitate their delivery of the intervention if they were to keep a record of discussions during the reflective/planning sessions:

What I thought might help...when we have the debrief is making notes of that...so if we were running a session we’d look back and think “Oh yeah, we said we’d change this one or do this or we didn’t like that” (CD2).

The researcher concurs that making notes throughout the intervention would facilitate future delivery as it would support deliverers in building on successes and avoiding aspects that did not go as well.

4.7.4.3 Organising Theme: Session content
CDs and pupil participants made several recommendations for future delivery regarding session content.

4.7.4.3.1 Basic Theme: More youtube clips
Pupil 1 made the suggestion that playing “more...Youtube clips” during the sessions would have improved them:

CD1 concurred with this suggestion in the semi-structured interview, stating, “I would also say that we do the [Youtube] clips as well because I think they were really important”.

This point was corroborated by the research diary, which stated, “pupils enjoyed the visual and practical activities, e.g. Youtube clip, which really helped to embed the key message of the session in an amusing way that appealed to the pupils”. Although not a part of the WhyTry Program as depicted in the WhyTry Program manual (see Moore, 2001), the Youtube clips were suggested at the WhyTry facilitator training and emerged as an integral part of the intervention in the present research, according to pupil participants and deliverers.
4.7.4.3.2 Basic Theme: Posters and colour photocopies of visual analogies

CDs shared that they would utilise the “posters” (CD1) and colour photocopies of the visual analogies for future implementation. This view was supported by pupils at the member checking stage. It was suggested that pupils having their own colour photocopy of the visual analogies helps to keep them focused during the sessions. This is perhaps because it appeals to those pupils who have a predominantly visual learning style. The researcher agrees that individual colour photocopies are important for future delivery because even if pupils are not listening to the session content, hopefully deliverers can still get the key messages of the sessions across to pupils through the visual analogy.

4.7.4.3.3 Basic Theme: More experiential activities

Several pupils commented that future groups should include more of the physical activities enjoyed by pupil participants in the present study. For example, in response to the question “How do you think WhyTry could be improved in the future?”, Pupil 4 responded “[m]ore activities”.

CDs felt that the experiential activities were “an integral part” (CD2) of the programme and both shared that they were planning to use the experiential activities when implementing the programme in future. This was corroborated by the research diary to some extent, which stated that deliverers “possibly need[ed] to break sessions up with practical/experiential activities”. This is potentially because the experiential activities appeal to those pupils who have a predominantly kinaesthetic learning style. It would also help the sessions to be less language based, which is important as too much talking was cited as a barrier to programme delivery in the present research.

4.7.4.3.4 Basic Theme: Don’t focus on the music

Music is a feature of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) and the deliverers of the present intervention played music during the sessions. However, this was not a major feature of the sessions themselves in the present study. CD1 felt “it’s not really about the music, it’s about [the pupils] understanding the content of the lesson”. For this reason, CDs shared that they would play the music in the background to accompany the sessions. Although the music is designed to engage pupils and embed the principles of the programme further (Moore, 2001), CDs felt that it was more important to support pupils in understanding the content of the sessions.

4.7.4.3.5 Basic Theme: Pupil visitor

CDs highlighted having a pupil as a guest speaker as a facilitator of the present intervention (see Section 4.7.2.5.3) and shared that would “definitely have a guest again because that really worked”. This would be included in the Get Plugged In
session when discussing mentors as the school has a peer mentoring system. The pupil participants agreed with this point at the member checking stage.

4.7.4.4 Organising Theme: Programme adaptation
CDs discussed a number of adaptations they would make to the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) for future delivery.

4.7.4.4.1 Basic Theme: Introductory session
CDs shared that they liked the introductory session and that this facilitated the delivery of the group (see Section 4.7.2.5.1). They shared that they would include an introductory session for future groups. The success of the introductory session was also noted by the researcher in the research diary (see Section 4.7.2.5.1) and the researcher agrees that it would be useful to include an introductory session when implementing the intervention in the future.

4.7.4.4.2 Basic Theme: Follow-up session
CDs discussed including a follow-up session:

...now the sessions have finished, we don’t want anything good they’re taking away to finish as well and...perhaps a follow-up session, even if it’s just with the [pupils]...just saying “How are things going? Do you still think about WhyTry? What aspects of WhyTry are you still using...?" (CD2)

CDs wanted to run a follow-up session for the pupil participants in the present study as well as any future groups they would run in-house. A follow-up session was planned for the pupil participants in the present study and this took place in March 2012 along with follow-up measures and member checking.

4.7.4.4.3 Basic Theme: Shorten programme
Both CDs felt that the programme was too long. The programme itself ran for ten sessions and the current facilitators also included an introductory session, totalling eleven sessions, each lasting 100 minutes. This meant that the programme ran for 18 hours in total, which is the approximate amount of time outlined in the programme manual. However, CDs felt that this was too long for the pupil participants in the present study and that they “would shorten...the programme” (CD2) to “between six to eight sessions” (CD1). After further questioning, the CDs shared which of the sessions they would not include for future implementation of the programme. These were the Lift the Weight session, the Motivation Formula and Jump Your Hurdles. CDs shared that they felt eight sessions would be an optimal number for future implementation of the programme in the focus school. This is in contrast to suggestions made by pupil
participants who recommended the inclusion of more sessions for future implementation (see Section 4.7.4.4.4).

4.7.4.4 Basic Theme: More sessions
Pupil 5 shared that he felt including “a few more sessions” could improve the programme when it is implemented in future. This is in contrast to the views of the CDs who felt that the programme was too lengthy (see Section 4.7.4.4.3). Pupils remained of the view that more sessions would be helpful when deliverers implement the programme in future at the member checking stage.

4.7.4.5 Basic Theme: More breaks
Pupil 1 shared that he thought group members might benefit from breaks in the sessions and that deliverers should “actually give [pupils] a chance to stop and relax because [they’ve] been talking and listening to what [the deliverers have] been saying”. The deliverers of the intervention in the present study had not planned for breaks during all the sessions due to concerns about getting through the session content. However, it was agreed at the member checking stage that more breaks for future groups would be beneficial. This would have implications for how much of the programme content it would be possible to cover and this will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

4.7.4.5 Organising Theme: External aspects
It was the CDs who suggested the following recommendations regarding external aspects. This is likely to be because the CDs are aware of the systems in place at their school, which need to be taken into account when implementing any kind of programme, whereas the pupils are not necessarily aware of this kind of information. However, when the following suggestions were made to pupils at the member checking stage, they agreed that they were good ideas for future implementation of the programme.

4.7.4.5.1 Basic Theme: Obtain feedback from staff
CDs shared that obtaining feedback from staff would be useful when implementing the programme in the future. CD2 shared, “[w]e could ask teachers actually. ‘These children have been taking part in a programme, could you give us any feedback?’…Just so we get their feedback ‘cause they of course will see them in lessons”’. The researcher acknowledges that it was initially her intention to collect quantitative data from teachers to support the discipline data collected, but this was not possible due to time constraints (see Chapter 3). However, if CDs feel that they would have time to collect this information, the researcher concurs that it would be useful, especially in terms of gathering evidence to gain the backing of the senior leadership
team to support the continued implementation of the programme (see Section 4.7.4.5.3).

4.7.4.5.2 Basic Theme: Obtain feedback from parents
Although is acknowledged that parents’ views are important, the researcher in the present study opted not to engage parents during programme implementation in the present study due to time constraints. However, the CDs in the present study felt that engaging parents would be important for future group implementation. CDs shared that it would be useful to ascertain how pupils involved in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) were developing outside the context of the group and the school:

What about...getting feedback from parents? Maybe get in touch...and say “Well, he’s done this programme now. We’re really proud of him, but how do you think he’s done at home?” Because it’s important they’re taking the right decisions at home as well (CD1).

CD1 suggested parents could be engaged through CDs telephoning home.

4.7.4.5.3 Basic Theme: Obtain backing of SLT
CD2 felt that it was “important [CDs] get the backing of the SLT when [they’re] doing [the intervention]” as this would help to elevate the status of the programme amongst school staff, which they saw as facilitative of programme delivery. This supports Durlak and DuPre’s (2008) suggestion of acquiring a programme champion who has high status amongst staff to help orchestrate the diffusion of an intervention being a facilitative factor of successful programme implementation.

4.7.4.6 Organising Theme: Environmental aspects
Pupil participants and CDs made suggestions regarding the physical environment in which future groups might be run.

4.7.4.6.1 Basic Theme: More private venue
Some of the pupils suggested the use of a venue that would reduce disruption for future groups. Pupil 6 suggested that future deliverers should “change to a room where no one can hear you and no one comes in”. CDs highlighted that the environment during the present research posed somewhat of a barrier to programme delivery due to the number of interruptions that occurred during delivery (see Section 4.7.3.4.2). CDs suggested more private venues for future delivery, such as “the dance studio” (CD1).

4.7.4.6.2 Basic Theme: Larger venue
Lack of space has already been highlighted as a barrier to the delivery of the programme in the present research (see Section 4.7.3.4.3). A suggestion for future
delivery made by the pupil participants was to hold the group in a “bigger room” (Pupil 2). CDs agreed with this suggestion at the member checking stage. Also, the venues they suggested during the semi-structured interview – the dance studio and a meeting room (see Section 4.7.4.6.1) – are both larger than the venue in which the intervention was held in the present intervention, which support pupils’ suggestion of a larger venue to some extent.

**4.7.4.7 Organising Theme: Permeate school ethos**

A final recommendation for future delivery made by pupil participants in the present study was to extend the principles of the programme to the wider school community. Similarly to the pupil participants in the present study, CDs in the present study recommended that the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) should permeate the whole-school ethos.

**4.7.4.7.1 Basic Theme: WhyTry assemblies**

One suggestion CDs made to support the extension of the programme principles throughout the focus school was to “[get] the message across in an assembly” (CD2). Pupils agreed with this at the member checking stage and one pupil (Pupil 5) made a further suggestion that pupils at the focus school could visit feeder primary schools to run assemblies there to help prepare them for transition. CDs agreed that this would be a good idea.

**4.7.4.7.2 Basic Theme: WhyTry displays**

A further suggestion made by CDs regarding extending the principles of the programme to the wider school ethos was to have WhyTry “displays in classrooms” (CD1). Although CD1 made the point that pupils who had not been part of the intervention would not necessarily be able to relate to these, if the other developments were made, such as including the programme in assemblies (see Section 4.7.4.7.1) and/or the personal, social and health education (PSHE) or drama curriculum (see Section 4.7.4.7.3), all pupils in the school would be familiar with the programme principles and, therefore, they would be able to relate to WhyTry displays placed around the focus school.

**4.7.4.7.3 Basic Theme: WhyTry in drama/PSHE curriculum**

Another suggestion made by CDs to help support the extension of the programme throughout the focus school was to include the programme in “PSHE lessons or drama lessons because there is an element of drama in it because [pupils are] doing practical activities” (CD1).
4.7.4.7.4 Basic Theme: WhyTry badges for ‘ambassadors’

This final recommendation for future delivery was made solely at the member checking stage. Pupil 1 suggested the pupil participants – and any other pupils who participated in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in the future – should wear “a WhyTry badge” to set them apart from other members of the school community and to advertise the programme. CD2 agreed that this would be a good idea, but made the point that if pupils were to wear the WhyTry badge, they would need to be “an ambassador for the programme” and put the principles of the programme into practice. CD1 agreed and suggested that it would be important for a WhyTry ambassador to be “a role model”.

4.8 Summary

Taken as a whole, the results from the present research were positive, suggesting that the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) was an effective intervention with the group of pupil participants in the focus school.

Pupil participants’ mean achievement points increased from pre- to post-intervention, suggesting more positive behaviours across the group according to school staff perception; there was a dip in achievement points achieved at the follow-up stage, but mean achievement points remained higher than at the pre-intervention stage (see Figure 4.1). Pupil participants’ mean behaviour points also increased from pre- to post-intervention, suggesting more negative behaviours according to school staff perception, albeit to a lesser extent than the increase in positive behaviours; this was maintained at the follow-up stage (see Figure 4.2). Pupil participants’ mean score on the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) increased from pre- to post-intervention, suggesting progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives according to self-report; there was a further increase at the follow-up stage (see Figure 4.4). Pupil participants’ mean score on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) decreased from pre- to post-intervention, indicating an improvement in pupils’ self-perceived behaviour; this was maintained at the follow-up stage (see Figure 4.5). Pupil participants’ mean score on the BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) increased from pre- to post-intervention, indicating an improvement in pupils’ self-concept, according to self-report; there was a further increase at the follow-up stage (see Figure 4.6). Refer to Section 4.6 for further details on the individual pupil participants’ data.

Focus group, interview and research diary data revealed a number of outcomes of the intervention. The majority of outcomes were positive. These were social, emotional and behavioural gains; the teaching of key skills to pupils; positive experience for pupils; and academic gains for pupils. However, some unsuccessful aspects of the intervention were also highlighted, namely an apparent lack of improvement generally
for Pupil 1 and Pupil 4 becoming more disruptive. These latter points were the views of the co-deliverers in the present research as expressed in the semi-structured interview (see Section 4.7.1 for a full list of outcomes). A number of facilitators to programme delivery were highlighted. These included deliverer aspects; pupil aspects; planning/reflecting; session content; programme adaptation; making links; and external factors (see Section 4.7.2 for a full list of facilitators). A number of barriers to programme delivery were also highlighted. These included session content; difficulties with access; pupil factors; environmental factors; and external factors (see Section 4.7.3 for a full list of barriers). A number of recommendations for future delivery were made. These included pupil aspects; deliverer aspects; session content; programme adaptation; external aspects; environmental aspects; and facilitating the WhyTry Programme (Moore, 2001) in permeating the school ethos (see Section 4.7.4 for a full list of recommendations for future delivery).

The following chapter will explore the more salient findings further, discussing them in relation to each research question and placing the research in the context of the existing literature outlined in the Literature Review.
Chapter 5: DISCUSSION

5.1 Section Outline
This chapter will summarise and discuss key findings in relation to each of the three research questions (RQs) the present study aimed to address. The effectiveness of the present intervention for one group of pupils in the focus school will be evaluated and findings will be considered in relation to previous research. A model of effective programme implementation specific to the focus school will be proposed based on emergent facilitators and barriers to implementation and recommendations for future delivery. The chapter will conclude by considering the limitations and the implications of the research.

5.2 Study Aims
The present study aimed to address the following RQs:

RQ1. To what extent is there evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) for pupils in a mainstream secondary school and are any gains sustained three months post-intervention?

RQ 2. Which factors appear to support or hinder the implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in one mainstream secondary school?

RQ 3. Which suggestions do pupil participants and programme deliverers make for future implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001)?

The present researcher will now summarise findings in relation to each of the RQs.

5.3 Research Question One
To what extent is there evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) for pupils in a mainstream secondary school and are any gains sustained three months post-intervention?

Quantitative data were gathered in order to partially address RQ1. The researcher triangulated the findings from quantitative methods with qualitative data. These levels of data will now be presented and then synthesised, in accordance with the partially mixed concurrent methodological design described in Chapter 3.

5.3.1 Quantitative data.
There were some general trends in the data at the group level. Generally, pupil participants displayed more positive behaviours following their inclusion in the intervention at a meaningful level (see Figure 4.1). Pupil participants also displayed more negative behaviours following their inclusion in the intervention at a meaningful
level (see Figure 4.2). Overall, these results suggest that the intervention was effective in supporting pupils’ positive behaviour, which is in line with previous investigations into the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) (e.g. Joye & Alvarez, 2010; Mazzotta-Perretti, 2009), although negative behaviours also increased. The unexpected finding of the increase in negative behaviours may be explained by growing confidence of the pupil participants in the present study. This was corroborated to some extent by discussions with pupil participants at the member checking stage. Pupils suggested that the fact that they had developed confidence as a result of the intervention may have attracted more attention generally from teachers, so not only did they receive increased acknowledgement for their positive behaviours, they also received increased acknowledgement for their negative behaviours. The researcher considers this explanation plausible and believes that it could adequately explain the unexpected finding in the present study of increased negative behaviours post-intervention.

Generally, pupil participants showed progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives post-intervention, according to self-report; this progress was improved upon at the follow-up stage (see Figure 4.4). However, the present researcher does not consider this progress to be meaningful overall. The researcher is not aware of any previous published research that has utilised the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) as a pre-post measure and asserts that this is a novel finding of the present study. However, it was not a surprising finding that pupils showed progress on the WTM (WhyTry Organization website) as pupil participants’ progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives was expected since these were explicitly taught and reinforced throughout the intervention. An unexpected finding was Pupil 3’s lack of progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives, potential reasons for which will be explored later.

Pupil participants’ group mean on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) decreased slightly post-intervention, indicating a reduction in disruptive behaviour; this was maintained at the follow-up stage (see Figure 4.5). This is not in line with findings from the discipline data as this indicated an increase in negative behaviours, a possible explanation for which has been provided. However the severity level at all data collection points remained at average, suggesting that pupils did not consider their negative behaviour to be an issue at any point during the research process. This would be expected for three out of the six participants – Pupil 2, Pupil 4 and Pupil 5 – as these pupils were selected on the basis of their initial presenting SEBD being internalising in nature and, therefore, disruptive behaviour was not a major issue for these participants. However,
one might expect elevated scores on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) at the start of the intervention for Pupil 1, Pupil 3 and Pupil 6 and this was not the case. One way to interpret this finding is that it is possible that the pupils did not understand that their behaviour was an issue prior to starting the intervention and, therefore, rated their behaviour as *average* at the pre-intervention stage when in fact it may have been *mildly elevated, moderately elevated or extremely elevated*. Over the course of the intervention, pupils may have moved along the behaviour change cycle (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1998) (see Figure 5.1, adapted from Atkinson & Amesu, 2007). Had interim measures been taken, the present researcher may have found that pupils’ self-rating of their own disruptive behaviour may have worsened as they developed a deeper understanding of their behaviour. As the intervention progressed and pupils moved further along the behaviour change cycle (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1998), this may have resulted in genuine improvements in pupils’ behaviour, thereby resulting in the post-intervention and follow-up scores represented herein. However, as interim measures were not taken, this is merely a suggestion by the present researcher.

![Figure 5.1: The model of stages of change (adapted from Atkinson & Amesu, 2007, p.32)](image-url)
Another way to interpret this finding is that the researcher, in collaboration with school staff, selected inappropriate participants for the research. It could be the case that the behaviour for Pupil 1, Pupil 3 and Pupil 6 was not as disruptive as school staff suggested and, therefore, improvements in disruptive behaviour were not observed as they were not necessarily required. It has been explored within the qualitative data that Pupil 3 emerged as somewhat of a role model throughout the course of the intervention, which would be unlikely to be the case if his behaviour was highly disruptive prior to the start of the intervention. Perhaps a more objective and specific measure of pupil behaviour would have yielded more precise and reliable results, for example, parent, teacher and child versions of the SDQ (Goodman, 1997; 1999). It could be the case that school data may be too broad a measure and too context dependent to detect subtle changes.

Generally, pupil participants’ self-concept remained at the same level post-intervention, indicating no change in pupils’ self-concept. However, there was an increase in the group mean at the follow-up stage, indicating an improvement in pupils’ self-concept over time (see Figure 4.6). These findings are a novel finding of the present study as the researcher is not aware of any other research that has studied participants’ self-concept. The improvement in self-concept found in the present study may be due to the focus in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) on pupils’ positives and strengths and the guidance in the programme manual for deliverers to praise and encourage pupils (Moore, 2001). Another aspect of the intervention that may have had a positive impact on pupils’ self-concept is their apparent improvement in other areas. This would indicate that improvements as a result of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) are interlinked and an improvement in one area, such as academic performance, could lead to an improvement in another area, such as self-concept. Without having explored this further within the current research design, it is difficult to attribute the changes to any one construct in particular. It may be the case that this improvement in self-concept was attributable to some other factor within pupil participants’ lives other than their inclusion in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001). Alternatively, it could be the case that the intervention took time to take effect and positive effects in self-concept were only perceptible to pupils three months following the cessation of the intervention. However, the researcher suggests that these positive changes may not have occurred had the pupils not been part of the intervention. This finding provides a rationale for future research into the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) to consider its impact on self-concept to ascertain whether this effect is generaliseable to CYP in other settings.
There were some interesting findings at the individual level, both expected and unexpected. These are summarised below.

**Pupil 1**

The discipline data indicated no meaningful change in Pupil 1’s behaviour (see Figure 4.1 and Figure 4.2). This was corroborated by CDs who felt that there had been no noticeable change in Pupil 1 across any domain following his participation in the intervention (see Section 4.7.1.5.1). However, this was in contrast to Pupil 1’s responses on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) (see Figure 4.5). It could be the case that Pupil 1 remained at a precontemplative stage on the cycle of change (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1998) in terms of his behaviour, showing no awareness of his behaviour difficulties following his involvement in the intervention. If one were to accept this explanation, one might conclude that the intervention had not been effective for Pupil 1 in terms of improving his behaviour and any results suggesting otherwise are anomalous. Alternatively, the group may have had a positive impact on Pupil 1’s behaviour that CDs and other school staff were unaware of. The WTM data (WhyTry Organization website) suggests that Pupil 1 made meaningful progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives, as expected (see Figure 4.4). The BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) data suggests that although there was no initial improvement in Pupil 1’s self-concept at the post-intervention stage, there was considerable improvement at the follow-up stage, leading to an improvement in the severity level of Pupil 1’s self-concept from *much lower than average* to *above average* (see Figure 4.6). As previously stated, this improvement in self concept could be attributable to some other factor. Alternatively, it could be the case that the intervention took time to take effect for Pupil 1 and positive effects in self-concept were only perceptible to him at the follow-up stage.

**Pupil 2**

The discipline data indicated no meaningful changes in Pupil 2’s behaviour (see Figure 4.1, Figure 4.2 and Figure 4.3). Pupil 2’s responses on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) indicated a reduction in disruptive behaviours from pre-intervention to post-intervention, which was maintained at the follow-up stage (see Figure 4.5). This contrasted somewhat with the discipline data described above, as the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) suggested a reduction in disruptive behaviours, whereas the discipline data suggested that the negative behaviours displayed by Pupil 2 saw no change. However, the nature of the negative behaviours altered. During the term preceding the intervention, Pupil 2 received behaviour points for failing to complete homework. During the term in which
the intervention ran, Pupil 2 received more behaviour points for disruptive behaviours than any other misdemeanour. This could indicate Pupil 2’s increased confidence levels causing him to be more vocal, which may have been perceived as disruptive at times by staff. However, during the term following cessation of the intervention, Pupil 2 received behaviour points for failure to complete class work and homework rather than disruption, suggesting that Pupil 2’s disruptive behaviours had actually diminished by the end of the intervention, which would support Pupil 2’s self-reported views. The WTM data (WhyTry Organization website) suggests that Pupil 2 made meaningful progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives, as expected (see Figure 4.4). The BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) data suggests that there was a steady improvement in Pupil 2’s self-concept from pre- to post-intervention through to the follow-up stage (see Figure 4.6). This led to an improvement in Pupil 2’s severity level, which went from average to above average. Again, the researcher acknowledges that this improvement in self-concept may have been attributable to some other factor other than Pupil 2’s inclusion in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) and, without further investigation, the catalyst for this positive change cannot be detected with any certainty. However, the researcher asserts that the change may have occurred, at least in part, as a result of exposure to the present intervention.

Pupil 3

The discipline data indicated that Pupil 3 was displaying more positive behaviours at the follow-up stage compared with the pre-intervention stage, but he was also displaying more negative behaviours at the follow-up stage compared with the pre-intervention stage (see Figure 4.1, Figure 4.2 and Figure 4.3). These changes were considered by the present researcher to be meaningful. The suggested increase in negative behaviours was in contrast to the views of the deliverers of the intervention in the present research (see Section 4.7.2.2.2). The unexpected finding of an increase of behaviour points could be indicative of increased confidence as a result of the intervention, which may have attracted more attention generally from teachers, so not only did Pupil 3 receive increased acknowledgement for his positive behaviours, he also received increased acknowledgement for his negative behaviours. There was no notable difference in Pupil 3’s BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) score from pre-intervention to follow-up; Pupil 3’s score remained in the mildly elevated range (see Figure 4.5). This contrasts somewhat with the discipline data described above as it suggests a maintenance of disruptive behaviours, whereas the discipline data suggests an increase. Also, Pupil 3 showed no meaningful progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives, as measured by the WTM (WhyTry Organization website).
There was an inconsistency between these data and the qualitative data in the present research; the qualitative data suggested Pupil 3 was somewhat of a role model within the group, his behaviour had improved and that he had apparently made progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives. Perhaps Pupil 3’s inclusion in the group had communicated to him that his behaviour was an issue. This seems plausible to the present researcher as Pupil 3 was a bright pupil and often engaged in reflection during the group sessions so it is possible that his inclusion in the group caused him to reflect on his behaviour, which could be why his BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) score remained at a mildly elevated level throughout and why he appeared not to make progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives on the WTM (WhyTry Organization website). The BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) data suggests that although there was an initial decline in Pupil 2’s self concept at the post-intervention stage, leading to a change in the severity level from above average to much lower than average, the level returned to average at the follow-up stage, indicating no notable change in Pupil 2’s self-concept (see Figure 4.6).

Pupil 4

The discipline data indicated that although there was a meaningful increase in the number of positive behaviours displayed by Pupil 4 following his involvement in the intervention (see Figure 4.1), there was also a meaningful increase in the number of negative behaviours displayed (see Figure 4.2). This was corroborated to an extent by the qualitative data in the present study, which indicated that Pupil 4 became more disruptive as the intervention developed (see Section 4.7.1.5.2). This may be attributable to Pupil 4’s growing confidence leading to him finding a voice with which to express himself, which may have attracted more attention than previously, both positive and negative. The nature of the negative behaviours displayed by Pupil 4 altered. During the term preceding the intervention, Pupil 4 received one behaviour point for distracting behaviour. During the term in which the intervention ran, Pupil 4 received behaviour points for distracting behaviour, defiance, lack of equipment and fighting. Again, the defiant, distracting and physical behaviours could indicate Pupil 4’s increased confidence levels causing him to be more vocal, which may have been perceived as disruptive at times by staff. The types of negative behaviours displayed during the term following cessation of the intervention were lack of equipment and one incident of damage to school property, indicating that, on the whole, Pupil 4’s disruptive behaviours had reduced. This is in line with findings on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005), which indicated a reduction in Pupil 4’s disruptive behaviours. It could be the case that Pupil 4 remains at a precontemplative stage on the cycle of change in terms of his
behaviour (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1998), showing no awareness of his behaviour difficulties following his involvement in the intervention. However, the nature of Pupil 4’s disruptive behaviour altered (see above), which suggests a behaviour shift. Having said this, as other studies have found a lack of progress for some pupils participating in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) (e.g. Eggett, 2003), this indicates that further research is required to ascertain more specifically what type of pupils the intervention is most suitable for. The WTM data (WhyTry Organization website) suggests that Pupil 4 made progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives, as expected (see Figure 4.4). The BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) data suggests that there was a steady improvement in Pupil 2’s self-concept from pre- to post-intervention through to the follow-up stage (see Figure 4.6). This led to an improvement in Pupil 4’s severity level, which went from much lower than average at the pre- and post-intervention stages to average at the follow-up stage. Again, the researcher acknowledges that this improvement in self-concept may have been attributable to some other factor other in Pupil 4’s life other than his inclusion in the present intervention. However, the researcher asserts that the change may have occurred, at least in part, as a result of exposure to the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001).

Pupil 5

The discipline data for Pupil 5 indicates a meaningful decrease in the number of positive behaviours displayed (see Figure 4.1). This is not what one would expect given the programme objectives (Moore, 2001) and previous research findings (e.g. Joye & Alvarez, 2010; Mazzotta-Perretti, 2009). However, Pupil 5 was selected due to his internalising SEBD and his disruptive behaviour was not considered to be an issue. There was no meaningful change in number of negative behaviours displayed following the intervention (see Figure 4.2 and Figure 4.3). Furthermore, it emerged from the analysis of the qualitative data in the present study (see Section 4.7.2.2.2) that Pupil 5 was somewhat of a role model, so perhaps he had been included in the intervention in error. Pupil 5’s score on the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) remained in the average range at all three data collection points (see Figure 4.5). This contrasts somewhat with the discipline data described above. However, the BDBI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) data supported the qualitative data in the present study to some extent, which indicates that Pupil 5’s behaviour was not an issue from the outset of the intervention through to the end. The WTM data (WhyTry Organization website) indicates that Pupil 5 made progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives, as expected (see Figure 4.4). The BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) data suggests that there was an improvement in Pupil 5’s self concept at the post-intervention stage, leading to an
improvement in the severity level of Pupil 5’s self-concept from *average* to *above average* (see Figure 4.6). This was maintained at the follow-up stage. As previously stated, this improvement in self-concept could be attributable to some other factor and further investigation would be required to determine the catalyst for this positive change.

**Pupil 6**

The majority of the findings with regard to Pupil 6 suggest that the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) had been effective for this pupil, providing support for the efficacy of the programme, in line with previous research findings (Eggett, 2003; Bushnell & Card, 2003; Baker, 2008; Mazzotta-Perretti, 2009; Joye & Alvarez, 2010). Pupil 6’s positive behaviours increased to a meaningful level (see Figure 4.1) and his negative behaviours had decreased to a meaningful level by the follow-up stage (see Figure 4.2). His self-reported disruptive behaviours remained at *average* throughout (see Figure 4.5). The WTM data (WhyTry Organization website) indicates he made meaningful progress against the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) objectives, as expected (see Figure 4.4). Although there was no change to Pupil 6’s BSCI-Y (Beck et al., 2005) score from pre- to post-intervention through to the follow-up stage, the above *average* levels maintained throughout suggests that an improvement was not necessary for Pupil 6. Perhaps Pupil 6’s data suggest that the group is more efficacious for externalising pupils, like Pupil 6, than for internalising pupils. However, positive findings were also revealed for internalising pupils in the present study, indicating that the programme could indeed be efficacious for both. This area requires further research to ascertain for whom the programme is maximally effective.

*5.3.2 Qualitative data.*

It emerged that all pupil participants developed the ability to trust one another as a result of their inclusion in the intervention (see Section 4.7.1.3.1). The researcher observed that group members were open and honest with one another throughout the duration of the intervention. This may indicate that they trusted the programme deliverers also as they shared personal experiences with them as well as with the other pupil participants. This is a particularly pleasing outcome of the intervention as it indicates that the programme provided a supportive network for pupil participants to enable them to express themselves freely and hopefully get more out of the intervention than they would have if they had not participated as fully. Pupil participants also developed the ability to give support to and receive support from one another and to give support to other people outside the context of the group (see Section 4.7.1.3.2).
This is further evidence of the supportive network and ethos provided by the intervention. The intervention also highlighted the support that was available to pupils outside the context of the WhyTry sessions. Overall, the programme provided pupils with an opportunity to be supported and to support others.

Pupils shared that they felt that they had improved in terms of their academic performance as a result of their inclusion in the intervention (see Section 4.7.1.4.1). Academic gains were not directly measured by the researcher. However, this provides some support for the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) having a positive effect on pupils' academic skills, which partially supports previous research into the efficacy of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) (e.g. Mazzotta-Perretti, 2009).

One aspect of the intervention that the present researcher considers to be key to its success is the fact that it was an enjoyable experience for pupils (see Section 4.7.1.3.3.). This was in part attributed to the experiential activities that form part of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001), but also to the programme deliverers and the intervention as a whole. The present researcher feels that it was particularly important that the intervention was enjoyable for participants because if participants had not enjoyed the intervention, this may have led to a lack of engagement or participant drop out and may have resulted in a lack of positive outcomes for the pupils.

5.3.3 Summary of RQ1.
Overall, the findings from the present study with regard to RQ1 are promising, but, as previously acknowledged, limited given the small sample size. The present study provides some support for previous research into the efficacy of small group work to support SEBD in CYP (Humphrey et al., 2008). It also provides support for the use of approaches underpinned by CBT (Evans et al., 2004; Cooper & Jacobs, 2011), especially those delivered in groups (Durlak et al., 1991) and by an EP (Squires, 2001). Furthermore, it provides support for the use of approaches underpinned by SFBT for CYP with externalising and internalising SEBD in school-based groups over five to 10 weekly sessions delivered by a professional with therapeutic skills, requisite training and access to supervision (DfE, 2011b). The present study adds to previous positive findings in relation to the longevity of the positive effects of a CBT-based approach (Ruttledge & Petrides, 2011), although a longer follow-up would have been preferable in the present study, though not possible due to time constraints. The present research also provides further support for the use of manualised programmes (Cooper & Jacobs, 2011) and responded to Cooper and Jacobs’s (2011) recommendation for the rigorous evaluation of less widely studied interventions, although the present researcher
acknowledges the potential low level empirical support provided by the present study due to the small sample size.

Given that the adaptation of the programme based on advice from those who know the consumers led to such positive outcomes, the present study also provides some support for Durlak and DuPre’s (2008) suggestions for effective implementation (see Section 2.7.1). However, support has also been provided for Greenberg et al. (2005) who claimed that without high levels of fidelity to the original programme, positive results are less likely to be replicated, as the intervention in the present study was implemented with a high degree of fidelity (see Section 4.2).

The present research provides support for evidence informed practice as proposed in the TaMHS guidance (DCSF, 2008). The guidance advocates the use interventions for CYP at risk of experiencing mental health problems, which encompasses CYP with or at risk of experiencing SEBD, which are planned according to local need and grounded in an increasing knowledge of what works. The intervention in the present research was planned according to local need and, going forward, will be implemented based on the knowledge gained from the present research.

Support has also been provided for the efficacy of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001), in line with previous research findings (Eggett, 2003; Bushnell & Card, 2003; Baker, 2008; Mazzotta-Perretti, 2009; Joye & Alvarez, 2010). However, as Corboy and McDonald (2007) suggest, “[t]he implementation of any programme does not occur in a vacuum” (p.13), therefore, the present researcher acknowledges that the changes in pupil behaviour and self-concept evident in the present study may be due, at least in part, to extra-programme factors. Most of the previous evaluations of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) have not included such a level of qualitative information as was reported in the present study. Joye and Alvarez (2010) reported some similarly encouraging qualitative findings, such as pupils improving their behaviour and responses to pressure situations following their inclusion in the programme. However, the present research fills a gap in the literature by making qualitative methodology a focus of the investigation into the efficacy of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001), revealing support for the effectiveness of the intervention for one group of pupils in a mainstream secondary school in the focus LA. As regards the reasons why the intervention may have been effective, this was addressed by RQ2, which is explored in the following section.
5.4 Research Question Two

RQ 2. Which factors appear to support or hinder the implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in one mainstream secondary school?

A focus group with pupil participants, semi-structured interview with programme CDs and data from the research diary were used to address RQ2. There emerged two global themes from the data in relation to RQ2. These were ‘facilitative factors’ and ‘barriers to implementation’. The supportive factors – or the facilitators – of the intervention will be discussed first followed by the factors which posed a hindrance, or the barriers to implementation.

5.4.1 Factors supporting implementation.

In order to address RQ2, CDs were asked what supported delivery of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in the focus school and pupil participants were asked what they liked about the way the researcher and CDs delivered the sessions. The researcher also made notes on emergent facilitative aspects of programme implementation throughout delivery in the research diary. The researcher will now summarise the salient findings, which have contributed to the development of the model of effective implementation in the present research (see Section 5.6).

Understanding what works for the consumer

A facilitative factor emerging from the present research was CDs understanding what works for the pupils (see Section 4.7.2.1.2). The fact that the CDs knew the pupil participants and, therefore, had an understanding of what activities may or may not work for them, enabled deliverers to adapt the programme accordingly to meet pupils’ needs. This is in line with claims made by Durlak and DuPre (2008) following their review of the literature on programme implementation; they concluded that programme deliverers need to be knowledgeable about their communities in order to make adaptations to make the programme more effective in a particular context. They include the caveat that programme deliverers should carefully measure what is happening during implementation, which the present researcher did (see Section 4.2). The researcher felt confident in making adaptations to the intervention in the present study in collaboration with CDs, as CDs were knowledgeable about the pupils. The researcher acknowledges that this would have been virtually impossible without the CDs because she did not possess the required knowledge to make adaptations to the intervention in order to make it more effective for the target audience. This also has links with a suggestion made by Reddy and Newman (2009) for programme deliverers to adopt a consumer perspective by linking programme design to consumers’ – or, in
the case of the present research, pupils’ needs. This is thought to increase consumers’ investment and engagement in the programme (Reddy & Newman, 2009). Furthermore, it provides support for the DfE (2011a) who found that one factor that improved the implementation of the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) was having projects that show an awareness of the context, which the present research did.

Adaptations

One adaptation made to the intervention in the present research was to include an introductory session before beginning the intervention (see Section 4.7.2.5.1). The purpose of this was to support group formation and cohesion prior to beginning the intervention. The facilitative nature of the inclusion of an introductory session was further corroborated by the fact that it emerged as a recommendation for future implementation (see Section 4.7.4.4.1). A further adaptation that programme deliverers made to the programme in the present study was to adapt some of the experiential activities (see Section 4.7.2.5.2). This was to make them more accessible, particularly for programme deliverers. Some might argue that programme deliverers should prioritise pupils’ needs rather than adapting the programme to suit their needs in terms of time and resources. However, within the context of so many competing demands prevalent in a mainstream secondary school, this simply is not a practical view. In the present researcher’s view, if too many constraints are placed on programme deliverers, this is likely to negatively affect programme diffusion (Rogers, 2003) and the researcher considers the outcomes for pupils to be a priority over strict adherence to programme guidelines. Although the researcher acknowledges the value of adhering to manualised programmes, as suggested by the DfE (2011a), she also takes into account suggestions by the DfE (2011a) that this must be combined with local ownership to aid uptake and the present researcher saw programme adaptation as evidence that the school community, as represented by the CDs, were taking ownership of the intervention. A final adaptation made to the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) that emerged as a facilitator to implementation in the present study was the inclusion of a pupil guest speaker (see Section 4.7.2.5.3). CDs shared that they felt that pupils were able to relate to the pupil guest speaker and could see the potential to improve their own behaviour in the way that the pupil guest speaker had. The facilitative nature of the inclusion of a pupil guest speaker was further corroborated by the fact that it emerged as a recommendation for future implementation (see Section 4.7.4.3.5).
Training and TEP support

CDs in the present study felt that having a TEP as the main deliverer of the programme was a further facilitative factor of programme implementation in the present study (see Section 4.7.2.1.3). This supports the DfE’s (2011a) finding that having TaMHS workers in schools that could be easily accessed facilitated the positive impact of the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008). Although the present researcher was not based in the focus school, she spent a considerable amount of time there over the course of the research. The facilitative nature of the TEP in the present study was mainly due to the TEP’s knowledge of the programme built through a two day WhyTry facilitator training course attended in July 2011 and familiarity with the programme built through previous delivery (Kay, 2010). Although the training is not a prerequisite to the delivery of the programme, it is highly recommended (S. White, personal communication, 26 October, 2011) and the WhyTry Program manual (Moore, 2001) states that deliverers of the intervention should have “formal training in and a good understanding of human development and cognitive and behavioural interventions” (p.3). This was applicable to the researcher in the present study; however, the researcher felt supported in her delivery of the intervention by her receipt of targeted training and would highly recommend that those intending to deliver the programme seek training in its application, which is in line with Willey et al’s (2007) positive findings regarding the delivery of quality training to school staff. The researcher does acknowledge, however, the current context of financial austerity and that this is likely to affect school budgets and, in turn, school personnel’s access to continued professional development and training. Indeed, the CDs in the present research commented that they would be unlikely to be given access to training (Research diary, 19.10.11). Provided that the CDs feel that they meet the requirements expected of programme deliverers as outlined in the WhyTry Program manual (Moore, 2001, p.3), the researcher feels that CDs in the present study, having been exposed to a model of programme delivery given by the researcher and being familiar with potential programme participants, would be well placed to deliver the intervention in the future. This is in line with suggestions made by Cooper and Jacobs (2011) that manualised programmes can be as effective when delivered by school staff as when delivered by psychologists.

Multiple programme deliverers

A further facilitative factor was having more than one programme deliverer delivering the intervention in the present study (see Section 4.7.2.1.4). This supports previous research findings by the present researcher (Kay, 2010).
Participant characteristics

CDs and the researcher agreed that six pupils was an optimal number of participants to include in the intervention group (see Section 4.7.2.2.1). This is in line with suggestions made by Joye and Alvarez (2010) who suggest that six to eight participants is an optimal number allowing for open communication and adequate numbers to complete the experiential activities. A further facilitative factor of the implementation of the present intervention was the inclusion of peer role models within the intervention group (see Section 4.7.2.2.2). Although it has been highlighted in the literature that positive peer role models can lead to therapeutic change during group interventions with CYP (e.g. Hill & Coulson-Brown, 2007), the emergence of role models throughout the intervention was accidental. It is unclear without further investigation whether the pupils who deliverers felt had emerged as role models – Pupil 3 and Pupil 5 – did so because of the intervention itself or because they were already role models from the outset. Regardless of how Pupil 3 and Pupil 5 came to be role models, discussions with CDs and comments made in the research diary over the course of the research suggest that this emerged as a facilitative factor in the present intervention as they were able to contribute to the group discussions, drawing on their experiences, and behaved in the way the researcher would expect the participants to behave if the intervention had been effective. It is interesting to note that deliverers’ perceptions of Pupil 3 as a role model seems to contrast with Pupil 3’s view of his own behaviour, self-concept and understanding of the programme objectives, as revealed by quantitative data (see Section 4.6). It could be the case that, although the inclusion of pupil role models was facilitative of delivery for the deliverers and was useful for the other pupil participants, it was not necessarily beneficial to Pupil 3 himself and, if this were true, one might consider the inclusion of role models much more carefully during future implementation of the programme so as to mitigate against any potential negative effects on the pupil role models. Unlike the inclusion of role models within the present intervention group, the inclusion of a mix of pupils displaying externalising SEBD and internalising SEBD was deliberate, as this is in line with suggestions made in previous research into effective interventions for pupils with SEBD (see Cooper & Jacobs, 2001). Deliverers felt that the mix of externalisers and internalisers was another facilitative factor of the implementation of the present intervention (see Section 4.7.2.2.3). CDs suggested that having a group made up of pupils displaying externalising SEBD does not work and makes it harder for all pupil participants to learn from the intervention. The present researcher agrees with this assertion; including only those pupils displaying externalising SEBD as their main difficulty may have rendered the group very difficult to
manage. Conversely, including only those pupils displaying internalising SEBD as their main difficulty may have made generating discussion difficult. The inclusion of internalisers appeared to ‘dilute’ the potential iatrogenic effects of the externalisers on the group as a whole (Dishion et al., 1999) and vice versa. It was interesting to observe that one of the pupils displaying internalising SEBD as their main difficulty – Pupil 4 – began to display more externalising behaviours over the course of the intervention. Deliverers hypothesised that this may have been due to Pupil 4 gaining confidence and finding his voice with which to express himself more freely. This was an unexpected finding of the present intervention, but not necessarily an undesirable one because, although it may place Pupil 4 at risk of getting into trouble with staff and parents, it could have reduced Pupil 4’s vulnerability amongst his peers and other individuals who may have previously taken advantage of his withdrawn nature and lack of confidence. Confidence is considered to be closely linked to self-esteem (Newman & Blackburn, 2002) and self-esteem is considered to be one of the building blocks of resilience (Daniel, 2010). Therefore, the development of confidence may have boosted Pupil 4’s resilience and perhaps the resilience of other pupils in the group, which may indicate reduced helplessness and the promotion of control (Newman & Blackburn, 2002).

Protected time to plan and debrief

Deliverers felt that the pre-planning of sessions was highly facilitative of programme delivery (see Section 4.7.2.3.1). Pre-planning allowed the researcher an opportunity to go through the session content as outlined in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) and shape the sessions as they would be delivered to pupil participants in the present study, based on CDs’ knowledge of pupils, in accordance with suggestions made by Durlak & DuPre (2008). Deliverers also felt that having the time to debrief straight after each session and reflect on the positives and negatives was also facilitative of programme delivery (see Section 4.7.2.3.3). Debriefing after each session gave programme deliverers an opportunity to begin to shape a model of effective programme implementation for the focus school. Linked to both of the above mentioned facilitators, deliverers shared that having protected time in which to plan and debrief supported their delivery of the programme (see Section 4.7.2.3.2). The researcher observed that it was quite difficult to access the CDs at times due to the demands placed upon them from other areas (see Section 4.7.3.5.1). The researcher, due to her experience in mainstream secondary schools, was aware of this potential barrier from the outset and ensured that time to debrief and plan was written into the school diary to help keep this time protected. Even so, outside demands occasionally impinged on this protected time.
Making links

Programme deliverers considered making links between the objectives covered by the programme and pupils’ lives outside the context of the sessions to be another facilitative factor of programme delivery (see Section 4.7.2.6.2). This was achieved through discussion of behaviour and achievement points received by pupils throughout the previous week during the sessions, with pupil assent. Programme deliverers felt that this had the effect of pupils considering the programme and their behaviour in further detail and considering whether they were putting what they had learnt in the sessions into practice.

Elevating the status of the programme

CDs shared that informing school staff outside of the context of the intervention that an “educational psychologist” (CD1) was delivering the programme served to elevate its status amongst school staff, making it more likely for them to release the pupils from their lessons, thus facilitating programme delivery (see Section 4.7.2.7.1). The researcher acknowledges that this may pose somewhat of a difficulty henceforth because the TEP will not be available to the school outside of the context of the research for direct delivery of the intervention due to other work commitments. Also, if the TEP did have sufficient time in which to deliver the intervention, she would need to charge the school for this time. This would incur considerable cost to the school which, in the current economic climate, may not be feasible for the school to pay. However, CDs in the present research have indicated their confidence in rolling out the programme following cessation of the research by planning the changes they would make to the programme in light of their experiences (see Section 4.7.4; CD1, personal communication, 28 March, 2012) This indicates that they feel that the absence of a TEP will not be a hindrance to the delivery of the intervention, even though they considered the presence of the TEP to be a facilitator to programme delivery in this case. This also provides support for Willey et al. (2007) who found that school staff experienced increased confidence in relation to programme delivery following EPs training school staff over a period of time. Also, the school EP could provide consultation as needed, thus decreasing the possibility of the absence of the TEP negatively affecting sustainability.

5.4.2 Factors hindering implementation.

In order to further address RQ2, CDs were asked what hindered delivery of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in the focus school and pupil participants were asked what they did not like about the way the researcher and CDs delivered the sessions. The
researcher also made notes on emergent barriers to programme implementation throughout delivery in the research diary. Responses were organised into one Global Theme – Barriers to implementation. The researcher will now summarise the salient findings.

Language

There were some issues with the language used in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) that emerged from discussions with the CDs and from the research diary (see Section 4.7.3.2.1). The first issue was that, despite the pack being tailored to secondary age pupils, some of the language was quite difficult for the pupils in the present study to understand and it was felt that this negatively affected pupils' understanding of the sessions at times. This is unsurprising to the present researcher, given the link between SEBD and literacy difficulties as well as speech, language and communication difficulties (SLCD) evident in the literature (Miles & Stipek, 2006; Benner et al., 2002). The researcher and CDs sought to mitigate against the effects of the difficult language by altering some of the language used within the session plans, drawing on CDs' knowledge of pupil participants, in accordance with suggestions made by Durlak and DuPre (2008). A further issue with the language used in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) was the fact that it was “Americanised” (CD1). This is not surprising, given the fact that it is an American intervention, and was usually not an issue, except for cases where words and phrases that are not typically used in England featured, such as surrendering the one-up relationship (Moore, 2001). Throughout delivery, efforts were made to Anglicise the session plans to some extent, in collaboration with CDs. The programme deliverers also made efforts to explain the language to pupils to support their understanding. Nevertheless, the language within the programme as a whole emerged as a barrier to implementation within the present study. A further barrier to implementation was the large amount of talking common to some of the sessions (see Section 4.7.3.2.2). Again, this is unsurprising given the prevalence of SLCD in this population of CYP (Benner et al., 2002). The programme deliverers made efforts when planning all sessions to keep activities brief, particularly the less practical activities, in an attempt to maintain pupils’ interest. However, there were times when pupils were required to listen for lengthy periods. At these times, it was noted in the research diary and commented on by CDs that pupils began to lose focus and, therefore, may have missed some aspects of the teaching input, which could serve to explain some of the unexpected findings within the present research. This will need to be taken into account by future programme deliverers.
Lates

Pupil participants arriving late to sessions posed a barrier to programme delivery (see Section 4.7.3.3.2). Efforts were made in the introductory session to communicate session dates and times clearly with pupil participants and they were each provided with a copy of the session timetable. However, pupils still frequently forgot that the sessions were taking place and would often go to their usual lesson for that period, which meant they had to be brought to the sessions by the CDs. This had an impact on the amount of the session that it was possible to get through and meant that the programme deliverers could not devote as much time to some activities as they would have liked. In cases where only one pupil was missing at the start of a session, the researcher would begin the session whilst one of the CDs would locate the missing pupil. This meant that this pupil would miss some of the input. This was frequently the case for Pupil 6, although his quantitative data suggested that he was not negatively affected by this to any great extent. In terms of pupils remembering to come to the sessions as opposed to their regular timetabled lesson, it would have helped if the sessions were held on the same day and at the same time each week. However, it was a stipulation of the University’s Ethics Committee that the times of the sessions were altered so as to avoid pupils missing the same lesson each week and any potential negative effects associated with this and the researcher was in agreement. The researcher proposes that there could have been enhanced advanced communication between CDs and teachers regarding the dates and times of the sessions so that teachers could have been alerted to pupils’ unexpected presence in their lesson during the periods when WhyTry sessions were scheduled. However, this is in the context of many competing demands placed on school staff and the researcher questions whether this suggestion is feasible.

Threats to privacy

A further barrier to programme implementation emerging from the present research was disturbances to the sessions by those who were not part of the group (see Section 4.7.3.4.2). The sessions were interrupted relatively frequently; although the present researcher did not make a note of each interruption, she estimates that pupil participants and programme deliverers were interrupted approximately once per session on average. The interruptions affected the amount of the session it was possible to cover and may have made pupils more self-conscious during discussions. This finding has some links to the Joye and Alvarez (2010) study in which CYP shared that they did not like it when other CYP were coming in and out of the group, although
this was in relation to the group composition as opposed to disturbances by people not involved in the intervention. Joye and Alvarez (2010) perceived this as a threat to the trust built up within the group, which may have also been the case in the present research. In hindsight, it was not surprising that the sessions were disturbed so frequently because the room in which the programme was delivered is a space for pupils with Special Educational Needs (SEN) and other additional needs to come to when they require support. It was evident that pupil participants would have appreciated more privacy as this was one of their recommendations for future delivery (see Section 4.7.4.6.1) and CDs agreed with this view. Hopefully, changing the venue for future delivery will serve to reduce the amount of disturbances to the sessions and will hopefully mitigate against any potential negative effects of the disturbances.

**Contextual demands**

The demands of school life outside the context of the intervention often placed restrictions on the CDs (see Section 4.7.3.5.1). Joye and Alvarez (2010) also found this to be a threat to the implementation of the WhyTry Program (2001) in their study. This was not a surprising outcome of the present research; the researcher, having previously worked in a mainstream secondary school, is aware of the various demands placed on school staff and their numerous responsibilities. Nevertheless, the present researcher noted her frustration at times when CDs were required to devote their attention elsewhere rather than to the facilitation of the delivery of the sessions or the planning of/reflecting on the sessions. However, as the researcher noted in the research diary, school staff’s priority was and should be the pupils within their school and it is right that pupils took precedence over the research.

### 5.4.3 Summary of RQ2.

The present researcher is not aware of any previous studies that have considered the facilitators and barriers to the implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in such a level of detail, and certainly not any that have done so within the context of a UK mainstream secondary school. Therefore, the present research fills a gap in the literature by making a detailed study of the mechanisms by which the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) may be effective or ineffective a focus of the present research.

The present researcher’s findings provide some consistency with those previously identified in the literature. For example, Langley et al. (2010) suggested several barriers to the implementation of a programme for CYP, including competing responsibilities of the programme deliverers and logistical barriers, such as adequate space and time. These barriers were also highlighted in the present research.
Furthermore, Rogers (2003) suggested that interventions may encounter implementation problems that can negatively affect an intervention’s impact and there was some evidence for this in the present research. Reddy and Newman (2009) suggested guidelines for practitioners to overcoming barriers to designing, implementing and evaluating programmes with CYP with SEBD. These included recruiting key stakeholders and utilising what works. Such facilitators were utilised during the implementation of the programme in the present research with favourable results. Dusenbury et al. (2003) proposed that the study of programme implementation maintains quality and ensures programme objectives are achieved, as was the case in the present research. Greenberg et al. (2005) claimed that without high levels of fidelity to the original programme, positive results are less likely to be replicated. As the present intervention was implemented with a high degree of fidelity, this assertion is consistent with the present research findings. Durlak & DuPre (2008) suggested that as long as programme deliverers are knowledgeable about their communities, they should be able to adapt a programme in order to make it more effective in a specific context providing that they carefully measure what is happening during implementation. This is consistent with the present research findings. Furthermore, Berman and McLaughlin (1979) suggested that the greater the flexibility allowed for modifications to be made to interventions by programme deliverers, the greater the likelihood the intervention will be adopted, implemented and have positive results. Again, this is consistent with the present research findings. As present research findings in relation to RQ2 are consistent with those in the wider literature, this provides some evidence for the generaliseability of the findings of the present research and, therefore, strengthens applicability of the present findings.

The key findings in relation to RQ2 will be represented in a proposed model of programme implementation specific to the focus school (see Section 5.6).

5.5 Research Question Three

RQ 3. Which suggestions do pupil participants and programme deliverers make for future implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001)?

A focus group with pupil participants, semi-structured interview with CDs and data from the research diary were used to address RQ3. There emerged one global theme from the data in relation to RQ3. This was Recommendations. The researcher will now summarise the salient findings, which have contributed to the development of the model of effective implementation in the present research (see Section 5.6).
Participant characteristics

Two recommendations emerging from the present research was that gender and year groups should not be mixed in future intervention groups (see Section 4.7.4.1.2 and 4.7.4.1.3). As stated in Chapter 4, the researcher did not probe these points further during the semi-structured interview and so can only suggest possible reasons for these assertions. The present researcher suggests that this may be due to pupils’ comfort levels in terms of them feeling able to express themselves, particularly in the case of single gender groups. With CBT and SFBT underpinnings, the WhyTry Program (2001) could be viewed as a talking therapy so it is important that pupils feel able to discuss issues freely and it is possible that the presence of the opposite gender could lead some pupils to feel inhibited. In terms of avoiding the mixing of year groups, the present researcher asserts that this may be to facilitate the pupils being able to relate to one another. For example, pupils in Year 10 are much more likely to be able to relate to each other than a pupil in Year 8 and a pupil in Year 10 because pupils in Year 10 are under similar school-based pressures, such as studying for their GCSEs, and are more likely to be at the same developmental stage. However, these are only tentative explanations. It would have been useful to check out CDs’ reasoning behind these assertions; however, time did not permit this.

Supporting transition

A further recommendation that emerged from the present research was that the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) would be helpful for transition (see Section 4.7.4.1.5). In the case of the present research, transition refers to the main transition points of pupils moving from the primary to secondary phase of education (Year 6 to Year 7) and pupils moving from the secondary phase of education to further educational establishments, employment, training or other destinations (Year 11 onwards). Considering the potential negative effects of an unsuccessful transition, such as negative academic effects (Alspaugh, 1998; Galton, Morrison & Pell 2000; Hargreaves & Galton, 2002; Whitby, Lord, O’Donnell & Grayson, 2006); and negative effects on self-esteem, peer relationships and emotional well-being (Garcia, Pender, Antonakos & Ronis, 1998; Horobin, 2009; Lord, Eccles & McCarthy, 1994), the researcher agrees that utilising an intervention that has been found to support academic performance, self-concept, peer relationships and emotional well-being would be likely to facilitate the transition process.
Key staff to deliver the intervention

CDs of the present intervention shared that they would be the staff members to roll the programme out following cessation of the present research (see Section 4.7.4.2.1). This was a pleasing finding of the present research as it was the present researcher’s intention to up skill CDs on the delivery of the programme so that they would feel confident running future groups. This supports one of the main aims of the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008), which was to build the capacity and confidence of school staff in supporting the mental health needs of CYP. Since CDs shared that they would run future groups, it appears that this objective has been fulfilled and that, hopefully, the gains the present pupil participants have made during the course of the intervention will be made by pupils participating in the programme in future. The CDs made the assertion that they would need to become confident with the delivery of the programme before training any other members of staff on its delivery (see Section 4.7.4.2.2). However, the fact that CDs can envisage themselves becoming confident enough in their delivery of the programme to train up other members of staff was a pleasing finding of the present research, as up skilling more staff makes it more likely that the programme will be rolled out even further, thus supporting more pupils and the sustainability of the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) within the focus school, which was the ultimate objective of the present research.

Pupil co-deliverers

A further recommendation to emerge from the present research was that the programme could be co-delivered by pupil participants in the present study in the future (see Section 4.7.4.2.3). The present researcher asserts that this would be an excellent idea as, not only would it be likely to have numerous benefits for individual pupils in terms of social, emotional and behavioural gains, but it would also help to embed the principles of the programme for the present pupil participants. This is according to the learning pyramid (National Training Laboratories [NTL] Institute for Applied Behavioral Science), which asserts that learners retain approximately 90 per cent of what they learn when they teach someone else (see Figure 5.2 below).
However, the learning pyramid has been disputed. The original research which underpins the model cannot be located (NTL). It is thought that the model is based on Dale’s (1969) Cone of Experience which theorises that learners retain more information by what they do as opposed to what they hear or see. This type of experiential learning is present in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001), particularly in the experiential activities. The teaching element is also present in the programme in the plenaries. Whether the learning pyramid has a valid evidence base or not, the present researcher asserts that utilising pupils as teachers would have social, emotional and behavioural benefits.

Adaptations

A suggestion for future deliverers of the intervention emerging from the present research was to include an introductory session (see Section 4.7.4.4.1). This was an adaptation made by the present programme deliverers and emerged as a facilitator of programme implementation in the present research (see Section 4.7.2.5.1). A further suggestion for future implementation emerging from the present research was to include a follow-up session (see Section 4.7.4.4.2). The purpose of this would be to check that pupil participants are still implementing the strategies they learnt through their involvement in the intervention and still applying the principles generally. As a
result of this suggestion, the present researcher planned a follow-up session for pupil participants in the present study, which took place in March 2012. As this took place after the focus group and semi-structured interview, the researcher cannot provide any evidence of the utility of this from the CDs’ and pupils’ perspective. However, informal feedback suggests that it was a useful exercise in reminding pupils of the principles of the programme and the support still available to them (CD1, personal communication, 28 March, 2012). It was interesting to note that although CDs in the present research felt that the programme was too long and their recommendation would be to shorten the programme (see Section 4.7.4.4.3), pupil participants in the present research felt that the programme was not long enough and they would recommend more sessions (see Section 4.7.4.4.4). It is the present researcher’s experience that when delivering group programmes with CYP, CYP usually feed back that they would like more sessions. This could be because CYP enjoy the attention provided in a smaller group setting and/or the novelty of being out of the classroom, amongst other factors. Previous research has revealed that children involved in school-based interventions often feel privileged to be involved and look forward to the sessions (Corboy & McDonald, 2007) and this appeared to be the case in the present research, which may be one reason why pupils recommended more sessions. However, it is not surprising to the present researcher that CDs suggested fewer sessions, given the fact that demands of school life emerged as a barrier to programme delivery in the present research; programme deliverers are more likely to consider the delivery of the programme within the context of other demands that are placed on them, such as administration duties, pastoral care activities and such like. A further recommendation emerging from the present research was to include more breaks in future sessions (see Section 4.7.4.4.5). The researcher agrees that more planned breaks in programme sessions might help to support pupils’ attention and, therefore, their overall engagement with the programme, thus potentially leading to a greater impact of the programme on pupil development. However, including more breaks in future sessions would inevitably affect the amount of the programme the deliverers could get through in the sessions, which in turn may have a negative effect on pupil development, particularly if crucial aspects were missed. Future programme deliverers would need to select carefully which aspects of the programme they omit from future sessions and this might involve a period of experimentation. It would also require future deliverers to have knowledge of the pupil participants so that they could make adaptations with them in mind (Durlak & DuPre, 2008). A further recommendation was to include a pupil guest speaker in future delivery of the sessions (see Section 4.7.4.3.5). This supports the assertion that including a pupil guest speaker in the present implementation of the
intervention was a facilitator to programme delivery. The fact that including a pupil
guest speaker emerged as a facilitator to programme delivery in the present research
and also emerged as a recommendation for future delivery supports programme
adaptation generally and also supports the assertion that pupils could be used as
programme deliverers in future.

**Obtain feedback from staff and parents**

A further suggestion for future implementation of the intervention emerging from the
present study is to obtain feedback on pupil progress from school staff (see Section
4.7.4.5.1). The researcher had originally considered the collection of quantitative data
from teachers to support the discipline data collected in the present research, but this
was not possible due to time constraints. However, the researcher concurs with the
assertion that it would be useful to gather feedback from staff, especially in terms of
gathering evidence to gain the backing of the senior leadership team to support the
continued implementation of the programme, which is another recommendation of the
present research (see below). Similarly, a further recommendation emerging from the
present study is to obtain feedback on pupil progress from parents during future
implementation of the intervention (see Section 4.7.4.5.2). Whilst the present
researcher acknowledges that parents’ views are important, she opted not to engage
parents in the present study due to time constraints and the fact that this was a school-
based study. However, the present researcher concurs that this may help to support
the continued implementation of the programme and garner support for pupils within
the home context. This supports Reddy and Newman’s (2009) suggestion regarding
overcoming barriers to the implementation of interventions to pupils with SEBD:
recruiting key stakeholders, which should ideally include children and their families,
who will often have their own ideas about how programmes should meet their needs,
and school staff.

**Obtain support from SLT**

A further recommendation emerging from the present research was to obtain the
backing of the senior leadership team (SLT) for future implementation of the
programme (see Section 4.7.4.5.3). CDs felt that obtaining the support of SLT would
help to elevate the status of the programme amongst school staff, which they saw as
facilitative of programme delivery (see Section 4.7.2.7.1). This supports Durlak and
DuPre’s (2008) suggestion of acquiring a programme champion who has high status
amongst staff to help orchestrate the diffusion of an intervention being a facilitative
factor of successful programme implementation and also supports Reddy and
Newman’s (2009) suggestion regarding overcoming barriers to the implementation of interventions to pupils with SEBD: recruiting key stakeholders, which can include SLT.

**Environment**

As disturbances and the fact that the room in which the intervention took place in the present research was considered too small emerged as barriers to delivery in the present intervention (see Section 4.7.3.4.3), it is not surprising that the present research recommended a more private venue (see Section 4.7.4.6.1) and a larger venue (see Section 4.7.4.6.2) for future delivery of the programme. Due to the personal nature of some of the topics under discussion, the present researcher asserts that a more private venue may serve to facilitate frank discussion during the sessions as pupils may feel less inhibited. Also, the present researcher asserts that a larger venue would support the inclusion of experiential activities in future programme delivery.

**Permeate the school ethos**

A final recommendation to emerge from the present research was for the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) to permeate the school ethos. This supports the researcher’s original objective to support the sustainability of the programme within the focus school and the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) in general because more staff and pupils will become aware of the principles underpinning the programme and may benefit in the way that the present pupil participants have. A benefit to the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) permeating the school ethos might be that even those pupils who do not participate in the intervention may benefit, in the same way that merely having a nurture group on site in a mainstream school appears to have a positive impact on those pupils who attend the school, but who are not part of the nurture group (Cooper & Whitebread, 2007). This is especially important, given that many pupils within the education system have SEBD that are unidentified (Mihalas et al., 2009), so by permeating the school ethos, the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) may have a positive impact on such pupils who might not otherwise have been identified for further intervention. It was suggested through the present research that the key messages of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) could be delivered through assemblies in the focus school and at feeder primary schools (see Section 4.7.4.7.1). The present researcher suggests that this may help to support the retention of programme principles for pupil deliverers if one were to accept the learning pyramid (NTL) as a valid theory. This would also potentially have benefits for the pupils in primary schools as they may learn key strategies that could support them in their primary setting and in their transition to and performance in their secondary setting. A further suggestion made during the
The present research was to have WhyTry displays in classrooms (see Section 4.7.4.7.2). The researcher asserts that having visual displays around the focus school would support the pupils in keeping the principles of the programme in mind and make it more likely that they would continue to apply the principles following cessation of the intervention.

5.5.1 Summary of RQ3.
The present researcher is not aware of any previous studies that have considered recommendations for the future implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in such a level of detail, and certainly not any that have done so within the context of a UK mainstream secondary school. Therefore, the present research fills a gap in the literature by providing a model of effective implementation specific to the focus school (see Section 5.6).

5.6 A Model of Effective Programme Implementation

In effect, the present research can be conceptualised as a process-focused pilot, which will enable the school to have a contextually valid intervention they can roll out more widely. Future implementation is more likely to be successful given the thoroughness of this initial pilot.

The present research intended to provide the focus school with a model of effective implementation specific to their setting. This has been created based on Durlak and DuPre’s (2008) model (see Section 2.7.1.2). The model emerging from the present research confirmed several areas in the Durlak and DuPre (2008) model, such as community factors, provider characteristics and innovation characteristics. However, there are some aspects in the present model that are novel additions, such as environmental factors and participant characteristics, and the details of the factors differ, as one might expect given the fact that local contexts differ (Durlak & DuPre, 2008). Some factors included within the model are general factors that could apply to many programmes, including the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001), while other factors are specific to the focus school. The model is presented in Figure 5.3 below:
Figure 5.3: A model of effective programme implementation for the focus school
The model depicted in Figure 5.3 is expanded upon in Figure 5.4 below:

A model of effective programme implementation

Community factors

The community context was considered to be important in the effective implementation of the programme in the focus school. The community factor that emerged from the present research was as follows:

- Acquire sufficient funding to release key staff to implement the intervention.

Environmental factors

A novel addition to the present model was the environmental context in which the intervention should be implemented. The single recommendation is as follows:

- Secure an appropriate location in which to run the intervention, which is private and has adequate space.

Provider characteristics

Provider characteristics involve perceptions related to the need for, and potential benefits of, the intervention, self-efficacy and skill proficiency (Durlak & DuPre, 2008). The provider characteristics emerging from the present research are as follows:

- Obtain the support of SLT to elevate status of the programme.
- Obtain feedback from staff and parents regarding pupil progress.
- Providers should have a belief in programme efficacy.
- Accredited training should be considered for key staff.
- Key staff should be allowed time to become confident in delivery before training up other members of staff on programme implementation.
- Include former pupil participants as programme co-providers.

Participant characteristics

A further novel addition to the present model was participant characteristics, which includes recommendations specific to the pupil participants to be included in the intervention in the focus school. These recommendations are as follows:

- Include approximately six pupil participants.
- Include a mix of externalisers and internalisers.
- Homogenous gender/year group.
- Target transition points, e.g. Year 6 – 7; Year 10/11.
Innovation characteristics

Innovation characteristics are factors specific to the intervention, in this case the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001).

- There should be adherence to the programme manual where possible and the programme should only be adapted as necessary by those who are familiar with the participants and the context, with the needs of participants in mind.

Delivery system (organisational capacity)

Organisational capacity in the present model relates to general organisational factors, specific practices and processes and staffing considerations.

a) General organisational factors:

- Permeate school ethos to create a shared vision.

b) Specific practices and processes:

- Establish effective mechanisms through which to make links between the programme and the organisation, e.g. effective communication with staff regarding the intervention and effective communication with pupils regarding their performance within the organisation.

c) Staffing considerations:

- Use of CD1, CD2 and CD3 as programme champions.
- Acquiring the support of at least one member of SLT to become a programme champion.

Support system (training and technical assistance)

Training relates to preparing programme providers for new tasks and the factors related to training in the present model are as follows:

- Consider accredited training for programme champions.
- Programme champions to cascade training to other staff members.

Technical assistance relates to resources provided or acquired once the intervention begins and the factors related to technical assistance in the present model are as follows:

- Indirect T/EP supervision for programme providers.
- Programme providers should have protected time to plan/debrief.
- Programme providers to monitor fidelity/adaptation throughout implementation.

Figure 5.4: An expanded model of effective programme implementation for the focus school
Figure 5.4 presents 22 contextual factors specific to the focus school thought to contribute to effective programme implementation. These will need to be investigated further as the programme is rolled out across the focus school. Due to the overlap amongst factors, they are likely to be reduced in light of further investigation.

The factors presented in Figure 5.3 and Figure 5.4 are likely to interact in several ways. For example, the acquisition of a member of SLT to become a programme champion will most likely have an impact on the ability to acquire funding to release key members of staff as well as the likelihood that the programme will permeate the school ethos. These interactions are represented by the arrows in Figure 5.3. Again, these interactions will need to be investigated further as the programme is rolled out across the focus school to ascertain which factors influence which other factors within this specific context.

Implementing this strategic model in the focus school would support both of the key elements of the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) – strategic integration, where those involved in the delivery of mental health support to CYP work together to deliver effective intervention, and evidence informed practice, including the delivery of interventions planned according to local need and grounded in an increasing knowledge of what works.

5.7 Implications of the Present Research
The use of a mixed-methods approach in the present research allowed for a rich picture of the process of implementing an intervention to be created. This has resulted in a greater understanding of the utility of the intervention and the mechanisms via which the intervention may work within the focus school, leading to the proposal of an implementation model specific to the focus school (see Section 5.6).

The present research suggests that the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) is an effective intervention to support one group of SEBD pupils in the focus school. Not only was the intervention an enjoyable experience for the pupil participants, a number of gains were also reported. These included social, emotional, behavioural and academic gains. These findings add to the relatively small evidence base for the intervention (see Chapter 2) and provide some support for the utility of the intervention in a UK context, which is a novel finding of the present research.

The present research also revealed facilitators and barriers to the implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in the focus school. This extends previous research into the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) (see Chapter 2), as it focuses on the
reasons why the intervention may or may not have been effective, rather than merely whether the intervention was effective or not. Understanding the mechanisms that make an intervention successful or unsuccessful in a particular context is important as what works in one context may not necessarily work in another context. It was the researcher’s intention to ascertain what works in terms of programme implementation in the focus school in order to provide a model of effective implementation specific to the focus school. The present researcher feels that this has been achieved and will have implications for future implementation within the focus school context.

In addition to studying facilitators and barriers to the implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in the focus school, the present research also studied the recommendations that participants made for future implementation. It was pleasing to the researcher that the participants felt the programme had enough utility to warrant rolling it out further and this is indicative of the flexibility of the programme in allowing deliverers to adapt it to meet the needs of the focus school and integrate it with its systems. An aim of the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008), which underpinned this research, was to instil within school staff key skills in supporting CYP who may have mental health needs. It is hoped that the development of a local evidence base and a local approach will help to support sustainability of the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) within the focus school once funding for the project extension ceases in August 2012.

The present research provides further support for Durlak and DuPre’s (2008) suggestion that as long as programme deliverers are knowledgeable about their communities, they should be able to adapt a programme in order to make it more effective in a specific context providing that they carefully measure what is happening during implementation. This was done in the present research with favourable results. As the present intervention was delivered with a relatively high degree of fidelity, the present research provides support for the importance of programme fidelity in implementation (Dane & Schneider, 1998).

The present research provides further support for Langley et al. (2010) who suggested that competing responsibilities of the programme deliverers and logistical barriers provide barriers to the implementation of programmes with CYP. These were also found to be barriers in the present research along with several other barriers.

The present research also provides further support for Reddy and Newman (2009) who suggested guidelines for practitioners to overcome barriers to designing, implementing and evaluating programmes with this group of CYP. They found that adopting a consumer perspective, recruiting key stakeholders and utilising what works can
overcome barriers to delivery and this was found to be the case in the present research.

The fact that the present research included the voice of the pupils means that one of the researcher’s main beliefs that underpinned the research – that CYP’s views are important and should be sought and represented – has been successfully incorporated. This fulfils Evans et al.’s (2004) recommendation for further research into strategies for CYP with SEBD, which was to ascertain the views of the participants about the strategies used.

A further implication of the present research is that it has provided some evidence for the role of the EP in evaluation research (Frederickson, 2002; Greig, 2001; Marsh, 2011) to support the development and use of interventions that are grounded in research, evidence informed practice and practice based evidence (DCSF, 2008). Although the present research provides further evidence for the role of the EP in delivering interventions within schools (Liddle & Macmillan, 2010), it has not provided evidence that SEBD interventions may be as effective when delivered by school staff as when delivered by a psychologist (Cooper & Jacobs, 2011) and that interventions can be delivered by a range of professionals with therapeutic skills who have had appropriate training, ensure fidelity to guidelines and receive appropriate supervision (DfE, 2012). This is a suggestion for future research (see Section 5.9). The present research provides further evidence for the effectiveness of the role of the EP in training school staff over a period of time (Cline, 2012; Willey et al., 2007). Overall, the present research has provided support for the role of the EP as scientist-practitioner-trainer.

The results of this research was shared with the participants, the EPS team and other relevant professionals in order to support future implementation of the intervention and further investigations into its utility in a UK context so that the present research can be extended and built upon. The present researcher could contribute to this endeavour through a supervisory role.

The present research has further implications in relation to the present researcher’s TEP practice. At the time of writing this report, the present researcher is in consultation with a specialist SEBD provision regarding the implementation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) in this setting. The present researcher will utilise her experience and knowledge acquired through the present research when implementing the intervention in the SEBD provision. For example, the present researcher intends to recruit at least two CDs to support her in delivery of the programme and will refer to these individuals, as people who know the pupil participants well, on matters of programme adaptation. It
is intended that this endeavour will help to support the roll out of the programme across the LA.

5.8 Limitations of the Present Research
As explored in Chapter 3, the small sample size included in the present study could be considered to be a methodological limitation of the present research as it limits the generalisability of the findings in relation to effectiveness. The present researcher acknowledges that a larger sample size would have increased the external validity of the research in relation to effectiveness. However, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention was not the main aspect of the present study; the present study is characterised as a process evaluation and the inclusion of just one intervention group allowed for a more thorough exploration of the process of programme implementation. This led to the development of a model of effective implementation specific to the focus school, which is hoped to have real utility for the focus school.

A further aspect of the present study that some might consider to be a limitation is the arguable lack of robustness in the methods used to collect quantitative data to address RQ1. The present researcher only collected quantitative data from pupil participants and opted not to collect such data from staff and parents. This was partly due to time constraints and partly due to the fact that effectiveness, which was the focus of RQ1, was not the main focus of the present research. However, the present researcher acknowledges that for this reason, the present research’s conclusions with regard to RQ1 could have been more robust and, therefore, the present research does not fully address the issue of the effectiveness of the intervention. Also, the lack of interim measures in the present research (see Section 5.3.1) may have meant that the research did not fully capture the pattern of change over the course of the intervention and this has implications for future research (see Section 5.9).

A number of changes to planned delivery and data collection occurred over the course of the study, reflecting challenges associated with real world research (Robson, 2002). These changes led to some participants not receiving the full dose of the intervention and an incomplete data set, which could be considered limitations of the present research. The former limitation is likely to be less impactful on the research as a whole as only two participants missed sessions and they only missed one session each, which is unlikely to have affected the outcomes of the research as a whole, particularly as the nature of the intervention means that key objectives are returned to throughout the programme. However, the latter limitation – an incomplete data set – could potentially be more impactful. The data set is incomplete because CD3 was absent for
the semi-structured interview. She may have had important insights into the effectiveness of the programme; delivery system facilitators and barriers; and recommendations for future research. Unfortunately, these views cannot be gathered and studied at a research level, thus the present research is limited in this sense. However, the real world impact is likely to be less severe as CD3 can feed back her points to CDs 1 and 2 when she returns to school and continues her contribution to the implementation of the intervention.

5.9 Implications for Future Research
Following the cessation of this research, it is hoped that the intervention will now be rolled out further across the focus school by the CDs in the present research. There is, therefore, scope to study the effectiveness of the intervention as delivered by school staff, thus potentially providing further support for Cooper and Jacobs (2011) and the DfE (2011b). Now an understanding of how to implement the programme in the focus school has been established, rolling out the programme with more pupil participants will also allow future researchers to add to the quantitative data available for this intervention, thus supporting generaliseability to the population, which was not possible in the present study due to the small sample size.

Future researchers could extend the implementation of the intervention to other schools within the LA. This would support the roll out of the intervention and of the TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008) as a whole across the LA and add to the local evidence base as well as the general evidence base for the intervention. Furthermore, the efficacy of the use of the intervention within specialist provisions, such as SEBD provisions, may be a useful feature of future research.

Future research should build on the methodology of the present research as well as address its methodological limitations in order to improve the evaluation of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001). For example, future research should utilise the WhyTry Measure (WhyTry Organization website) in order to establish how this indicates effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the intervention. Also, future researchers may choose to collect interim measures in an attempt to capture the pattern of change over the course of the intervention. Future researchers should utilise measures of self-concept in order to build on the evidence base in this area provided by the present study. As well as outcome evaluation studies, the present researcher asserts that future research should include more of a focus on process evaluation in order to better understand the mechanisms by which the programme is effective.
5.10 Conclusion
This exploratory process evaluation of an SEBD intervention programme, the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001), has yielded positive findings for the effectiveness of the intervention with one group of pupils in a mainstream secondary school, as indicated by apparent improvements in pupil participants’ SEBD and other gains. This study has also provided detailed information regarding the effective implementation of the intervention in the focus school, which led to the development of a context specific model of effective implementation.

It is hoped that the present research will have utility for the focus school and that the provision of an ecologically valid model of implementation will support the sustainability of the intervention programme henceforth as well as supporting the sustainability of the wider TaMHS Project (DCSF, 2008), thus having an impact on more pupils within the focus school.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Literature search strategy

A detailed keyword search was performed using the following academic databases:

- Applied Social Sciences Indexes and Abstracts
- Australian Education Index
- British Education Index
- ERIC
- Sage Full Text Index
- PsychInfo

An initial search was carried out between January 2011 and May 2011 with smaller scale follow-up searches carried out in October 2011 and April 2012.

The literature search was carried out in several parts. For the literature on SEBD, the researcher entered keywords related to SEBD into the above databases, utilising truncations so as to capture as much of the relevant data as possible. The researcher combined these search terms with secondary search terms using the Boolean operator ‘AND’, as depicted in Table A1 below:

Table A1: Literature search strategy for SEBD literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search term 1</th>
<th>Boolean operator</th>
<th>Search term 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social emotional and behavio* diffic</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>Pre-valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and behavio* diffic</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>Outcome*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavio* emotional and social diffic</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>Intervention*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BESD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this search yielded a high volume of results, the researcher restricted the selection of journals for inclusion to those from the previous 20 years, written in the English language, taken from peer reviewed journals and where the full text was available electronically.

For the literature pertaining to research into the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001), the researcher entered the search terms ‘WhyTry’ and ‘WhyTry Program*’ into the aforementioned databases. As this literature search yielded far fewer results, the
researcher chose to include non-peer reviewed research. The present researcher focused her search on those reports in which the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) was the focus of the research and on original reports as opposed to publications reviewing other researchers’ use of the intervention.

For the literature related to programme implementation, the researcher entered truncated keywords combined with other truncated search terms using the Boolean operator ‘AND’ as depicted in Table A2 below into the above databases:

Table A2: Literature search strategy for programme implementation literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search term 1</th>
<th>Boolean operator</th>
<th>Search term 2</th>
<th>Boolean operator</th>
<th>Search term 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Program*</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>Implementation*</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>School*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intervention*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this search yielded a high volume of results, the researcher restricted the selection of journals for inclusion to those published since 2008, as the researcher had already obtained a review paper on this topic published in 2008 (Durlak & DuPre, 2008), written in the English language, taken from peer reviewed journals and where the full text was available electronically. Journals not concerning the implementation of an intervention programme in schools were excluded.

The researcher also hand searched relevant journals, including Educational Psychology in Practice and Educational and Child Psychology, and utilised a reference harvesting method whereby the references of journals accessed via databases or hand searches were searched and any relevant journals that were not highlighted by previous searches were accessed. In addition, the researcher also accessed tutorial sessions with a university tutor and discussions during these tutorials led the tutor to highlight relevant literature that the above search strategy may have missed, such as books and governmental guidance publications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Description of ‘kernel’</th>
<th>Evidence from studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response cost</td>
<td>Non-emotional removal of a token or privilege for misbehaviour.</td>
<td>Foreman (1980); Kendall and Finch (1976); Little and Kelley (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal praise</td>
<td>This can be oral or written and encourages co-operative acts between individuals. It encourages positive teacher-student relations and reduces aggressive and disruptive behaviour.</td>
<td>Lowe and McLaughlin (1974); Marchant and Young (2001); Marchant, Young and West (2004); Martens, Hirall and Bradley (1997); Matheson and Shriver (2005); Robinson and Robinson (1979); Scott, Spender, Doolan, Jacobs and Aspland (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat the timer</td>
<td>Children are set a task to be completed in a given time and are rewarded if they succeed.</td>
<td>Wolfe, Kelly and Drabman (1981); Adams and Drabman (1995); Drabman and Creedon (1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery motivators</td>
<td>Students are invited to select from a jar or bowl a mystery prize for achieving a target.</td>
<td>Brown and Redmon (1989); Fox and Schaeffer (1981); Moore, Waguespack, Wickstrom, Witt and Gaydon (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team competition</td>
<td>Groups compete on a task, performance or game.</td>
<td>Beersma, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, Moon, Conlon and Ilgen (2003); Hojgaard, Salvenbom and Tonnessen (2006); Koffman, Lee, Hopp and Emont (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time out</td>
<td>Using a timer, a child is withdrawn from one environment into another place for one minute, plus one minute for each year of his/her age. The best results are obtained from shorter (five minutes) than longer (15 minutes) time out.</td>
<td>Fabiano et al. (2004); Kazdin (1980); Wolf, Risley, Johnston, Harris and Allen (1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premack principle</td>
<td>The principle here is that children will adopt a behaviour they may be resisting if they believe it will lead to something they want. This is the principle of ‘work now, play later’.</td>
<td>Agathon and Granjus (1976); Andrews (1970); Browder, Hines, McCarthy and Fees (1984); Ghosh and Chattopadhyay (1993); Gonzalez and Ribes (1975); Harrison and Schaeffer (1975); Homme, Debaca, Devine, Steinhorst and Rickert (1963); Hosie, Gentile and Carroll (1974); Knapp (1976); Leclerc and Thurston (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic light system</td>
<td>Using the traffic light colour system to indicate when a behaviour is becoming disruptive (red) or when it is desirable and safe (green).</td>
<td>Medland and Stachnik (1972); Wasserman (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal transition cues</td>
<td>This could be playing music or switching lights on and off, ringing a bell, changing voice tone – or another cue, to signal the end of one activity and the start of another.</td>
<td>Abbott, O’Donnell, Hawkins, Hill, Kosterman and Catalano (1998); Embry, Flannery, Vazsonyi, Powell, Atta (1996); Rosenkoetter and Fowler (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful roles</td>
<td>Giving children meaningful roles to encourage responsibility.</td>
<td>Kahne and Bailey (1999); Rutter (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise notes from peers</td>
<td>Peer approval notes posted in a book, displayed on a wall or read out loud in which children are praised for their behaviour, strengths, achievements or co-operation by other children.</td>
<td>Abbott et al. (1998); Embry et al. (1996); Gottfredson (1986); Skinner, Neddenriep, Robinson, Ervin and Jones (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive school-to home notes</td>
<td>Sending notes home to the family when behaviour has been particularly desirable.</td>
<td>McCain &amp; Kelley (1993)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Cooper and Jacobs (2011)
Appendix C: Summary of the ten core concepts of the WhyTry Program

1) The Reality Ride
This visual analogy is of a roller coaster representing the reality of life. It provides students insight into the consequences of their decisions. One path leads to extreme highs and lows ending in a crash and often getting stuck in a loop where behaviours are repeated. The other path is harder but worth it and leads to opportunity, freedom and self-respect.

2) Tearing off Labels
This visual analogy is a picture of cans. It teaches students that negative labels must be torn off and encourages students to let their strengths emerge.

3) Defence Mechanisms
This visual analogy uses a knight protected in armour to teach students how to make good decisions for protecting themselves when angry, frustrated and scared; and to choose positive coping mechanisms so they won’t hurt themselves or others.

4) Channelling Anger, Frustration and Challenges into Positive Motivation
This is a picture of a river with a series of dams that channel and control the flow of water. This analogy helps teach students how to convert challenge into positive motivation.

5) Climbing Out
This visual analogy illustrates peer pressure by showing crabs trying to climb out of a pot. This shows students how peers can affect them positively and negatively.

6) Jumping Hurdles
The concept taught in this visual analogy teaches students to overcome problems by following steps. The steps are as follows: identify the problem, create options, get help, take action, believe in positive change and ‘jump back up’ if they trip.

7) Desire, Time, Effort
This is a maze that helps students understand and experience the importance of desire, time and effort in overcoming challenges.

8) Lift the Weight
This visual analogy is a picture of a weight lifter. The purpose is to create a cognitive connection between becoming physically stronger by lifting weights and mentally stronger by following rules and self-discipline.

9) Getting Plugged In
This is a picture of sockets and a light bulb. The analogy teaches the importance of building a positive support system. Students are taught that connecting with others (carers, a positive friend, a teacher, etc.) can help them see the light in their future.

10) Seeing Over the Wall
This visual analogy of a brick wall and stairs teaches students to see more in life than just challenges. Applying the above principles will help them see their potential with more clarity. Through this programme students learn one step at a time how to get on top of the wall and see opportunity in life, how they can earn freedom to make the most of their opportunities and achieve more self-respect.

Adapted from Moore (2001)
Appendix D: WhyTry Program fidelity checklist

WhyTry Program Fidelity Checklist

The purpose of this fidelity checklist is to track the implementation of the WhyTry Program to assist in determining overall programme efficacy. This form should be completed by the deliverer after each intervention session.

Directions: Complete this form after each intervention session.

Section One: Demographic Information

Today’s date:________________ Deliverer/s: _______________________________

Type of intervention: Small Group

Number of deliverers: ______

Group size (# students): ______

Length of intervention session (minutes): 100

Analogy covered during the intervention session (circle one):
Motivation Formula
Reality Ride
Tearing Off Labels
Defence Mechanisms
Climbing Out
Jumping Hurdles
Desire, Time & Effort
Lift the Weight
Plugging In
The Wall

Section Two: Tracking WhyTry Intervention Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Intervention STYLE (check every item below)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Deliverer uses “attention getter”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Deliverer teaches analogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Deliverer uses poster set to teach analogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Deliverer uses 8 x 10 picture to teach analogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>Deliverer uses PowerPoint to teach analogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>Deliverer uses music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>Deliverer uses body/kinaesthetic activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>Deliverer processes body/kinaesthetic activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>Deliverer uses journal activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>Deliverer praises or affirms student’s contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions

DELIVERER USES “ATTENTION GETTER”: An “attention getter” is used when the deliverer begins the lesson with a short video clip, icebreaker, music or other group activity. This can include any other quick activity that will grab students’ attention and build relationships among the students and between student and deliverer. For example, have a “show and tell” where students and teacher take time to tell each other about hobbies, family, background, recent vacations.

DELIVERER TEACHES ANALOGY: Deliverer teaches analogy to students by introducing the core concept and walking the students through analogy step-by-step following the numbers on the poster or in the PowerPoint.

DELIVERER USES POSTER SET/8X10/POWERPOINT: This question asks about the presentation of the material. The analogy looks the same on all three mediums. This is asked to gain a sense of what teachers/instructors are using and the combination they are using. Deliverer could use all three of these in one lesson.

DELIVERER USES MUSIC: Deliverer uses music during the lesson to reinforce content student is learning. This could be music provided on WhyTry? CD, music deliverer provides, and/or music student(s) provide.

DELIVERER USES BODY/KINESTHETIC ACTIVITIES: Deliverer leads students through body/kinesthetic or experiential activity reinforcing the concept taught in core analogy. Deliverer may spend entire lesson on this activity and not teach analogy. S/he reviews core concepts through body/kinesthetic learning using multisensory learning.

DELIVERER PROCESSES BODY/KINESTHETIC ACTIVITIES: Deliverer processes the relevance of the kinesthetic activity to the core concept of the analogy. There are a series of suggested questions to follow in the WhyTry? Curriculum manual to guide deliverer through discussion. This discussion connects analogy and kinaesthetic activity together.

DELIVERER USES JOURNAL ACTIVITIES: The WhyTry? journal is provided as a supplemental text book for the curriculum. To answer yes on this question, the deliverer will use activities from the journal in and/or outside of class to reinforce the core concepts.

DELIVERER PRAISES OR AFFIRMS STUDENT’S CONTRIBUTIONS: Deliverer acknowledges student’s contribution to class through verbal and/or written expression. A student’s contribution to the class is not defined by successes or failures but by the student’s presence.
Appendix E: Questions and probes for TaMHS link person

- **Your behaviour system**
  
  *How is positive behaviour logged? How do staff respond to positive behaviour with pupils directly? How are parents informed? How is negative behaviour logged? How do staff respond to negative behaviour with pupils directly? How are parents informed? Is there a sanction system? What does this look like?*

- **Approaches to effective social functioning already in school**

  *What approaches to teaching positive behaviour are their already in school? How are pupils taught to problem solve i.e. solve peer conflict, conflict with staff, etc.? How are pupils taught to deal with their emotions? What materials are currently used within school to teach these skills? What helps or hinders the teaching of such skills?*

- **Key staff in supporting behaviour and social functioning**

  *Who might be a useful staff member/s to have present in the group as a way of embedding the principles and skills within the school once the group has finished?*

- **Are you aware what WhyTry is? (an explanation will be provided)**

  *How might WhyTry complement existing work in your school to support the development of pupils’ social and emotional needs?*
Appendix F: Parental consent form/information sheet

Dear Parent/Carer,

I am a trainee educational psychologist studying at The University of Manchester and based at X Educational Psychology Service. I am planning to complete my doctoral research looking at the effects of a programme that is currently delivered in schools. The programme is called the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001).

The WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) aims to teach social and emotional skills to young people to improve a range of outcomes including attendance, behaviour and attainment. The research project will involve pupils selected by the school. I am hoping to measure the benefits to these pupils from taking part in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) as well as the wider implications for the use of the programme within X.

I am writing to request your consent to invite your child to take part in the programme. I have enclosed an information sheet providing further details on the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) and what the research project involves if, with your consent, your child decides to take part.

If you agree to give consent for your child to take part in the programme, please sign the consent slip below and return it to school. I also require your consent to include your child’s data in the research project. All data will be kept anonymous.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss the programme further, please contact me on 0000 000 000 or send me an email at lindsay.kay@X.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely,

Lindsay Kay
Trainee Educational Psychologist

Please return to.

Parental Consent

Name of child: ……………………….. Date of Birth: …………..
Contact Telephone Number: ………………………………
I agree that my child may take part in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) and that my child’s data may be included in the research project.
Signature of parent/carer: ……………………. Date: ……………….
Invitation

Your child is invited to take part in a programme currently being delivered in schools called the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001). The effectiveness of the programme will be investigated as part of a research project being carried out by a trainee educational psychologist working within the authority. This information sheet will outline the programme and the reason for the research project being carried out. Please consider the information carefully before deciding whether you would like your child to take part in the programme.

Why is this research being carried out?

I am a trainee educational psychologist completing my training with X Educational Psychology Service. I also work for the Targeted Mental Health in Schools (TaMHS) project in X, which is a project that helps schools support pupils. As part of my training, I am required to carry out a substantial piece of research and the TaMHS project manager has asked me to evaluate a programme called the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001). The programme is designed to improve outcomes for those children taking part. The research project will hopefully provide further evidence for the effectiveness of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001).

What is the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001)?

The WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) was created to provide solutions to problems young people can face. It aims to improve a range of outcomes including attendance, behaviour and attainment. Using ten pictures, it teaches skills to young people e.g. decision making, considering the consequences of decisions, problem solving. Please refer to the WhyTry Organization’s website for more details: http://www.whytry.org/ or contact the trainee educational psychologist (details overleaf).

Why has your child been chosen to take part?

Your child has been chosen to take part as the school thinks that your child will benefit from the programme. Other pupils will also be invited to take part.

What happens if my child takes part?

I will meet your child and explain the programme and the research project to him/her very carefully, answering any questions he/she has. I will then ask for his/her permission to include him/her in the programme. If he/she is happy to continue, I will gather information about your child using questionnaires that are completed by your child. I will also gather data from the school. I will gather this information at various points in time, before the programme, immediately after the programme and several months after the programme to see what effect the programme has had. When I record this information, I will use a code rather than your child’s name in order to keep the information confidential.

Your child will attend ten sessions of the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) over approximately 10 weeks. The sessions will be run during lesson time and, therefore, your child will miss some lessons, but school will support your child in catching up with his/her work.

I would also like to gain your child’s views on what they thought was useful in the sessions and how they feel it has helped them by inviting them to take part in a group discussion with the other pupils taking part in the programme, which will be audio recorded.
Does your child have to take part?

Your child does not have to take part if you are not happy for him/her to do so. If you do want your child to take part, please provide your signature on the enclosed consent letter. This gives your permission for him/her to be included in the programme as well as for me to gather data and to include this data in the research project. All information gathered will be kept anonymous and will be confidential. If at any point during the research you decide you would like your child to withdraw from the programme, or if he/she no longer wants to take part, your child can do so without giving a reason and your child’s data will be destroyed. Please note that this programme is an additional form of support for your child. If your child decides to withdraw from the programme, this will not affect the care he/she would otherwise receive.

What are the possible benefits of taking part?

The programme is designed to help young people, but benefits will depend on a number of factors including attendance and engagement in the sessions. The research project may help to show how the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) could be used to help other young people.

What happens after the research project?

When the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) ends I will write to you and your child to tell you how it has gone. I will be available to meet with you to discuss this further if you wish.

Contact details
Name of trainee educational psychologist: Lindsay Kay
Contact telephone number: 0000 000 000
Email: lindsay.kay@X.gov.uk
Dear X,

I am a trainee educational psychologist studying at the University of Manchester and working in X schools. An educational psychologist (or EP for short) has been trained to understand how children and teenagers learn and behave. I used to be a teacher in a school like yours, but now I go into lots of schools and work with children of all ages and their teachers and parents. Some children need help with their school work, some with their behaviour, some with getting along with others, some with their feelings and some with other things like getting around or seeing or hearing. I work with everyone in school – and parents – to try to help children do better in school.

I am going to be doing some research in your school looking at a series of lessons delivered to a small group of pupils. These lessons are referred to as the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001). The WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) teaches skills to children to help them do better at school (it can help them do better outside school too!) The types of things you will learn about are how to have better relationships with adults and friends, how to solve problems in school and how to find supportive people who can help you.

I am writing to see if you would like to take part in these lessons because Mrs X thinks you will enjoy the experience and it will help you. If you agree, you would join a group of five other children in your year group and go to one lesson per week for about 11 weeks. You would miss some lessons, but not the same lessons every week and your teachers will help you catch up. I would ask you some questions before the series of lessons and some questions after the series of lessons to see how they have helped you. I will also invite you to talk to me about what you thought about the lessons once they are all finished. During this talk, I will record everyone’s voices so I can listen back to what you said. What you tell me might help me when I deliver this programme to other children in your school or in other schools. After the programme has finished, I will write to you to let you know how it went and can come into school to talk to you about it if you like.

If you would like to take part, please read and sign the consent slip overleaf.

If you have any questions or would like to talk about the programme, please contact me on 0000 000 0000 or send me an email at lindsay.kay@X.gov.uk.
Yours sincerely,

Lindsay Kay

Trainee Educational Psychologist

______________________________________________________________________________________________________

Child Assent

Name of child: …………………………….. Date of Birth: …………

I agree to take part in the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001).

I agree to the researcher recording my voice if I agree to participate in the discussion about the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001).

I agree that my information may be included in the research project.

I understand that no one else will see my information, except the researcher, without my permission.

I understand that I can withdraw from this programme or the research at any time without giving a reason and that my information will then be destroyed.

Signature of child: ………………………. Date: ……………
Appendix H: Co-deliverer consent form

Dear Staff Member,

I am a trainee educational psychologist studying at the University of Manchester and working with X Educational Psychology Service (EPS) and the Targeted Mental Health in Schools (TaMHS) team. As part of my training, I am required to conduct a substantial piece of research. I have been asked to evaluate the effectiveness of a social skills programme, which will be delivered to a group of pupils in your school. The group will receive the intervention at the start of the next academic year. The programme is called the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) (please visit www.whytry.org for further information).

I wish to invite you to become a co-deliverer of the intervention. I will take a lead in the delivery of the group so that you have an opportunity to familiarise yourself with the programme and how it is delivered.

The programme is ten sessions long and each session will last for one full lesson. I will also need to meet with you after each session is delivered to plan the next session, which could take up to one hour.

As part of the evaluation of the programme, I would like to interview you after the programme is delivered to ask about any perceived changes in the pupils as well as what the deliverers and barriers to delivering the programme were. This interview is likely to last approximately one hour and will take place at your convenience as far as possible. The proposed date will be following the delivery of the programme, so some time in December 2011. The interview will be audio recorded so that I am able to listen back and gain accurate summaries of your views. I would like you to be able to speak freely so all your information and comments will be kept anonymous. I will check any themes I draw from the transcription of the interview with you and any comments can be deleted from the research at your request. I will also be checking to see if the themes drawn are an accurate representation of your views. You will be provided with a list of interview questions prior to the interview taking place so that you have time to consider your responses.

If you consent to taking part, you have the right to withdraw from this research at any time and, should you choose to do so, any data collected will be removed from the research. If you consent to being a co-deliverer and to participating in the interview, please complete the consent slip overleaf and return to X.

If you have any questions about the research, please do not hesitate to contact me on 0000000 0000 or at lindsay.kay@X.gov.uk.

Yours faithfully,

Lindsay Kay

Trainee Educational Psychologist, X EPS and X TaMHS
Name: …………………………..

Contact Telephone Number: …………………………………

email address: ………………………………….

I consent to being a co-deliverer and participating in the post programme interviews, which I understand will be audio recorded. I consent to my data being included in the research and understand that I have the right to withdraw from the research at any time and my data will be destroyed.

Signature: ……………………….. Date: …………………
Appendix I: WhyTry Measure

WhyTry Measure-R

Below is a list of items that describe people. Please circle the number for each item that best describes you. If you ‘strongly disagree’ with the item circle the ‘1’, if you ‘disagree’ with the item circle ‘2’, if you are ‘undecided’ circle ‘3’, if you ‘agree’ with the item circle ‘4’, and if you ‘strongly agree’ with the item circle ‘5’. There are no right or wrong answers. Read the items carefully and if you have any questions you may ask for help from your teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I have a dream or goal for my life.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The choices I make today will affect my future.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>When I face challenges, I am more likely to give up than try harder.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I let other people help me when I have a problem.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I believe that laws and rules make my life more difficult.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Challenges are opportunities for motivation and growth.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I see my future as positive and full of potential.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I am willing to work for something that I really want.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>There are a lot of adults who care about me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>If someone treats me bad, I am more likely to ignore him/her and walk away rather than lash back.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I can think of lots of people who can help me to solve a problem.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I focus on what is right about me rather than what is wrong with me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>There is at least one adult at my school that I can trust.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I have the power to avoid getting into trouble in my life.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I often do things that I</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
really don’t want to do because it will make me look cool in front of my friends. R

16. I think my challenges at home will make me get into trouble. R

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. I can tell the difference between friends that pull me down and friends that lift me up.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. I think my challenges at school will make me get into trouble.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. I see getting help from others as a sign of weakness. R

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. There are many adults that I can count on.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. I understand the consequences of the things that I do.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. I can help people see the good things about me.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. I know how to solve the difficult problems I face in life.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. I can see the opportunities that lie ahead of me in the future.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. I know how to keep myself motivated when things are hard.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. I feel close to people at this school.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. I am happy to be at this school.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R indicates reverse coding for that item.

Scoring: The WhyTry measure is scored by reverse-scoring the items on the questionnaire marked “R,” and then simply adding up the individual item scores.

Thank you for your time
Appendix J: Beck Disruptive Behaviour Inventory for Youth

Here is a list of things that happen to people and that people think or feel. Read each sentence carefully, and circle the one word (Never, Sometimes, Often, or Always) that tells about you best. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>0: Never</th>
<th>1: Sometimes</th>
<th>2: Often</th>
<th>3: Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>I steal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Other people get me into trouble.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>I think about running away from home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>I do mean things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>I break into cars, houses, or other places.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>I fight with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>I like getting people mad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>I skip school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>I hate listening to other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>I argue with adults.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>I hurt people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>I like being mean to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>I break the rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>I like it when people are scared of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>I like to hurt animals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>I like to bully others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>I tell lies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>I like to trick people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>I break things when I am mad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>I swear at adults.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BDI-Y Total RS
Appendix K: Beck Self-Concept Inventory for Youth

Here is a list of things that happen to people and that people think or feel. Read each sentence carefully, and circle the one word (Never, Sometimes, Often, or Always) that tells about you best. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I work hard.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I feel strong.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I like myself.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>People want to be with me.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I am just as good as the other kids.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I feel normal.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I am a good person.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I do things well.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I can do things without help.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I feel smart.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>People think I’m good at things.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I am kind to others.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I feel like a nice person.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I am good at telling jokes.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I am good at remembering things.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I tell the truth.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I feel proud of the things I do.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I am a good thinker.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I like my body.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I am happy to be me.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L: Pupil focus group schedule

Pupil Focus Group Schedule

Equipment required:

- Digital recorder
- Focus group schedule
- Colour photocopies of the visual analogies x 6
- Flip chart paper with questions

Welcome:

Thanks for agreeing to take part in this discussion about your views about WhyTry. I think your views are really important and they could affect the way the programme is run in the school in future. We’ll spend about an hour chatting about the programme we’ve been involved with over the last 10 weeks. I’ll ask you some questions. There are no right or wrong answers; I just want to know what you think. I’d like to hear everyone’s views, but don’t worry if you don’t have anything to say for a particular question.

The main purpose of our discussions today is to find out what you thought about the programme. I’d like to know about anything you particularly liked or disliked and any changes you’d make to how it should be run in the future. I’d also like to know whether you think attending the WhyTry sessions has helped you and, if so, how.

All the questions I ask will be written on flip chart paper. Don’t be afraid to ask me to explain what any of the questions mean if you’re not sure – some of them are quite complicated. I’ll be recording our discussions, but I’ll also write down key points and we’ll check at the end of each question that everything you wanted to say has been noted down. I’ve also provided you with photocopies of all the visual analogies we’ve been using in the sessions to help remind you what we’ve covered.

Ground rules:

Just like in the WhyTry sessions, I’d like us to continue to follow the ground rules we have all agreed on e.g. only one person to speak at a time; be polite and respectful; take turns and let everyone have a turn. You were all good at following the ground rules in the WhyTry sessions so I’m sure you’ll be able to do it now.

I will be recording this discussion. I’ll listen carefully to it later and type up what was said afterwards. However, I will not mention anyone’s name in my write up – I will use codes. Once I have finished typing up the discussion, I’ll delete it. If you decide you do not want to part of the discussion at any stage, you are free to leave. Is everyone happy with that? Does anyone want to leave at this point? Are we ready to begin?

1. What did you think about the WhyTry Program?
2. Were there any sessions you particularly liked or enjoyed?

Which ones? What did you like about it/them? Were there any specific activities you particularly liked? Which ones? What did you like about it/them?

3. Were there any sessions you particularly didn’t like or enjoy?
Which ones? What did you dislike about it/them? Were there any specific activities you particularly didn’t like? Which ones? What did you dislike about it/them?

4. What did you think about the way that Mrs. X, Mrs. Y, Mrs. Z and I delivered the sessions?

   What did you like? Was there anything you didn’t like about the way we delivered the sessions? What could we have done differently to make it better?

5. Have you participated in group programmes in the past?

   If yes, was WhyTry similar/different? In what ways?

6. Do you think WhyTry has helped you?

   If yes, how? What did you learn that was helpful? Which sessions helped? How did they help? Which parts did you find helpful? Was there anything about the people in the group that was helpful – other pupils, deliverers?

   If no, which sessions were least helpful? Why? Which parts in particular were unhelpful? Was there anything about the people in the group that was helpful – other pupils, deliverers?

   Has WhyTry had any effect on how you deal with difficult or challenging situations? What’s different about the way you deal with these situations? Anything in school? Outside school?

   Have the sessions had any effect on your behaviour? In what ways? What is different about your behaviour? Who has noticed? What did they say? Can you give any examples?

   Has WhyTry had any impact on your relationships with other people? Friends? Other people in your class? Teachers? Family? In what ways? What is different?

   Has WhyTry changed the way you feel about yourself? How? In what ways do you think you’ve changed? How does that make you feel?

   Did you learn any other skills? What? Have you used these skills? When? How? Where? With whom?

7. Do you think the WhyTry Program was right for you?

   Why/why not? What types of pupils would it be most suited to? Why?

8. How do you think WhyTry could be improved in the future?

   The sessions? Which ones? How could they be improved? The way it is delivered? Who else is in the group? What would you change?

9. Do you want to add anything else?

   Thank you for taking part. Any questions?
## Appendix M: Key aspects of programme implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Key references</th>
<th>Where covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme fidelity</td>
<td>Dane &amp; Schneider (1998)</td>
<td>Session plans, Research diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme dosage</td>
<td>Dane &amp; Schneider (1998)</td>
<td>Session plans, Research diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme quality</td>
<td>Dane &amp; Schneider (1998)</td>
<td>Co-deliverer interview, Q1, Pupil focus group, Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant responsiveness</td>
<td>Dane &amp; Schneider (1998)</td>
<td>Co-deliverer interview, Q5, Pupil focus group, Q2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme differentiation</td>
<td>Dane &amp; Schneider (1998)</td>
<td>Co-deliverer interview, Q4, Pupil focus group, Q2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme reach</td>
<td>Durlak &amp; DuPre (2008)</td>
<td>Co-deliverer interview, Q7, Pupil focus group, Q5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme adaptation (and future adaptation)</td>
<td>Durlak &amp; DuPre (2008)</td>
<td>Session plans, Researcher diary (Co-deliverer interview, Q8, Pupil focus group, Q8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery system facilitators</td>
<td>Reddy and Newman (2009)</td>
<td>Co-deliverer interview, Q2, Research diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery system barriers</td>
<td>Langley, Nadeem, Kataoka, Stein and Jaycox (2010)</td>
<td>Co-deliverer interview, Q3, Research diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Swain, Whitley, McHugo &amp; Drake (2009)</td>
<td>Co-deliverer interview, Q9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N: Ground rules for WhyTry sessions

- Only one person to speak at a time.
- Put your hand up if you wish to speak.
- Be polite + respectful
- Trust
- Confidentiality.
- Don’t laugh at other people’s views.
- Be sensible + keep safe.
- Have patience.
- Take turns + let everyone have a turn.
- Encourage each other + help each other out.
Appendix O: Co-deliverer semi-structured interview schedule

Co-deliverer Semi-structured Interview Schedule

Equipment required:

• Digital recorder
• Focus group schedule
• Copies of session plans x 3

Welcome:

Thanks for agreeing to take part in this discussion about your views about WhyTry. Your views are really important and affect the way the programme is run in the school in future. We’ll spend about an hour chatting about the WhyTry Program (Moore, 2001) we’ve been involved with over the last 10 weeks. I’ll ask you some questions. The main purpose of our discussions today is to find out what you thought about the programme. I’d like to know about anything you particularly liked or disliked and any changes you’d make if you were to run in the future. I’d also like to know how you feel the pupils responded to the sessions. We’ve already discussed some of these points in our planning sessions, which I’ve found very useful. It’s as important to feed back what didn’t go well as well as what did go well so we can make improvements in the future.

I’ll be recording our discussions, I’ll listen carefully to it later and type up what was said afterwards. I won’t mention anyone’s name in my write up – I will use code names. Once I have finished typing up the discussion, I’ll delete it. If you decide you do not want to part of the discussion at any stage, you are free to leave. Is everyone happy with that? Does anyone want to leave at this point? Are we ready to begin?

1. How well do you feel the programme was delivered?

Which parts were delivered particularly well? Which parts were not delivered as well? (Feedback elements from the diary and ask for further detail.)

• Some visual analogies too difficult?
• Experiential activities – which did you think went well/didn’t go well?
• Christian Moore’s account in Motivation Formula – too difficult?

2. What supported the delivery of WhyTry in this school?

Is there anything about the way the sessions were set up, planned and run that facilitated delivery? What in particular was helpful? Anything else? (If focusing on how sessions were run, ask about planning or set up)

3. What hindered the delivery of WhyTry in this school?

Is there anything about the way the sessions were set up, planned or run that you think may have been a barrier to the success of the delivery? What in particular was not helpful? Anything else? (If focusing on how sessions were run, ask about planning or set up)

4. Have you run group programmes in the past?

How was WhyTry similar/different? In what ways?
5. To what extent were pupils engaged during the programme?

*Firstly, as a group...how engaged were they at the beginning? As the programme progressed? How do you think they functioned as a group? Now, individual pupils...*

6. Have you noticed any changes in the pupils since they started the WhyTry programme?


7. Do you think the pupils in the group were the right pupils?

*Why/why not? Is there anybody else who might have benefitted?*

8. How do you think either the sessions themselves or the set up and delivery of the sessions could be improved in the future?

*How do you plan to set the group up and introduce the programme? Will you be sticking to the lesson plans provided? If not, what changes are you planning to make? Which lessons will you be altering and in what ways? What would you keep the same? Why? Do you intend to deliver all the sessions? If not, which ones will you miss out and why? Are you intending to use all the experiential activities? Which ones aren’t you intending to use and why? Do you plan to play the music? If not, why not? If yes, which tracks? Why have you chosen those particular tracks? How will you be displaying the visual analogies? How do you think that would improve outcomes? Anything else?*

9. How do you see the programme being rolled out in this school now?

*Any key staff you see as facilitative in continuing this work within school? Anything that needs to happen in order to support this? How has this been done successfully in this school previously? How do you see the principles of WhyTry having a lasting impact after the group has finished? Do you have any strategies for integrating the principles into the school? Do you have any ideas for how this could be done? What else?*
Appendix P: Illustrative photographs of the thematic analysis process

Photograph 1a: Exemplar coded transcript for focus group

Photograph 1b: Exemplar coded transcript for semi-structured interview
Photograph 2: Post it notes containing initial codes

Key: pink: co-deliverers; orange: pupil participants; yellow: research diary

Photograph 3a: Post it notes organised into potential themes (1)
Photograph 3b: Post it notes organised into potential themes (2)

Photograph 3c: Post it notes organised into potential themes (3)

Photograph 3d: Post it notes organised into potential themes (4)
Photograph 4a: Post it notes of reviewed themes (1)
Photograph 4b: Post it notes of reviewed themes (2)

Photograph 4c: Post it notes of reviewed themes (3)
Photograph 4d: Post it notes of reviewed themes (4)
### Appendix Q: Ethical considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Principle</th>
<th>Risk(s)</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Respect for human dignity</td>
<td>Potential risk to the pupils participating in the study due to the sensitive nature of topics under discussion during the sessions, such as peer relationships, home context, etc.</td>
<td>Consider group dynamics; encourage school to be sensitive in group selection; use of programme deliverer experienced in working with CYP and has received relevant training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential risk of researcher inadvertently misunderstanding participants’ views expressed during the focus group, leading to risk of misrepresentation.</td>
<td>Check understanding of ambiguous statements by asking for clarification. When focus group transcripts have been analysed, meet with participants and check that the outcomes are a true representation of their views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ensure integrity and quality</td>
<td>Methods used to gather views may potentially be inappropriate.</td>
<td>Consider all methods of gathering data and ensure they are appropriate and have a good evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Respect for free and informed consent</td>
<td>Participants may have been informed about the intervention by a perceived power figure and feel compelled to participate.</td>
<td>Remind participants of their right to withdraw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants/parents may not have a clear understanding of the project and therefore informed consent may not be obtained.</td>
<td>Explain project in sufficient detail to ensure participants and parents are able to give informed consent. Check their understanding of what their participation will involve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Respect for vulnerable persons</td>
<td>Vision/hearing or other impairments.</td>
<td>Consult staff/parents prior to meeting the participants whether they have any additional needs that may need to be taken into account when working with them and how these can be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Respect for privacy and confidentiality</td>
<td>Participants/parents may be concerned that personal and sensitive information may be divulged.</td>
<td>Inform participants that information gathered will be anonymised, kept in a secure place and kept confidential unless harm to self or others is suspected. If the researcher has cause to be concerned about a participant’s welfare at any stage, this will be dealt with in line with local authority protocol. This will be explained to participants from the outset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Participation in a voluntary way</td>
<td>Participants may feel under pressure to participate.</td>
<td>Researcher will inform participants of right to withdraw at any time and ensure they are not pressured to participate. Participants wishing to withdraw from the programme or merely from being involved in the research will be informed that their data will be destroyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Procedures should avoid harm</td>
<td>Due to sensitive nature of topics potentially under discussion during the WhyTry sessions, such as peer relationships, home context, etc., participants may become distressed.</td>
<td>Use of programme deliverer who has been trained in delivery of programme and who has experience of working with young people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix R: Letter of Ethical Approval

Secretary to Research Ethics Committees
Room 2.004 John Owens Building

Tel: 0161 275 2206/2046
Fax: 0161 275 5697
Email: timothy.stibbs@manchester.ac.uk

Ref: ethics/10429

Dr Caroline Bond
School of Education,
6.2b Ellen Wilkinson Building.

3rd May 2011

Dear Miss Kay and Dr Bond,

Research Ethics Committee 4
[Kay & Bond (Education): An evaluation of the WhyTry programme group intervention to support SEBD pupils in a mainstream secondary school: evaluating effectiveness and implications for future implementation (ref. 10429)].

I write to thank you for coming to meet the Committee on 13th April 2011 and to confirm that it gave the above research project, after the submission of amendments / clarifications, a favourable ethical opinion.

This approval is effective for a period of five years and if the project continues beyond that period it must be submitted for review. It is the Committee’s practice to warn investigators that they should not depart from the agreed protocol without seeking the approval of the Committee, as any significant deviation could invalidate the insurance arrangements and constitute research misconduct. We also ask that any information sheet should carry a University logo or other indication of where it came from, and that, in accordance with University policy, any data carrying personal identifiers must be encrypted when not held on a university computer or kept as a hard copy in a location which is accessible only to those involved with the research.

Finally, I would be grateful if you could complete and return the attached form at the end of the project or by the end of March 2012.

We hope the research goes well.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Deborah Bentley
Secretary to University Research Ethics Committee 4
## Appendix S: Time line and time budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time budget</th>
<th>Contingency time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March – April 2011</td>
<td>Literature Review and submission of A2 on 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; April 2011</td>
<td>Private study days throughout March and April</td>
<td>Weekends in March and April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>Initial set up meeting with TaMHS link</td>
<td>1 hour research time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>WhyTry training</td>
<td>2 x research days</td>
<td>1 x service day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial set-up with co-deliverers</td>
<td>1 x research day</td>
<td>1 x service day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>Pre-measures with pupils</td>
<td>1 research day</td>
<td>1 x study day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Term 2011</td>
<td>Programme delivery</td>
<td>Research days throughout the Autumn term</td>
<td>Private study days/minimal service days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2011</td>
<td>Write Literature Review – hand in draft on 28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; October</td>
<td>Research days</td>
<td>Private study days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td>Post measures with pupils</td>
<td>1/2 research day</td>
<td>Private study day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group with pupils</td>
<td>2 hours research time</td>
<td>Private study day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-structured interview with co-deliverers</td>
<td>2 hours research time</td>
<td>Private study day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>Transcription and thematic analysis of focus group and semi-structured interview</td>
<td>3 research days</td>
<td>Private study days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of quantitative data</td>
<td>1 research day</td>
<td>Private study days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write Methodology section – hand in draft on 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; January</td>
<td>3 research days (carried over from December)</td>
<td>Private study days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>Follow-up measures with pupils</td>
<td>1/2 research day</td>
<td>Private study day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete data analysis and write Results section – hand in draft on 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; March</td>
<td>4 research days</td>
<td>Private study days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>Write Discussion section – hand in draft on 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; April</td>
<td>Research days throughout April</td>
<td>Study days throughout April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April/May 2012</td>
<td>Proofread, collate and submit Thesis on 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; May</td>
<td>Research days throughout April</td>
<td>Study days throughout April</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix T: Risk Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal rejected by TaMHS steering group</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Negotiate idea with steering group including TaMHS project manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties with participant recruitment (staff member/s at school)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Liaise with TaMHS link at the school who will ascertain which staff members are interested in skill up on SEBD programme delivery/CPD opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties with participant recruitment (children to form group)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Identify pupils who could be invited to participate in the event of participant drop-out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties obtaining parental consent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Ask TaMHS link person to follow this up by contacting parents to ascertain whether letter has been mislaid/overlooked. Otherwise, send letters out to back-up participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental consent for inclusion in the group is given, but parents do not give consent for their child’s data to be used as part of the research</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Ask TaMHS link person to check with parents whether this was an oversight. If not and this happens with a small number of participants, analyse data of remaining participants only. If this happens with all participants, send letters out to back-up participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant absence during pre-/post-intervention or follow-up measures</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Use contingency time to administer measures on participant’s return to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant absence during intervention</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Keep an attendance record to acknowledge any missed sessions in write up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant absence during focus group/semi-structured interview</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>If there are sufficient numbers of pupil participants remaining to run a focus group, continue without absent participant/s. Otherwise, use contingency time to rearrange focus group for a different date. If very small numbers agree to participate, interview individual participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme co-deliverer absence</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Discuss with TaMHS link and programme co-deliverer contingency plans for absence during pre-programme meetings. Due to the relatively large staff:pupil ratio, sessions can go ahead if up to two co-deliverers are absent at any one time, although the risk of this is low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher absence</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Use contingency time, request an extension and/or reduce the amount of post-measure data to be collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix U: Intervention delivery in the present research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Omissions</th>
<th>Adaptations</th>
<th>Additions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Entire session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 | - Experiential Activity 1 – The Game of Life  
- Experiential Activity 2 – The Keys to Staying on Track | N/A | Icebreaker – ball game (see exemplar session plan in Appendix W) |
| 2 | Experiential Activity 2 – Panning for Gold  
Experiential Activity 1 – The Real Me (see Appendix W) | Experiential Activity 1 – The Keys to Staying on Track | Experiential Activity 2 from Session 1 – The Keys to Staying on Track |
| 3 | Experiential Activity 2 – Frustration Squares  
Experiential Activity 1 – Creative Pyramid (see Appendix W) | Experiential Activity 2 | Pupils draw a visual representation of the ‘reality ride’ they have been riding this week  
Malcolm in the Middle youtube clip ‘Duel at the Mall’ |
| 4 | - Attention Activity – Washers and Strings  
- Experiential Activity 2 – Nuclear Fallout | N/A | Reflecting on positive/negative defence mechanisms used this week |
| 5 | Experiential Activity 1 – The Egg  
Experiential Activity 2 – The Pot (see Appendix W) | Experiential Activity 2 | Reflecting on positive/negative referrals received this week |
| 6 | - Experiential Activity 1 – Acid River  
- Experiential Activity 2 – Electric Hurdle | N/A | Reflecting on positive/negative referrals received this week  
‘How not to jump hurdles’ youtube clip |
| 7 | - Experiential Activity 1 – Ring Challenge  
- Experiential Activity 2 – Stepping Stones | N/A | Experiential Activity 2 from Session 6 – Electric Hurdle |
| 8 | Attention Activity – The Paper and the Book | N/A | Pupils given homework – to notice what goes well and what doesn’t go well this week |
| 9 | - Experiential Activity 1 – Connections  
- Experiential Activity 2 – Dowels and Strings  
Attention Activity – Rabbit, Moose, Walrus adapted to Paper, Scissors, Stone (see Appendix W) | Experiential Activity 1 – Mouse Traps (see Appendix W) | - Reflections on what went well and what didn’t go well this week  
Pupil guest speaker  
Pupils given homework – to notice what goes well and what doesn’t go well this week |
| 10 | Experiential Activity 2 – Mouse Traps | Experiential Activity 1 – Mouse Traps (see Appendix W) | - Reflections on what went well and what didn’t go well this week  
youtube clip of moonwalking bear |
Appendix V: Exemplar session plan

**WhyTry**

Introductory Session

**Aims of Session:**
- To introduce WhyTry, deliverers and participants.
- To identify group rules and a group name.
- To start to build a group identity.

**Resources required:**
Flip chart paper and pens; small bean bag; 3 x balls; 10 x people bingo sheets; prizes (e.g. pens, pencils, etc); pictures of inspirational figures and associated quotations/facts in envelopes x 6.

**Session format:**

**10 mins  Deliverer’s introduction**
- Greet pupils and distribute name badges.
- Outline the format and aims of the programme: approximately 11 sessions incorporating discussion, activities and music that aim to support pupils in overcoming challenges they face in reaching their potential.
- Outline purpose of this session: To get to know each other.

**10 mins  Ground rules**
- Explain that in order for the group to be successful, we need to have some group rules. Link to ‘rules’ in society, i.e. laws, and the fact society needs these to be successful.
- Invite pupils to think of their own group rules they pledge to abide by for the next 11 weeks. Ensure the following feature:
  - Respect one another.
  - If someone speaks, we listen.
  - Don’t laugh at others’ suggestions.
  - Confidentiality (explanation: everything said in the group must remain within the group and shouldn’t be discussed outside the room. The exception to this is if we feel you or someone else may be at-risk; then we may have to pass this information on in order to keep you safe).
- Pupils and deliverers place their handprints on the group rules sheet. Display on wall.

**5 mins  Ice breaker 1**
- Ball game: Deliverer starts with one ball. Say the name of the person they are passing it to and throw the ball to that person. Continue. Deliverer gradually introduces two more balls into the process.
- Aim of this is for pupils and deliverers to learn everyone’s names and to have fun!
5 mins  Name group
- Pupils discuss in pairs/threes what might be a good name for our group.
- Take one idea from each group member.
- Vote on the best name – this is the name of our group.

10 mins  Ice breaker 2
- People bingo: each group member gets a sheet with statements on e.g. *This person has brown eyes.* They must walk around the room and find another group member for whom that statement is true. One point is awarded for every *different* name written. A prize is awarded to the person with the most points.
- Aim of this is for pupils and deliverers to interact and get to know a little about each other.

25 minutes  Inspirational people
- Explain that during the next session – and in future sessions – we will be discussing people who we find inspirational.
- Define the term ‘inspirational’ as someone who motivates or encourages us to do well.
- Explain that pairs of pupils will be given a pack of facts and quotations. They must decide which fact or quotation goes with which inspirational figure whose pictures are displayed around the room (ensure pupils know who the inspirational figures are first and give a mini biog).
- Share correct responses, using worksheet 1a as a guide. Spend some time discussing the quotations and what they mean to the pupils.

5 mins  Plenary
- Each group member and deliverer must state one thing they have learnt/got out of the group today.

5 mins  Homework Activity
- Challenge pupils to find a person who inspires them for the next session. These can be famous or non-famous people and can include the inspirational figures from today’s session.
- Ensure pupils are aware of the date of the next session.
### People Bingo

Collect the names of each person who fits each description below. You earn one point for each different name you collect. The person who earns the most points wins!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likes broccoli</th>
<th>Had cereal for breakfast</th>
<th>Has blonde hair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has brown eyes</th>
<th>Has a favourite football team</th>
<th>Had toast for breakfast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plays a sport</th>
<th>Can play a musical instrument</th>
<th>Has been to London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Worksheet 1a

Inspirational People

1. Lance Armstrong (USA) – Cyclist. Diagnosed with testicular cancer. He survived and went on to conquer the cycling world with seven Tour de France wins. He has since established the Lance Armstrong Foundation and is committed to the cause to end cancer.

“Pain is temporary...eventually it will subside and something else will take its place. If I quit, however, it lasts forever.”

2. Michael Jordan (USA) - The greatest basketball player of all time. He earned six NBA titles and two Olympic Golds. His charity work has led to the generation of millions of dollars. During his career, he lost more than 9000 shots, lost 300 games and missed the game-winning shot 26 times.

“I can accept failure, everyone fails at something. But I can't accept not trying.”

3. JK Rowling (UK) – Author of the Harry Potter series of books, which have since been made into films. She has won numerous awards and is estimated to be worth £620 million. Was put in the ‘stupid row’ when at primary school; later, as an unemployed and struggling single parent, wrote on scraps of paper in a local café.

"We've all got both light and dark inside us. What matters is the part we choose to act on. That's who we really are.”

4. Bill Gates (US) – Founder of Microsoft, one of the most successful computer software companies in the world. There are around 500 million users of Microsoft around the world. Bill Gates is estimated to be worth £26 billion. He has donated millions of dollars to charities.

“It's fine to celebrate success, but it is more important to heed the lessons of failure.”

5. Martin Luther King, Jnr. (US) - Influential civil rights activist. His passionate, but non violent protests, helped to raise awareness of racial inequalities in America, leading to significant political change. He was assassinated on 4th April 1968, aged 48.

“Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that.”
Lance Armstrong
(Cyclist)
Michael Jordan
(Basketball Player)
J.K. Rowling
(Author)
Bill Gates
(Inventor)
Martin Luther King, Jr.
(Civil Rights Activist)
This person has survived cancer. They said:

“Pain is temporary...eventually it will subside and something else will take its place. If I quit, however, it lasts forever.”

This person has won two Olympic golds. They said:

“I can accept failure, everyone fails at something. But I can’t accept not trying.”

Before they became successful, this person was an unemployed and struggling single parent and wrote on scraps of paper in a local café. They wrote:

“We've all got both light and dark inside us. What matters is the part we choose to act on. That's who we really are.”

This person is worth £26 billion. They said:

“It’s fine to celebrate success, but it is more important to heed the lessons of failure.”

This person was one of the world's most influential public speakers. They said:

“Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that.”
Appendix W: Adaptations made to the original programme

Session 2 Experiential Activity 1 – The Real Me

- Show pupils a tin can and ask what’s inside. How do we know? (The label tells us).
- Open the can to reveal sweets and process the activity: We cannot judge something just by its label because what’s ‘inside’ might be very different.
- Explain that the first step to tearing off our negative labels is to identify and focus on our strengths – how great we are and how much greater we can become when our labels are torn off!
- Complete ‘The Real Me’ sheet.
- Stress that putting out energies into focusing on our strengths and goals will help us to tear our negative labels off.

Session 3 Experiential Activity 1 – Creative Pyramid

- Pupils build towers with newspaper and sticky tape. The idea is to come up with creative ways to respond to a pressure situation.

Session 5 Experiential Activity 2 – The Pot

- Blindfolded obstacle course. Pupils work in pairs – one blindfolded. The non-blindfolded pupil has to guide their blindfolded pupil through an obstacle course. They then swap roles and repeat.
- **Processing the experience:**
  - The pot is the obstacle course...
  - How did it feel when you overcame it?
  - How effectively did you support each other to get out of the pot?
  - How could you use these strategies to get out of the pot in your life?
  - What are the reasons for getting out of the pot?
  - What will life be like when you do climb out?
  - Will you have the same feelings of accomplishment?

Session 9 Attention Activity – Rabbit, Moose, Walrus

*Paper, Scissors, Stone*

- Pupils should pair up and stand back to back. On the count of three, they should turn around and show either paper, scissors or stone. However, unlike the way the game is usually played, the aim here is for pupils to **match** their responses. Keep going until this is achieved for all three pairs.
- Process the experience...who matched the first time? Why did it take several attempts? It takes time to ‘connect’ with a person. Why is it important to connect with people in our lives? How can these connections help us solve our problems?

Session 10 Experiential Activity 1 – Mouse Traps

*Mouse Traps (but without the mouse traps!)*

- Place masking take on the floor in a rectangular shape 15 feet long and 4 feet wide. Place 30 objects (e.g. coasters) randomly within the rectangle. Blindfold a volunteer and ask them to walk through the rectangle without stepping on any of the objects (a deliverer should sound a buzzer if/when they do). Ask a
second volunteer to verbally lead the first volunteer through the rectangle. Finally, the first volunteer walks through the rectangle without the blindfold.

- Processing the experience –
  - how did the wall (blindfold) limit your view?
  - what were the frustrations of the person being led?
  - what were the frustrations of the helper?
  - what could the blindfold represent in life?
  - first time = no vision, no support;
  - second time = no vision, with support;
  - third time = vision, no support.
  - how do you know when you’re on top of the wall?