Exploring Pupil Perceptions of Self and Possible Occupational Selves, in a School for Social Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties

Chris Heslop
A9904734

Doctorate of Applied Educational Psychology
University of Newcastle
School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences

Overarching Abstract

This document comprises of three interrelated papers: a systematic literature review (Chapter 1), a bridging document (Chapter 2) and a piece of empirical research (Chapter 3).

An interest in how occupational efficacy may be enhanced during adolescence, led to a systematic review of literature examining the effectiveness of interventions designed to enhance 'Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy' (CDSME). The review took a quantitative approach to reviewing the findings of 10 published papers.

Findings of this review suggest limited effects of specific short-term interventions designed to increase CDSME in adolescents aged 11-16. An apparent paucity of literature was also apparent regarding CDSME development in young people attending schools for Social Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD).

Important supplementary outcomes of the review include epistemological reflection on the conceptualisation of self-efficacy, and the methodology employed in its assessment; in particular the seemingly absent perspectives of the young people who partook in the reviewed studies.

These considerations led to a piece of qualitative empirical research to explore the views of 6 students attending Riverdale SEBD School regarding perceptions of themselves and their occupational futures.

Findings of this study suggest that Riverdale School experiences may potentially contribute to these pupil perceptions of themselves and possible future career options.

This tentative understanding of pupils perceptions, developed through interpretation of their accounts, offers implications for local authority professionals responsible for the educational placement and experiences provided for these young people.

A bridging document explains how findings of the systematic review led to the development of the research. It details the theoretical and epistemological underpinnings and provides justification for the methodology adopted. It also considers ethical and methodological dilemmas in more detail and provides reflexive commentary on the research process.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 – Systematic Literature Review

Chapter 2 – Bridging Document

Chapter 3 – Empirical Research

Table of Tables

Chapter 1: What is known about the Effectiveness of Interventions to Increase Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy in Adolescents: A Systematic Review

Abstract

Acknowledgement of the significant role of self-efficacy in the domain of career decision making has generated increased interest in how this may be engendered in young people. Intervention to date has predominantly focused on post-secondary students, with encouraging results; although doubts remain about the long-term maintenance of enhancement effects. Less is known of the efficacy of interventions targeted at earlier adolescence.

In light of this, the literature was reviewed to ascertain the effectiveness of interventions aimed at enhancing the Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy (CDMSE) of adolescents aged 11-16.

The review followed the systematic process as outlined by Petticrew and Roberts (2008). Ten quantitative studies examining interventions to enhance the CDMSE of adolescents aged 11-16, were selected for in-depth analysis.

Eight of ten reviewed studies report significant short-term enhancement effects of CDMSE. However, effect sizes were small for interventions deemed stronger in quantitative experimental rigour. Studies yielding larger effect sizes were weakened by methodological concerns.

Findings of the review suggest limited effects of interventions, and variability in the quality of existing research in the field. It also considers the importance of methodology used in obtaining authentic accounts of CDMSE, and also the challenges faced when conceptualising and attempting to measure psychological constructs.

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Self-Efficacy

Several comparable definitions for self-efficacy are offered within the literature (Bandura, 1977; Lorig & Holman, 2003; Taylor & Betz, 1983); however, reference to Bandura's (1977) original conceptualisation is common to each of these definitions. Bandura's conceptualisation of self-efficacy refers to a person's beliefs concerning their ability to successfully perform a task or behaviour, beliefs which must be domain specific. The concept of self-efficacy is therefore proposed to require a behavioural referent to be meaningful (Betz & Schifano, 2000).

For example, self-efficacy may refer to singing ability, initiating relationships, driving a car, or programming a computer. The array of self-efficacy domains is limited only by the extensive number of life tasks and behavioural domains which can be defined (Betz & Schifano, 2000).

Self-efficacy expectations were initially proposed (Bandura, 1977) to influence at least three behavioural domains: performance, persistence and approach versus avoidant behaviour. Other studies (Uffelman, Subich, Diegelman, Wagner, & Bardash, 2004) agree, and have expanded this notion, postulating an underlying role for self-efficacy in many other psycho-social constructs, such as confidence, commitment and motivation.

Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, and Pastorelli (2001) contend that... *'Among the mechanisms of agency, none is more central or pervasive than beliefs of personal efficacy. This core belief is the foundation of human motivation, well-being, and accomplishments'.* (Pg.187)

Therefore, an individual who harbours low self-efficacy within a particular behavioural domain, may be expected to avoid associated behaviours (Bandura, 1977; Pajares, 1996). In addition, personal efficacy is implicated in the decisions people make at important points of their lives (Dotterer, McHale, & Crouter, 2009; Eva, Munoz, Hanson, Walsh, & Wakefield, 2010), such as career choice, and may influence the occupational paths chosen.

1.1.2 Career Exploration and Development

Over the last 30 years, interest in self-efficacy and its role in Social Cognitive Theories (Bandura, 1986; Krumboltz, 1993; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) has spawned much research in the domain of career exploration and development (Gainor, 2006). Career exploration has been conceptualised (Taveira, Silva, Rodriguez, & Maia, 1998) as the activities which target self-knowledge enhancement, and knowledge of one's environment, to assist in career decision-making and development.

Gati, Krausz, & Osipow's (1996) model of decision-making helps us understand the career development process further (Gati & Saka, 2001). This model suggests that, if a gap is perceived between the current state and the desired state, individuals will explore alternative courses of action.

In terms of career development, such gaps may be unclear career goals, little knowledge about possible alternative choices, poor motivation to make a choice, or indecision. The probability of alternative courses of action, in the form of career decision making avoidant behaviour may be predicted to be higher, should an individual not feel efficacious in their ability to successfully bridge this gap.

Career exploration is considered (Blustein, 1989) to be particularly relevant during adolescence, as it fosters the growth in self-awareness and occupational knowledge needed to commit to a vocational choice. A vision of a possible occupation helps young people organize their lives (Betz, 2007), provides meaning to their activities, motivates them, and enables them to overcome barriers to their goals (Blustein, 1989).

Importantly, Lent, Lopez, & Bieschke (1993) suggest efficacy beliefs to be predictive of occupational choices and level of mastery of educational requirements, when variations in actual ability, prior level of academic achievement, educational aptitude, and vocational interests are controlled. Without a sense of personal agency, young people may simply eliminate from consideration occupations they believe to be beyond their capabilities, however attractive the occupations may have originally been.

1.1.3 Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy (CDMSE)

The formalisation of Career Decision Making Self Efficacy (CDMSE), and the development of the Career Decision Making Self Efficacy Scale (Taylor & Betz, 1983), provided a significant addition to the field of self-efficacy research and its application to career development.

Heavily influenced by the proposals of Bandura (1977), and in response to calls for increased specificity with regards to causal factors of career indecision (Osipow, Carney, & Barak, 1976) , CDMSE describes the extent of an individual's perceived competence in completing various tasks associated with career decision making (Betz & Voyten, 1997).

Developed from Crites'(1961) model of career maturity, Taylor and Betz identified five areas of self-efficacy applicable to career decision making, which form the five sub-scales of a CDMSE assessment Scale; these being: self-appraisal, gathering occupational information, goal selection, planning and problem solving.

The first sub-scale, *Self-Efficacy for Self-Appraisal*, requires the individual to assess their career interests, skills, goals, and values.' The second of these scales, *Self-Efficacy for Gathering Occupational Information*, includes the capacity to describe an occupation of interest, as well as acquiring further information about this occupation.

The third sub-scale *Self-Efficacy for Goal Selection* subscale, examines the ability to identify a career goal which compliments the individual's values, interests, and skills; whereas *Self-Efficacy for Planning* describes tasks that prepare an individual for the job market and job application process in their field of interest. Finally, *Self-Efficacy for Problem Solving*, assesses an individual's resilience when faced with occupational barriers.

The scale is not suggested to encompass all of the skills under the CDSME umbrella. In fact Taylor and Betz (1983) speculate there to be approximately fifty of such related tasks or behaviours. However the domains of career behaviour identified by the CDSME scale may further our understanding of the type of skills which interventions attempt to augment.

1.1.4 CDMSE Interventions

A number of studies, primarily in the realm of further education, describe the positive effects of interventions designed to increase CDMSE. Studies have examined the efficacy of career classes, in which students participated in semester long courses designed to increase career decision-making confidence and facilitate career exploration (Fouad, Cotter, & Kantamneni, 2009). Tansley, Jome, Haase, and Martens (2007) explored the effect that persuasive messages have on college students' career decision-making cognitions and behaviours through message framing techniques. Other studies have examined Job search clubs (Bikos & Furry, 1999); computerised career assessment (Maples & Luzzo, 2005) and self-directed career searches (Uffelman et al., 2004).

Common to the conclusions of all these studies, is the implication of the four theoretical efficacy enhancing experiences (Bandura, 1977) in their design, these being: performance accomplishments, vicarious learning, emotional arousal and social persuasion.

Sullivan and Mahalik's (2000) study is considered (Betz, 2007) to be a stand out piece of research in the field of CDMSE, as its design is based on self-efficacy theoretical principles . It is also one of the few studies in the field to include a follow up measure (six months after the study). In this study, a career-counselling intervention was designed explicitly using the four sources of efficacy information (Bandura, 1986). Examples of tasks included: revisiting past occasions when task mastery experiences occurred (performance accomplishments), interviewing a successful role model about the career decision process (vicarious learning), relaxation and adaptive self-talk (emotional arousal), and provision of facilitators' positive feedback and encouragement (social persuasion and encouragement). Results indicated significant increases in CDMSE in the experimental groups, and also reported maintenance effects of the intervention.

Variety is evident in both the focus and design of interventions implemented in attempting to increase CDMSE; however existing research largely supports the notion that career interventions are effective in enhancing individuals' CDSME.

1.1.5 CDMSE and Adolescence

The majority of the studies aimed at increasing CDMSE have, perhaps predictably, targeted those studying at college or university. It is during this time of life when formalisation of career goals becomes of increasing importance, due to the impending entry for most into full- time employment (Eccles, 2009).

Less is known about the influence of Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy on the career development of adolescents of middle and high school age. This may be considered somewhat surprising, given that children's career trajectories are thought to become crystalized early in the developmental process (Bandura, 2006). Early adolescence (11-14 years) has also been postulated (Gottfredson, 2002) as a time of life when an individual's aspirations develop from idealistic to more realistic ideas. The self-development during formative periods forecloses some career options (Erikson, 1968) and makes others realizable. It is suggested (Kenway & Hickey-Moody, 2011) that career options which young people feel more efficacious in achieving, are more likely to be selected before those which are perceived as unobtainable to them.

1.1.6 The focus of the review

There exists a substantial and ever growing body of research regarding the development of career decision making. The degree to which young people feel efficacious in their ability to identify, pursue and achieve a fulfilling career has implications both for the individual and for society as a whole.

The current review hypothesises that the development of CDMSE may be advantageous to adolescents earlier in their educational career i.e. middle and high school, an area which is yet to be reviewed. This time of life has been identified (Muntean, Roth, & Iovu, 2010) as seminal in the formation of future life plans. Early development of CDMSE at this stage may allow a greater period of time, prior to the school/work transition, to experience CDMSE enhancing experiences, and to develop and internalise efficacious perceptions of achieving desired career outcomes.

It may also prove astute to evaluate CDMSE at an age prior to potentially pivotal career choice events, such as GCSE examinations or high school graduation. Performance in these exams may have huge bearing on an individual's chosen career (Sayid Dabbagh, 2011). Individuals, who have already achieved qualifications which have allowed them to access higher education, may already harbour above average levels of Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy.

Initial plans to only review studies which examined CDSME interventions in SEBD schools were widened to include interventions which have taken place in all schools, as preliminary searches identified an apparent lack of studies which have examined CDSME interventions in SEBD schools.

The present review will therefore focus on adolescents between the ages of 11 and 16 years old and will ask the question: '*What is known about the effectiveness of interventions to increase the Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy in adolescents*'?

1.2 Method

This review employs the systematic methodology as outlined by Petticrew & Roberts (2008). This method involves the implementation of seven individual stages from the identification of the review question through to communication of the outcomes of the review. It should be noted that whilst service users were consulted in defining the overall study, they were not directly consulted in generation of the review question

1.	Clearly define the review question in consultation with anticipated users
2.	Determine the types of studies needed to answer the question
3.	Carry out a comprehensive literature search to locate these studies
4.	Screen the studies found using inclusion criteria to identify studies for in-depth review
5.	Describe the included studies to 'map' the field, and critically appraise them for quality and relevance.
6.	Synthesise studies' findings
7.	Communicate outcomes of the review

Table 1: The systematic review stages (from Petticrew & Roberts, 2008)

1.2.1 Identification and description of relevant studies

The following electronic databases were searched: Australian Education Index, British Education Index and ERIC (all via Proquest), CSA Illumina, Cambridge Journals Online, Informaworld, JSTOR, Medline, Sage Journals, Science Direct, Swetswise, Scopus, Web of Knowledge, PsycInfo.

Electronically scanned copies of papers, which were not available directly (McWhirter, Crothers, & Rasheed, 2000), were requested from Newcastle University Library.

In addition, searches of Journals deemed to be of particular relevance to the current study, were undertaken: Journal of Vocational Behaviour, Journal of Career Development. All searches were undertaken between October 8 and November 11, 2011.

Searches were undertaken using a combination of relevant key words and phrases (see Table 2). Key words and screening criteria were sourced from review of relevant papers in the field. These terms were then entered into internet thesauri, ensuring the inclusion of further appropriate synonyms for use in the intervention, target population and outcome, search-term categories.

Target Group terms
Adolescen*, Teenage*, Child*, Pupil*, Student*, Young person, School age*, High school pupil*, Secondary school pupil*
Outcome Terms
Career, Self-efficacy, Career self-efficacy, Occupational self-efficacy, Career assessment, Career Exploration, Career decision making, Career locus of control, Career Choice, Career Development, Vocational self-efficacy, Occupational Choice, Career development.
Intervention Terms
Intervention*, Programme*, Career Intervention, Career Programme, Project, Course, Career Course

Table 2: Terms used in literature search

In order to be included in the current review, papers were required to meet particular inclusion criteria. The criteria, shown in Table 3 were used in the initial screening stage of the 207 papers identified from the literature search.

In line with the process used by Cole (2008), abstracts of papers which gave sufficient details of the study were first screened to exclude ineligible studies from the review. This process identified 20 studies which met these criteria.

Participants	Adolescents aged between 11-16 years
Settings	Any (school, residential, summer camp, home). Research from all countries was included.
Intervention	Included details/indication in the abstract, of the implementation of a programme of intervention targeted at increasing career related self-efficacy. For the purposes of this study, the term 'career related' self-efficacy is used to encapsulate the areas of self- efficacy related career decision making, as identified by Taylor & Betz (1983)
Study Design	Treatment targets were stated and included a measure of at least one of the following: career related self-efficacy, positive self-attributions, career decision making self- efficacy, attitude to career planning, future self-efficacy.
Time, Place, Language	All studies were reported in English and completed between 1995 and 2011.

Table 3: Initial screening criteria

Full texts of these remaining 20 studies were examined in detail using further screening criteria (see Table 4). A further ten papers were rejected at this stage (see appendix H, pg. 135) which left 10 papers for inclusion in the review. Details of the ten retained papers were then summarised in tabular form (see Table 6).

Further criteria were then applied (see Table 4) to the 36 studies identified by the initial screening stage. This process allowed the focus of the review to be further refined.

Participants	Studies which incorporated a mix of ages which crossed the identified age perimeters i.e. 11-18 were excluded.
Settings	No further criteria were included
Intervention	Studies which examined the impact of self-efficacy as an independent variable upon other outcomes were excluded
Study Design	Specifically measured, and included specific reference to (and outcome data), at least one measure of self-efficacy related to the domain of career decision making
Time, Place, Language	Studies were published in peer reviewed journals or books

Table 4: Additional screening criteria

1.2.2 Detailed description of studies in the review

Ten studies identified as meeting the inclusion criteria were analysed according to study aims and research questions, study design, methods of analysis, data collection and outcomes. This provided a description of each studies method and included information on several other variables outlined below in Table 5.

Participants	Number of participants, age and gender.
Context	Country and setting for the study.
Programme & Focus	Whether the programme targeted a subject specific area of career self-efficacy enhancement, or a general career self- efficacy.
Duration	The length and frequency of programme sessions.
Design	Whether the study used a between groups or within subject group design and whether a control group was used. Also included were details of steps taken to ensure experimental rigour.
Tools/Measures	Details of measures used to collect data.
Results/Significance	Details of dependant variables and significance of results.

Table 5: Categories of Information gathered from searches

Table 6 is also used to provide the outcomes of each study in terms of significance and the effect size of interventions. Cohen's d was calculated for each study which did not already provide effect sizes, using the formulae described in (Nakagawa & Cuthill, 2007). Using this statistic allows comparison of effect sizes from research with different sample sizes. Effect sizes of .20 are considered (Cohen, 1992) to be small, .50 considered as medium, and .80 large.

Table 6: Detail of studies included in the systematic literature review

Study	Participants		Context	Programme & Focus	Duration	Design	Tools/Relevant Measure	Results/Gain Made (*= significant effect ,p<0.05)	F	Effect size (d)
	N	Age								
O'Brien et al (2000)	48(30 female, 18 male)	M=15.73 (SD= 0.83)	American high school Upward Bound summer institute Students at risk of under achieving	Effects of 'Career Exploration Programme'	Groups Intervention 50 mins , 5 x per week for 5 weeks No follow up	Between groups Treatment v Control	Career Confidence Scale (CCS) Measure of number of considered career options.	Intervention group had improved Career decision making self - efficacy * No sig effect of number of considered careers	F=7.64	d = 0.38
Turner & Laplan (2005)	160(75 female, 85 male)	M= 12.5 (SD= 0.68)	American middle school students	Effects of 'Mapping Vocational Challenges' Career Development Programme (MVC)	Group Intervention total duration from pre-post-test = 5 weeks. Intervention phase = Single 45 min (app) exposure for each of the three MVC modules. No follow up	Between groups Quasi-Experimental, non-equivalent groups. Treatment v Control	Career planning and exploration efficacy (CPEE) Educational & Vocational Development Efficacy (EVDS) Unisex American College Testing Interest Inventory Revised	Increased 'Career planning & exploration efficacy'* Increased 'Educational & vocational development efficacy'*	t = 2.30 t = 2.38	d = .20

Study	Participants		Context	Programme	Focus and Duration	Design	Tools/Relevant Measure	Gain Made *= significant effect ,p<0.05	F	Effect size (d)
	N	Age								
Dawes, Horan & Hackett (2000)	169 (78 Female, 91 male)	M=12.67	American Public school	Effects of Intervention designed to increase technical/ scientific career self-efficacy.	Group Intervention 50 mins per school day for 7 week period No follow up	Between groups Treatment v Control stratified group allocation	The Self-Efficacy for Technical /scientific fields Educational Requirements Scale - revised General and specific career interest -revised	No Significant Effects specific scientific career efficacy No significant effect on general scientific career efficacy	Not given	d = 0.11 d = -0.15
Turner & Conkel (2010)*	142 (73 Female, 69 male)	M=13.21 (SD= .62)	American Inner City Middle school	Comparison of ICM intervention with 'traditional' career intervention and control groups	Group Intervention Treatment 1 = 2 x 1hr sessions Treatment 2 = 4 x 1 hr sessions No follow up	Between groups. Treatment 1 & Treatment 2 v delayed control Stratified Random group allocation	The Structured Career Development Inventory-R (SCDI-R) Proactive Skills for the New Economy (PSNE)	Efficacy/Positive Attributions (p=.045)*	F = 3.18	d = .52
Kerr & Robinson Kurpius (2004)	502 females	M=15.46	American rural high schools. Student identified as 'at risk' for not reaching potential	Effects of 'TARGETS' programme on technical/ scientific career self-efficacy	1 x Full day programme First assessed at 3-4 month follow up.	Within subjects design. No control group	Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale Educational Self Efficacy – Adolescents scale	No significant effects on 'Job' self- efficacy	N/A	d = 0.22

Study	Participants		Context	Programme	Focus and Duration	Design	Tools/Relevant Measure	Gain Made *= significant effect ,p<0.05	F	Effect size (d)
	N	Age								
Bozgeyikli & Dogan (2010)	60 (28 female, 32 male)	13-14	Turkish elementary school	Effects of 'Computer assisted career guidance programme' on career making self-efficacy	2 x 60min sessions per week for 5 weeks No follow up	Between groups Quasi experimental Treatment v control	Scale for self-efficacy of career decision making (CDMSES)	'Personal & Occupational features' efficacy sub scale* 'Collection of Career Information' efficacy sub scale* 'Making Realistic Plans' efficacy subscale *	t= 23.165 t= 24.226 t= 19.064	d = 7.45 d = 7.42 d= 5.22
Koivisto et al (2011)	1034 (517 female, 517 male)	14-15	Finnish secondary school	Effects of 'Towards Working Life' group intervention	15 hours over 1 week duration Post- test carried out 10 weeks after baseline assessment	Between Groups Treatment v control	Career Choice Self-Efficacy Scale – revised version	Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy (p=.01)* Information seeking self-efficacy (p.001)*	F= 11.06 F= 33.52	d = 0.30 d = 0.23
McWhirter, Rasheed & Crothers (2000)	166 (97 female, 69 male)	M = 15	American urban high school	The Career Education Class	50 mins daily sessions for 9 week duration 9 week follow up	Within subjects crossover Pre/post measures Control group	Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy Scale – short Form (CDSE-SF)	Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy*	t= -6.72	d =.04

Study	Participants		Context	Programme	Focus and Duration	Design	Tools/Relevant Measure	Gain Made *= significant effect ,p<0.05	F	Effect size (d)
	N	Age								
O'Brien et al (1999)	57 (32 Female, 25 Male)	M= 12.31 (SD= 1.26)	American Middle School

Summer programme for those 'at risk' of under achievement | Career Horizons Programme | 6 hours per day for 1 week

No follow up | Within subjects

Non randomised

No control | Missouri Comprehensive Guidance Evaluation Survey: Grades 6-9 | Career planning and exploration Self – Efficacy*

Knowledge of Self and Others Self-efficacy*

Educational and vocational Self-efficacy* | t = -6.42

t = -3.33

t = -5.10 | d = 0.77

d = 0.51

d = 0.54 |
| Speight et al (1995) | 45 (35 Female, 10 Male) | 14-15 year old | American high school | 'Medcamp' Programme | 3 day programme

No follow up | Within subjects

Non randomised sample

No control | Medical career Self Efficacy Scales (MCSES) | Specific Career Self efficacy Sub-Scale*

Related Career Self Efficacy Sub-Scale*

General Career Self-Efficacy Sub-Scale* | t = -9.31

t = -7.46

t= -5.05 | d = 1.81

d = 1.34

d = 0.86 |

1.2.3 Weight of Evidence (WoE)

Studies in the systematic review were also analysed using the EPPI-Centre Weight of Evidence (WoE) screening procedure (see Appendix I, pg136 for examples). This process considers three areas of measurement for each study, which combined, allow an overall measure of quality and relevance these are: A. How trustworthy are the studies (given methodological considerations), B: How appropriate are the studies research design and methods of analysis, C: How relevant was the study to this review (as judged by the sample, measures, focus of the study etc.), D: Overall weight of evidence, following consideration of sections A, B and C.

	A - Trustworthy in terms of own question	B – Appropriate design and analysis for this review question	C – Relevance of focus to review question	D – Overall weight in relation to review question
Between Groups Design				
O'Brien et al (2000)	Medium	Low	High	Medium
Turner & Laplan (2004)	Medium	Medium	High	Medium
Dawes, Horan & Hackett (2000)	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
Turner & Conkel (2010)	Medium/High	Low/Medium	Medium/High	Medium
Bozgeyikli & Dogan (2010)	Low/Medium	Low/Medium	Medium/High	Low/Medium
Koivisto,Vinokur & Vuori (2011)	High	Medium/High	Medium/High	Medium/High
Within Subjects Design				
O'Brien et al (1999)	Medium	Low	Medium/High	Medium
Kerr & Robinson Kurpius (2004)	Low/Medium	Low	Low/Medium	Low
Speight, Rosenthal, Jones & Gastenveld (1995)	Medium	Low	Medium	Low/Medium
McWhirter, Rasheed & Crothers (2000)	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium

Table 7: Weight of Evidence Summary

Observation of the synthesis table indicates that only one of the studies in the review (Koivisto, Vinokur, & Vuori, 2011) was felt to provide overall medium/high weight of evidence, as this study satisfied each sub-section of the weight of evidence criteria. The strength of this study lay in its experimental design including its large sample size, randomisation procedure and tests of group equivalence. In addition, post-intervention testing was done, on average, 10 weeks after baseline assessment and therefore the intervention demonstrates some maintenance effects.

Two of the studies reviewed provided low/medium weight of evidence, either as a result of lack of experimental rigour in their design (Speight, Rosenthal, Jones, & Gastenveld, 1995), or because of reliability concerns with results (Bozgeyikli & Dogan, 2010). Six studies were considered to provide medium weight of evidence, four of which utilised a between groups design, which included a control group and pre-test measures of group equivalence, and therefore were considered more methodologically sound. One within subjects study (McWhirter et al., 2000) employed a cross over design, and measures of pre-test group equivalence and was therefore more methodologically sound than other within-subjects studies.

One study was deemed to provide a low weight of evidence with regards to answering the review question (Kerr & Robinson Kurpius, 2004), due to concerns regarding impartiality of reporting. In addition, this study included job/career self-efficacy simply as one of many variables, and was not considered the central focus of the study.

It also suffered from the same methodological sampling issues as the review's other within-subjects studies. This study also failed to acknowledge any of several limitations in its design.

General observations from the weight of evidence, are that the conceptual foci of studies were highly relevant for the current review, but were let down by lack of experimental rigour, and analysis of long term effects. Both of these flaws are acknowledged in the discussion sections of several of the selected papers.

1.3 Synthesis of Evidence

1.3.1 General characteristics of the studies analysed.

Eight of the studies examined in the review were mostly conducted in North America, one in Finland and one in Turkey. Six of the studies were carried out in school settings and utilised pre-existing classes to deliver interventions. Students deemed at risk were identified for the remaining four studies, which were delivered on university campus. One of these (Speight et al., 1995) was conducted at a medical school.

Participants in the studies were all drawn from opportunity samples, from populations convenient to the researchers. Sample sizes ranged from 48 to 1034 with a median of 151, and consisted of 1467 female participants and 916 males. One study (Kerr & Robinson Kurpius, 2004) only included female participants.

There was variation observed in the length of intervention sessions (50 minutes to full days), the number of sessions administered (2 to 40) and the duration of time which the studies were conducted over (1 day to 10 weeks). There also existed considerable difference in the intensity of delivered programmes, with some choosing to administer consecutive full day sessions (Kerr & Robinson Kurpius, 2004; O'Brien, Dukstein, Jackson, Tomlinson, & Kamatuka, 1999; Speight et al., 1995) and others choosing to deliver smaller periods of intervention over a greater period of time (Bozgeyikli & Dogan, 2010; Koivisto et al., 2011; McWhirter et al., 2000).

Seven of the ten studies did not provide follow-up data. Only one of the studies (McWhirter et al., 2000) provided a 9 week follow-up, which reported small maintenance effects of their intervention. One study (Kerr & Robinson Kurpius, 2004) attempted a follow up 3-4 months later, but make reference to the limited generalisability of findings, due to high rates of attrition. Koivisto et al. (2011) carried out their post-intervention measures, 10 weeks after pre-intervention baseline assessment, which enabled them to claim some maintenance effects of their intervention. The omission of follow up studies, and the benefits of longitudinal assessment are acknowledged in the limitations sections of six of the reviews papers.

1.3.2 Experimental design of studies in the review

All studies examined group interventions. Six utilised a between groups design, and involved the use of a control group. Half of these six studies used random allocation to experimental or control conditions; however two of these studies did not (O'Brien et al., 2000; Turner & Lapan, 2005) and used a non-equivalent group design, due to timetabling constraints in schools. One study (Bozgeyikli & Dogan, 2010) did not give sufficient detail to determine whether random allocation had been used or not.

In five of these six studies, the control group received some comparable form of education, which did not include instruction which would be considered to affect the dependant variable of the study. The one exception was Turner & Laplan (2005), in which the control group still received the intervention, but at a later date.

Other measures of internal validity were undertaken by three of these six studies (Bozgeygklg & Dogan, 2010; O'Brien, 2000; Turner & Laplan, 2005) in the form of pre-test measures of group equivalence. Each of these studies found no pre-test significant differences between control and experimental groups on dependant variables. Interestingly, Turner & Conkel (2010) chose to examine pre-test group equivalence on demographic variables, but did not use a pre-test measure of dependant variables, which weakened their design. One of the studies (O'Brien et al., 2000) conducted a pilot study and modified their design based on the findings of this.

The remaining four studies in the review adopted a within-subjects design. These studies demonstrated less experimental rigour in their designs; not only concerns of validity which may arise from such a design (Rust & Golombok, 1999; Winer, 1999), but in other areas as well. Three of these four studies did not employ any control group, and participants were individually identified as being at risk of underachievement by tutors. This opens these studies to the possibility of considerable selection bias (Collier & Mahoney, 1996). One of the four studies (McWhirter et al., 2000) employed a cross-over design, and conducted pre-test measures of group equivalence, but did not utilise random allocation to these groups.

1.3.3 Outcomes and Effectiveness

Outcomes from the review indicate that eight of the ten studies report significant effects (p<.05) of intervention on CDMSE variables. Two of the studies (Dawes, Horan, & Hackett, 2000; Kerr & Robinson Kurpius, 2004) did not report significant findings. Comparison between studies is made complicated, by the use of differing instruments pertaining to measure CDMSE, across studies.

Cohen's *d*, calculated for each the studies indicated variation in the effect size of interventions (see Table 6). Cohen's *d* was assessed where possible using comparison of experimental and control post-test means. For studies which did not utilise a control group, comparison of pre and post-test means was used to calculate effect sizes. It is recognised that this formula is not as robust, and can artificially inflate effect sizes (Coe, 2002). Effect sizes for these studies should therefore be interpreted with this effect in mind.

Analysis of effect sizes indicates that five of the review's ten studies show effects in the range of .04 - .23, which is considered in the low range, using the benchmarks outlined by Cohen (1992). Slightly higher effect sizes (.38) were calculated for (O'Brien et al., 2000). Of the remaining four studies, Turner & Conkel (2010) showed an effect size in the medium range (.52), but suffered from the design flaws outlined earlier.

Three of the studies produced effect sizes at or above the high (0.8) threshold. Two of these studies (O'Brien et al., 1999; Speight et al., 1995) suffer from design flaws, due to the absence of a control group for comparison.

In addition, participants in these studies were individually identified as being at risk, and therefore the generalisability of these effect sizes is significantly limited.

One considerable anomaly, in terms of effect sizes, came from the study by Bozgeyikli and Dogan (2010), calculated to be an average of 6.67 over the three sub-tests of CDMSE measured. Effect sizes of such magnitude are likely to come under scrutiny for their accuracy. Given the relatively low numbers in each group, and the small standard deviation within these groups, every participant in the experimental group would have needed to demonstrate considerable increases in CDMSE to generate such results. Additional concerns from the study are that participants were selected due to pre-existing low levels of CDMSE, and sufficient information was not given to determine if random allocation took place. By chance, both the control group and the experimental group consisted of 14 females and 16 males. Measures of pre-test group equivalence also indicated means which would suggest comparability at an unusually high level. Each of these factors must be considered when interpreting effect sizes from this study.

1.3.4 Further Considerations

Additional considerations emerged from the review, these being issues of Construct Conceptualisation, Construct Specificity and Construct Measurement. Each will be discussed in turn.

1.3.4.1 Construct Conceptualisation

Problems of conceptualisation are often encountered when attempting to compare studies which examine psychological constructs (Pajares, 1996). The current review identified research which attempted to raise CDMSE. However it is acknowledged that the selected studies identify CDMSE through the implementation of a range of differing tasks, which collectively may engender a feeling of Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy. It may be then, that CDMSE itself can only be explored as a cognitive by-product, created/or inhibited by the manipulation of other variables. Betz and Schifano (2000) contend the term Career Self-Efficacy to be a misnomer, and that the term has been adopted to capture the body of research which applies self-efficacy theory to the behaviours relevant to the career development process, such as the ones outlined by Taylor and Betz (1983). Whilst this may not be as much an issue for a stand-alone study, it does raise issues of reliability when comparing studies in a review. Similarly, Pajares (1996) speaks of a 'proliferation of expectancy constructs' (pg.550) in the literature and the similarity of their conceptualizations e.g. self- efficacy, confidence, competence, perceived ability or self-concept.

Complications regarding the validity of comparisons therefore quickly become apparent. Pajares (1996) points out that there is no reason why theorists should conceptualise expectancy beliefs in the same way, or agree without solid empirical evidence which suggests they should. This raises concerns of where boundary lines lie between expectancy constructs and raises questions of whether objective definitions of any psychological construct is possible.

This point is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that such constructs are often described through metaphor and analogy; descriptions also may be restricted by an individual's lexical diversity. Although a definition of self-efficacy may be reached, we have no shared point of objective reference to compare our understanding and therefore precise individual experiences of self-efficacy may differ.

In acknowledging the variety of ways in which self-efficacy may be conceptualised, we may then further question the wisdom of utilising quantitative methods to measure such constructs. The term construct itself, should perhaps warn against the use of such methods, or efforts to generalise findings.

It may also be predicted that, as the number of studies within a review increases, so does the probability of subjective variation in the conceptual focus between researchers. For this reason, although studies were selected on the basis of an explicit reference to the enhancement of CDMSE, we must question whether the conceptualisations of CDMSE were identical, and therefore comparable, in each case.

1.3.4.2 Construct Specificity

Zimmerman (1995) speaks of the problems in self-efficacy research which surround the issue of mismeasurement. Pajares (1996) contends that because judgements of self-efficacy are domain and indeed often task specific, then global or inappropriately defined self-efficacy assessments weaken effects.

Bandura (1986) warns against the use of omnibus measures of self-efficacy, even those which target a specific domain (such as CDMSE). He suggests that even domain specific omnibus measures may be problematic, if composite multi-scale scores, drawn from different subsections of the domain, are used. This was the case in all of the studies examined in the current review. Bandura argues that such measures decontextualize the self-efficacy–behaviour correspondence, and transform efficacy beliefs into a generalised personality trait.

This is an interesting point, as it may be argued that the engenderment of a general efficacious nature may be a more beneficial goal of a longer term intervention. Some research (Lent & Hackett, 1987; Pajares & Miller, 1995) acknowledges that although specific measures of self-efficacy and outcome behaviours provide precision and better prediction, they do so at the cost of lesser generalisability and practical utility.

1.3.4.3 Construct Measurement

Although some consensus may be reached as to a definition of self-efficacy, it may be questioned whether numerical value can be attributed to this or indeed any psychological construct.

Some authors (Borsboom, 2005; Borsboom et al., 2009) ask whether such ratings have use beyond the individual, given the subjective ascription of numbers to a psychological state, and their likely ephemeral nature. We might then ask if one person's rating of (for example) a 5 is comparable to someone else's without an objective point of reference. This is known as the problem of reification(Day, 2005). Attempting to combine data or generate mean scores using interval data may then be considered problematic (Borsboom, Mellenbergh, & Van Heerden, 2003; Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). Furthermore individual variation in self-ratings from one day to the next may also be expected (Lundberg & Manderbacka, 1996) due to many environmental confounding variables (Borsboom, Mellenbergh, & van Heerden, 2004) . We might question therefore whether a rating of 5 represents exactly the same thing, or to exactly the same degree on two different days. Issues with measurement such as these might then lead to questions regarding the validity of quantitative measures of psychological constructs.

1.4. Limitations and Recommendations

1.4.1 Limitations of the review

Limitations of the systematic review are acknowledged. The first of these is the possibility of bias during the coding stages of the review. Although studies were subject to strict selection criteria, conclusions are limited by the fact that ultimately I selected/rejected studies therefore selection bias may have occurred. These effects may have been increased during the weight of evidence coding procedure, during which a greater level of subjectivity is

undeniable when attributing, somewhat general weights, such as low, medium, or high to studies.

Another limitation of the study is that, eight of the ten studies in the review were conducted in North America, which may have exposed them to unique cultural effects of this part of the world. Therefore, wider generalisation of the findings of the review should be done with this in mind.

1.4.2 Recommendations for further research and practice

The question may be asked if the use of quantitative methods to examine a cognitive construct such as self- efficacy is appropriate. Is self-efficacy quantifiable in terms which mean exactly the same to all; and can we ensure parity in the conceptualisation of CDMSE across studies? In all of the studies in the current review, the reasoning behind chosen methods of evaluation was rarely transparent, other than some (such as ratings scales) had been used in previous studies.

Intuitively, to ascertain an authentic view of a construct susceptible to individual interpretation and context, an idiographic approach may be considered a more appropriate way of exploring self-efficacy. The goal of generalising findings, as is the concern of much quantitative research (Willig, 2008), should perhaps not take priority because of the associated difficulties with measurement already addressed. In addition Parajes (1996) expresses concerns that, as with self-esteem, there is a danger that self-efficacy intervention may soon 'come in a kit' (pg.569). More authentic assessment of personalised constructs such as self-efficacy may therefore be best achieved through qualitative methods.

The use of qualitative methods may also help to ascertain a more representative view of young people's views using an idiographic approach, through which their views may be better represented (Lundy, 2007).

Researchers might consider ways to gather authentic representation of views, and ensure that young people aren't being exploited as a result of an adult led research agenda (Forlin, 2010; Woolfson et al., 2008).

Ethical considerations in employed methodology must not simply be surrendered amidst a desire for theory development. Several of the studies in the current review (Kerr & Robinson Kurpius, 2004; O'Brien et al, 1999; O'Brien et al, 2000; Speight et al,1995) initially identified students deemed to be at risk by teachers, and then implemented the agenda of the researcher. These studies portrayed a sense that researchers had set out to develop a tool or intervention, and that generalisation of results took priority over the participation experience of the young people involved. These important issues are considered in more detail in chapter 2.

1.5. Conclusions of the systematic review

Conclusions of the current review suggest limited efficacy of interventions designed to raise the CDMSE of adolescents aged 11-16. In general, these findings do not concur with those of past studies which examine CDMSE enhancement of older populations, such as those already attending higher education or university.

Analysis of the effect size data from the examined studies indicated smaller values of Cohen's *d* for interventions considered more robust in their design. Studies yielding (considerably) higher effect sizes (Bozgeyikli & Dogan, 2010; O'Brien et al., 1999; Speight et al., 1995) contain design flaws, which weaken their findings, and limit their wider generalisation.

None of the studies in the review implemented a reliable measure of maintenance effect of their intervention; again limiting the capacity to generalise findings. Any attempt to generate a pooled effect size for the review is considered unwise, for reasons of reliability.

Although findings of the current review suggest that short-term reactive interventions designed to boost occupational efficacy appear of questionable value in adolescence, variation in methodological rigour between studies in the current review demonstrates the merits of the EPPI weight of evidence tool, when assessing robustness of studies, to ensure context surrounds the provision of statistics. The review also highlighted potential conceptual and methodological pitfalls which researchers may face when attempting to measure expectancy constructs such as CDMSE. These issues raise important questions regarding the most effective ways to promote measure and maintain feelings of occupational agency in young people, and how the construct is conceptualised in research.

1.5.1 Future Directions

Future studies in this domain may consider exploring the age at which CDSME interventions are introduced into schools and whether there may be an optimum time for their introduction. Super and Hall (1978) suggest that by the age of thirteen pupils are able to match their own interests with the specific requirements of potential future careers, but that children as young as eight begin to match their interests with career knowledge. Some researchers (Walsh, Walsh, & Osipow, 1990) suggest that pupils may be set on a particular career path as early as middle school, with avenues to particular career options explored/rejected depending on which academic sets they are placed in. It may be that pupils begin to harbour perceptions of which types of job are available to them much earlier in their lives, therefore interventions designed to enhance CDMSE could be beneficial during this time of life, with an aim of ameliorating such effects.

There does not appear to be general consensus in the literature regarding a recommended age at which CDSME intervention may be introduced. It is suggested however that young people being to form occupational aspirations/expectations earlier much earlier than adolescence. However, it is important to guard against assuming children's competence based solely on chronological age ().

Some researchers (Gottfredson, 2002; Marsh, 1989) contend that children's occupational aspirations are developmental in that they are influenced by changes and life transitions as one matures. Gottfredson (2002) proposes that

aspirations of some children decline as they mature, (see Gottfredson's model of Circumscription and Compromise), partly through exposure to an increasingly competitive academic environment as they move through school.

Proposals such as these may suggest that furthering our understanding of the educational environment which may engender/inhibit the natural development of occupational self-efficacy may be an important avenue for future research. The current review identified a knowledge gap in the literature with regard to the development of occupational agency in specialist educational provisions.

Listening to the perspectives of students may also further our understanding of how/if such environments influence the occupational efficacy of young people often described as at risk (Burton, Bartlett, & Anderson de Cuevas, 2009; Norwich, 2008). Unfortunately, such perspectives have been largely overlooked in the past (Lewis & Burman, 2008; Thomas, 2007). A better understanding of what young people feel is possible for them, in terms of their future careers and the conditions which may contribute to this growth/restriction may prove of importance to all stakeholders with an interest in pupils' occupational development .

Chapter 2 – Bridging Document

Abstract

As part of my doctorate training in applied educational psychology I carried out a systematic review of the literature examining the effectiveness of interventions to raise Career Decision Making Self Efficacy in young people. Findings of this review led to a piece of empirical research examining pupil perceptions of current selves and possible occupational selves in a school for Social Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD).

This chapter attempts to explain the links between the theoretical and methodological findings of the systematic literature review and the design of the empirical research study reported in Chapter 3. It explains how I became interested in this area of research and the role of epistemological assumptions which underpin the study. The selected methodology is explained in more detail and issues of critical ethics are considered. Lastly, personal reflections on the research process are reported.

2.1 Developing an interest in this domain

As a practitioner who works with young people displaying Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD), I have regularly encountered presumptive adult discourse regarding the post-school destinations/occupations of these young people. These views have been most commonly encountered in specialist school settings and, although often speculation at the time, have regularly proved to be accurate. This may be important, as teacher expectations are suggested (Rubie-Davies, 2010) to play a part in the development of pupils self-fulfilling prophecies (Wilkins, 1976), which may affect perceptions of attainable future careers.

In my experience, the perspectives of the young people themselves are less regularly explored. Given that the number of pupils displaying SEBD continues to grow (Department for Education, 2012b), it is perhaps surprising that exploring the views of pupils labelled with SEBD regarding their future prospects, represents a relatively limited area of research (Burton et al., 2009). My own experience of conversations with these pupils has often revealed their capacity for insightful introspection.

A systematic review of studies designed to boost Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy in adolescents, suggested that adult led interventions designed to provide a quick fix efficacy boost, may be of limited utility at this time of life. Given that the adolescent years are considered influential in identity development (Bandura, 2006; Erikson, 1968) and in the development of possible occupational future selves (Gottfredson, 2002; Markus & Nurius, 1986), researching pupil perspectives on this development may prove valuable to

professionals making important decisions regarding the development and futures of these students.

2.2 Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy, and Possible Selves.

In conceptualising a piece of qualitative research, its purpose and its audience must be carefully considered (Yardley, 2000). The way ideas are presented and understood may determine the degree to which research findings are embraced. The aim of the empirical research reported in part three of this thesis, was to explore young people's perceptions of themselves and their occupational futures and to identify any implications for schools settings regarding this development.

With this in mind I reflected on the somewhat academic language of the Career Decision Making Self Efficacy construct, explored in the systematic literature review. Groundwater-Smith and Mockler (2007) advocate the use of a 'shared, recognisable language' (p.200) within research, which allows for well- informed debate. Subsequently I chose to explore a conceptually related aspect of individual agency - 'Possible Selves' (Markus & Nurius, 1986), the language of which I contend as more accessible to those perhaps unfamiliar with the field of self-efficacy research.

The slight differences in how these two constructs are conceptualised in the literature are acknowledged. For example, Bandura (1995) describes self efficacy as '...*the belief in ones capabilities to organise and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations*' (p.2).

Whereas Markus and Nurius (1986) contend possible selves as '…*self-knowledge that pertains to how individuals think about their potential and about their future'. (p.954)*

Given my critical realist standpoint, slight differentiation between these concepts is not considered problematic (see page 36). Macfadyen (2011) proposes that we must not fall into a trap of believing that naming a problem or a phenomenon solves it, something referred to as a nomothetic fallacy. My position as a critical realist assumes the existence of psychological phenomena, but I contend delineation based on language as problematic due to the absence of any shared objective point of reference. Although Bandura (1986) may question the utility of omnibus measures of self-efficacy, Lent and Hackett (1987) also observe that specificity and precision are often purchased at the expense of practical relevance.

Within the empirical research, efficacy beliefs are considered dynamic and to work in tandem with a range of other factors in determining human thought and action (Lent & Hackett, 1987). The notion of possible selves would appear consistent with these proposals, as Markus and Nurius (1986) present them as the "*cognitive manifestation of enduring goals, aspirations, motives, fears, and threats*" (p.954)

2.3 Purpose of the study

The goals of the empirical research were twofold. Willig (2008) speaks of the type of knowledge which a qualitative study aims to produce and offers two examples pertinent to the empirical study, these being... '*to give voice to accounts which may be marginalised or discounted*' (p.12) and to '...*identify recurring patterns of experience amongst a group of people*' (p.12).

My view is that attempting to understand children's views is philosophically important in its own right, and that a sense of present value (Christensen & Prout, 2005) should be acknowledged in how young people are positioned in research. By seeking only to know what young people will become, we risk devaluing who they currently are. The empirical study therefore examined pupil perceptions of current selves alongside possible occupational selves.

It is important to acknowledge that researching these pupil perspectives was also of interest to the commissioners of the current research, as evidenced in their most recent Children and Young People's Plan. '...*the challenge is to see through the eyes of the child and understand what would make a difference to their world*' (Anon, 2010, p.4). Therefore, obtaining pupil views may still partly serve an adult led agenda. The methods employed in attempting to '*see through these eyes of the child* (op cit) then become of critical importance in how pupils are represented in research.

2.4 Problematising Pupil Voice

Concerns regarding the objectification of children by traditional and psychological social research has seen an increased focus on researching pupils' views on matters which affect them (Gallacher & Gallagher, 2008). The merits of accessing pupil views are suggested to include: increased pupil confidence (Hoyle & Sherrill, 2006), positive identity development (Bae, 2009), the promotion of social inclusion(Spicer & Evans, 2006), a tolerance of diversity, and mutual respect within schools (MacBeath, Demetriou, Rudduck, & Myers, 2003). More than this though, accessing student voice has moved beyond the pragmatic benefits and become a philosophical position (Christensen & James, 2008) which repositions young people as agentic in their own lives. This has resulted in the emergence of many participatory research methods assumed to promote this agency.

However, some research (Cocks, 2006; Gallacher & Gallagher, 2008) warns of the seemingly empowering allure of participatory approaches, and the dangers of an uncritical approach to their application (Renold, Holland, Ross, & Hillman, 2008). Consideration needs to be given to the contexts in which children's voices are produced and the power imbalances which have the potential to shape them (Spyrou, 2011). How and why we gather students' voice extends far beyond the pragmatics of asking pupils what they think, and raises critical issues of ethics, methodology and the epistemological viewpoint from which voice is gathered and interpreted.

2.5 Interpretive framework - Critical Realism

The epistemological position taken by a researcher has implications for the aims of their research, the methodology used and the type of knowledge it aims to produce (Robson, 2002; Willig, 2008). One of the key assumptions of critical realism is that the world exists independently of our knowledge of it (Johnson & Duberley, 2000; Sayer, 2000). Whilst acknowledging the existence of a 'real world', a critical realist position contends that this cannot be objectively accessed.

Objects, or entities, provide the basic theoretical building blocks for a critical realist epistemological position. These can be such things as organisations, people, relationships, attitudes, resources, inventions, or ideas. These entities may be human, social or material, structured or unstructured. Bhaskar (1975) proposes both 'intransitive' and 'transitive' dimensions of knowledge to help explain how entities are understood (Sayer, 2000). Intransitive elements refer to the objective status of entities e.g. the physical objects or social processes being studied, whereas the transitive elements refer to the more subjective, rival theories which surround their existence. A critical realist epistemological position espouses that our knowledge of the world may be socially constructed, but acknowledges an essential intransitive dimension which remains the same for all, which is understood in different ways. Therefore although we may study the world, fallibility in the theory-laden knowledge (Scott,2007) which is generated is accepted, due to individual differences in perception and interpretation. As Larkin, Watts, and Clifton (2006) contend 'what is real is not dependent on us, but the exact meaning and nature of reality is'(p.32).

In my research I listened to the perspectives of young people identified as displaying SEBD with the belief that these young people's realities are experienced whether I ask about them or not. From a critical realistic perspective, observation would not suffice in understanding social phenomena as meaning may not be externally visible. A critical realist perspective gives emphasis to the perspective of the social actor (Bryman, 2008) therefore my understanding is filtered through my own interpretation of pupil accounts - a 'double hermeneutic' (Smith & Osborn, 2003). The version of reality which I report is likely distorted by my own theories, choices and biases and therefore requires critique of this reality. Furthermore, the language used by participants may distort the experience it is assumed to represent (Silverman, 2011). My access to young people's worlds thus also becomes dependent on their ability to convey experience through their words, which then remains subject my interpretation.

2.6 Ethics

The assumption that children are competent experts on their own lives (Burke, 2005), might suggest there should be no need for a specific set of child friendly research methods. Pupils in the empirical study were positioned as competent in understanding themselves and their environment. However, the degree to which they are able to display this may depend on conditions which support competent performance. Adult assumptions of presumed incompetence may contribute to the perspectives of pupils who fall outside of the mainstream – such as those displaying SEBD- going unheard (Cocks, 2006). This incompetence may be better attributed to a researcher's inability to create

conditions conducive to supporting young people share their views (Punch, 2002).

In this way, competence is not regarded as something achieved, but instead to remain in flux and be context dependent. Therefore essentialist notions of completeness (Cocks, 2006) regarding competence are rejected, and a critical realist stance reconfirmed. Within the empirical study competence is conceptualised as temporary, and dependant on many idiosyncratic emotional, cognitive, verbal and social conditions being met. To assume competence based on a singular dimension such as age (France, 2004), may risk failing to recognise the dependencies which underpin even the most assured demonstrations of it (Cocks, 2006). This thesis therefore questions assumptions of competence as something tangible, which raises the issue of how this is ensured when acquiring participant consent - itself a potentially fluid process (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004).

Whilst both verbal and written consent was obtained from all students, Renold et al. (2008) question the established idea of informed consent, instead conceptualising this as '*always in process and unfinished'* (p.427). In this way, young people may consent to partake in a study, but may feel unable to withdraw from this should topics of discussion become uncomfortable. By utilising semi-structured interviewing, I aimed to allow participants freedom to explore or avoid particular lines of questioning. However, using these methods I also needed to remain aware of the iterative nature of discussions and the possibility of interviews becoming uncomfortable quickly and unexpectedly. To address this, the empirical study adopted principles proposed by Renold et al.

(2008) who speak of individuals *becoming participant as* studies progress. It has been contended (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004) that consent may be something never fully achieved or realised, therefore alongside the formalities of acquiring written informed (parental) consent for the empirical study, participant consent was conceptualised as a fluid process. Taking such a position required on-going critical awareness of each young person's presentation throughout interviews to attempt to gain what I would describe as rolling consent. Participants were given the option to remove all consent and completely opt out of the study at any point, and were regularly reminded that they could speak as little or as much as they wished. A 'pass' option was also explained to participants so that they could avoid any uncomfortable questions. Whether pupils felt empowered enough to use such an option may be questioned, therefore close attention was paid to their physical presentation before, during and after interviews to monitor for signs of discomfort or distress (Kortesluoma, Hentinen, & Nikkonen, 2003).

It may be naïve to think that the power which comes with a researcher role can be fully neutralised (Greene & Hogan, 2005). Adults typically have authority over children and therefore participants in the study may have found it hard to voice opinions which they may perceive as wrong or unacceptable. This may be a particular issue interviewing children attending an SEBD school who may have learned that who they are and therefore what they think, is in some way different, and so strive to find the socially acceptable answers which they believe researchers wish to hear. Alternatively, the opposite may occur if young

people are not sufficiently engaged, with the potential for resistance or even sabotage of the interview (McLeod, 2007).

It is also important to consider the possibility of 'performativity' within the views gathered for the study. Performativity is the possibility that responses given were done so to promote or protect a particular image or agenda. Participants may have been motivated to provide responses which project an image congruent with how they wish to be perceived, such as streetwise or tough. Some studies (Anderson & Zuiker, 2010; Skattebol, 2006) have commented on the importance of demonstrating affiliation to the in-group as a protective factor for self-image. To not conform to this view may risk leaving the individual in a state of limbo in terms of their identity, as they then do not 'fit' into either a mainstream or alternative environment, which may prove damaging to their self-image. Whilst I have no reason to suspect that this was the case, it is important to acknowledge this possibility.

Complications such as these may be hard to circumvent, but be reduced through the empowerment of participants. Christensen & James (2008) emphasise the value of familiarity with 'local cultural practices of communication' (p.7) to help reduce power differentials. I believe that working in Riverdale School prior to the study in my capacity as a trainee educational psychologist (not directly with any of the participants), allowed me to establish rapport with participants, as shared points of reference helped facilitate discussion and may have helped put pupils at ease during conversation. I also believe that my 6 years of familiarity with the culture of SEBD provisions

assisted me in adopting the least adult role (Christensen, 2004) during interviews.

Greene and Hogan (2005) also remind us that we can help address the adult-child power differential, by thinking of other ways of relinquishing power in the research process. Hill (2006) promotes the value of involving participants when choosing methods. Having this choice may influence commitment to the study and the subsequent representativeness of the data. With this in mind, several participatory methods were explored prior to the main study, with the assistance of a university researcher. Such approaches included: diamond ranking activities, life grids, use of photography and the use of drawing. Participants were given the opportunity to choose from these methodological options; something rarely considered in research with young people (Hill, 2006). However students requested to simply 'chat'.

These choices may have been influenced by pupils not wishing to appear overly compliant in front of their peers for fear of ridicule; or alternatively a willingness to dissent, which may indicate (desired) pupil agency in the research process.

A final ethical consideration regarding pupil participation is issues of anonymity. Although individual responses are protected, Riverdale is the only SEBD School within the Local Authority who commissioned the research. This is recognised as potentially problematic as the views of pupils may be traced back to Riverdale School.

2.7 Reflexivity

Throughout my research I have remained responsive to emerging changes in my epistemological viewpoint and attentive to ethical considerations, each of which transformed the aims of my research. This repositioning is most evident in my decision to use qualitative methods in my empirical research, even though my systematic review employed a qualitative approach. At a more personal level these changes have instigated significant change in how I view the naming and measurement of psychological constructs.

Assisting children who display Social, Emotional and Behavioural difficulties is a long held interest which pre-dates my training as an educational psychologist. Reflecting on my experiences and own biography throughout the study was essential. This helped me appreciate the events and motivations which led me to choose this area of research and to remain attentive to potential bias during interviews and when interpreting data.

It is also important to reflect on how the design of the study might have inadvertently limited or constructed the data and the analysis (Willig, 2008). Methodological decisions in particular, which were taken with ethics and the goals of the study foremost in my mind, required some personal compromise, such as the decision to use semi structured interviews.

My own position is that participatory methods may better address issues of power within a study; however the young people opted not to use them, which perhaps ironically afforded them more power in the process. Similarly, Gallacher and Gallagher (2008) make an interesting point in suggesting

empowerment may be undermined by adult-designed participatory methods, and in some ways risk maintaining the power differential that they are designed to overcome.

In deciding how to represent views within the study, I reflected on the status of these young people in the local authority and the purpose of the research. I attempted to address concerns that individual perspectives may remain unheard, by reporting these through seemingly common experiences (themes) which may provide needed amplification to make these voices heard.

My part in interpreting what is deemed worthy of amplification is acknowledged, and although the relevance of themes was agreed by the young people during post-interview discussions, this is not to assume absolute homogeneity across the perspectives of all participants, or presumed to signify direct causality between school experiences and how participants view themselves or their future. Both themes and potential implications are offered tentatively to support local education providers in critical reflection

Undertaking my research has brought about a change in how I view the treatment of pupils labelled as having SEBD. My interest at the beginning of my research journey focused upon how we can 'treat' young people, hence a systematic review of the efficacy of CDSME intervention programmes. However, it may be argued that a potential problem with such interventions is that the onus for change is placed on the young people themselves. This may promote a within child model of deficit and lessen the likelihood of systemic review within school settings.

Whilst other important influences (e.g. family background, socioeconomic status) are acknowledged, discussion with Riverdale pupils has demonstrated to me the crucial role of school setting upon pupils' perceptions of self and their possible occupational futures. These findings suggest to me that future research may consider the potential latent effects of SEBD School upon many areas of pupils' lives, which may not initially have been considered. Such studies may give helpful insight to preventative measures which may be taken to addressing these problems, rather than attempting intervention at a later date.

2.8 Concluding comments

This chapter has attempted to explain the justification for the empirical research and the conceptual link between this and the systematic review of the literature. Methodological considerations in the design have been explained, and problematized with particular attention given to issues of ethics. Personal and epistemological reflexivity has been employed to explore how the research has impacted on me and how my interpretation of voice influences the research.

My research experience has emphasised to me the difficulties of balancing ethical and methodological considerations in attempting to voice the perspectives of vulnerable young people. Some compromises are acknowledged, however I would argue these decisions were taken ultimately for the benefits of young people involved

Chapter 3: How do pupils attending a school for SEBD perceive their Current Selves and Possible Occupational Selves?

Abstract

Many contended implications of attending a school for Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD) can be found within the SEBD literature. However, where research in this area has considered student experience, it has tended to consider the views of previous students, rather than current attendees of such schools.

Using semi-structured interviews, this study attempted to explore the perspectives of six students of Riverdale SEBD School (pseudonym) aged 13-15, regarding perceptions of their current selves and their possible occupational selves. Thematic Analysis was used to analyse and then interpret these findings.

Themes interpreted as relevant to the young people included the types of occupation which they perceive as expected and those unrealistic/impossible. Themes relating to how current selves are perceived included, behavioural perceptions, academic perceptions, perceptions of character, normality, and how pupils feel they are perceived by others.

Interpretations of findings, in light of reviewed psychological literature, suggest that Riverdale school experiences may have a role in pupil perceptions of themselves and their future occupational options.

Potential implications for Riverdale School are suggested, regarding the type of social and curricular experiences which students might access in order to widen their occupational expectations. Pupil perceptions also raise implications for the local authority regarding the potential wider social effects of SEBD school placement upon self-image. Methodological and ethical complications of exploring pupil perspectives are also considered.

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 'Social Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties'

Since the late 1970's, the term 'Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties' (SEBD) has been used within education, to encompass a range of behaviours which may make school life additionally challenging for some pupils (Goodman & Burton, 2010). Amongst a range of definitions in the literature, the Special Educational Needs Code of Practice (Department for Education and Skills, 2001) suggests pupils displaying SEBD may often be '...*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).

SEBD may therefore be considered as something of an umbrella term (The Social Emotional and Behavioural Difficuties Association, 2006) used to conceptualise a 'loose collection of characteristics' (Cooper, 1999,p.3). Consistent with a critical realist epistemological standpoint, I suggest individual dispositions may contribute to SEBD, but that these difficulties may be differently understood dependant on the expectations of the socio-cultural environment (Bennett, 2005; Department for Education, 2012a).

3.1.2 SEBD Schools

Behaviours sometimes associated with SEBD, are reported to often conflict with mainstream school expectations (Goodman & Burton, 2010), presenting potential challenges for pupils (Cooper & Jacobs, 2011), their teachers (Hastings & Oakford, 2003; Sharma, Forlin, & Loreman, 2008) and policymakers (Department for Education, 2012a; Ofsted, 2011).

Whilst inclusive educational policy has prevailed in the UK over much of the past 30 years (Goodman & Burton, 2010), many students (13,245 in 2012) displaying SEBD remain educated in SEBD schools. These environments have been suggested to better meet the needs of these pupils, through the provision of a more widely differentiated curriculum (de Jong & Griffiths, 2006) and specialist teaching support (Spiteri, 2009; Westwood & Graham, 2003).

However many negative social implications of SEBD school attendance are also considered within the literature. For example, several studies (Norwich, 2008; Polat & Farrell, 2002; Spiteri, 2009) suggest attending SEBD involves labelling and segregation from mainstream peers, both educationally and socially. This has been suggested (Spiteri, 2009) to contribute to the development of alternative identities, constructed via opposites such as us and them, or the included and excluded (Woodward, 1997). It may be argued that attending SEBD school could potentially lead to pupils perceiving themselves, or becoming perceived, as different (Woodward, 1997) not only in location, but also in what can/can't be achieved for their group (Michael & Frederickson, 2013).

3.1.3 SEBD and Social Identity

Feeling different, in terms of behaviour or ability has been argued to contribute to oppositional or deviant (Bennett, 2005) identities, which may deride academic effort (Cooper, 1999). Therefore, characteristics not dependent on academic endeavour, such as physical strength or masculinity (Jackson, 2002), become of greater value to pupils, as they feel more able to compete on these measures.

Using desirable characteristics to differentiate one group from another is a well-established feature of social identity development (Buunk & Gibbons, 2007; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Such theorists argue that individuals demonstrate affiliation with an in-group by displaying associated behaviour and will belittle the qualities of the out-group, ultimately as a means of self-esteem enhancement.

However, some studies of pupil transition from SEBD provision into post-school life (Bradley, Doolittle, & Bartolotta, 2008; Casey, Davies, Kalambouka, Nelson, & Boyle, 2006) suggest that pupils may find it difficult to reinvent their identities and leave school without the knowledge or skills to make the transition to training or employment. Therefore, although affiliation with an oppositional cultural and behavioural norm in SEBD School may secure temporary group membership, it may also conflict with wider societal expectations upon leaving school. Such effects may play a part in the reported increased risk of pupils displaying SEBD not accessing education, employment or training (Mainwaring & Hallam, 2010; Woolford, 2012), or their continued involvement in anti-social behaviour (DfE,2012).

64

3.1.4 Pupil Identity and Possible Selves

It is suggested (Dunkel & Kerpelman, 2006; Markus & Nurius, 1986) that young people mentally formulate what they hope to achieve, what they expect to achieve, and what they want to avoid. Markus and Nurius (1986) contend that this process involves forming possible selves defined as …'*self-knowledge that pertains to how individuals think about their potential and about their future'* (p954).

Developing positive possible selves has been argued (Dunkel & Kerpelman, 2006) to help young people identify and work towards goals in both academic and career domains. However little appears to be known of this development in SEBD schools. Several studies (Oyserman, Bybee, & Terry, 2006; Oyserman & Fryberg, 2006; Strahan & Wilson, 2006) suggest young people generate possible selves through comparison with significant others and by internalising stereotypes and norms relating to important social identities. Possible selves may therefore be unlikely to be held, or actively avoided if viewed negatively by significant others, as attaining them may lead to disappointment, derision or exclusion from their group (Oyserman & Fryberg, 2006).

Many studies (Abrams & Hogg, 1990; Gottfredson, 2002; Lent & Brown, 1996) also propose that young people identify possible careers by assessing their compatibility with valued current social identities. For example, Gottfredson's career model of compromise (realisation of what will be possible) and circumscription(eliminating the least favoured options previously entertained) contends that adolescents gradually reject possible occupations perceived as incompatible with their social identity.

Similarly, Lent and Brown (1996) suggest enduring career interests may form from anticipating that they will produce valued social outcomes. Expecting negative outcomes may instead result in young people developing aversions to particular career options or activities. For example, a student may hold an aspiration to be a florist, but reject this option because of a perceived association between flowers and femininity, an attribute which they may wish to avoid if masculinity is valued amongst peers.

Oyserman and Fryberg (2006) also suggest that possible occupational selves may be influenced by perceptions of what might be attained by a particular social group. Therefore, attending SEBD school, often associated with less positive social (Bennett, 2005; Farrell & Polat, 2003) and academic outcomes (Department for Education, 2013; Ofsted, 2011), could have bearing on occupational selection. However, Burkitt (2008) reminds us that social and occupational norms may differ depending upon group expectations; therefore the degree to which these outcomes are regarded as positive or negative may be somewhat subjective.

3.1.5 SEBD School and Pupil Views

With SEBD now the UK's most common special educational need (Department for Education, 2012b), it is perhaps surprising that studies of SEBD school experiences are few. Moreover, the views of students displaying SEBD are argued to be amongst the least explored in research, with adult/professional discourses still dominating (Lloyd & O'Regan, 2000; Thomas, 2007).

Lewis and Burman (2008) suggest some teachers of pupils displaying SEBD may resist pupil voice initiatives as they are uncomfortable about conceding power or control to pupils. It has also been suggested that these students' views may be perceived as unacceptable and so they are simply ignored or silenced (Cruddas, 2007). This may be a missed opportunity, as many studies argue the significance of the views of pupils displaying SEBD, arguing that they can provide important messages about what makes a relevant curriculum and an effective learning environment (Cefai & Cooper, 2010; MacBeath et al., 2003; O'Connor, Hodkinson, Burton, & Torstensson, 2011; Sellman, 2009).

However, Lundy and McEvoy (2012) remind us of the dangers of limiting pupil views to curricular issues and of the risk of students becoming objects of an adult led research agenda. They question the extent to which pupil views are genuinely sought in educational settings and argue that much research only seeks views on topics which are non-negotiable and safe, in that they don't challenge the world view of the adults.

There would appear no existing research which utilises a prospective approach to researching SEBD pupils' views of their occupational futures. I propose prospective exploration of young peoples' perceived occupational options may give opportunity to schools to act upon these views (Hill, 2006), rather than retrospective study of past students.

This study therefore sought to explore the perspectives of a group of students currently attending specialist SEBD School, regarding themselves and their future occupational options.

3.2 Design

Riverdale is a school for pupils displaying Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties in the North East of England; educating children aged 7-16. As a trainee educational psychologist, working within Riverdale School, I carried out a piece of practitioner research (Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2007) within this setting.

Described as 'critical social enquiry' (p.200), this approach is useful for focusing on local issues. I selected this approach as it can be used to explore how issues are understood, interpreted and located in wider social discourse. It is also an approach which foregrounds ethical considerations, as an indicator of research quality (Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2007). Two guiding research questions were considered:

RQ1. - How do pupils attending Riverdale School perceive their current selves and those of pupils attending mainstream school?

RQ2. – How do pupils attending Riverdale School perceive their possible occupational selves?

3.2.1 Participants

All six participants were white males and aged between 13 and 15 years old, and were recruited from an opportunity sample. Each pupil had attended Riverdale School for at least 2 years, and had attended a mainstream school prior to this. All pupils attending Riverdale have a Statement of Special Educational Needs identifying behavioural difficulties as their primary need.

68

Pseudonyms are used throughout the study to protect the identity of the school and its pupils.

3.2.2 Method

Following approval for the study from my university ethics committee, consultation was held with the Deputy Head Teacher of Riverdale School to explain the nature and purpose of the research. Letters were subsequently sent to parents of all pupils, to explain the study and formally asking for active (see Coyne, 2010) consent for their child's participation (see Appendices A and E, pg.119 & 131).

Eight formal consent forms were returned which formed the initial sample for the study. However, it is important to emphasise that consent was regarded as an ongoing process throughout the study (see page 53). Of these eight pupils, one decided not to take part and one was absent on both days when the study was conducted, leaving six participants.

A month prior to the main study, a visit was organised to Riverdale School to explain the research to participants. Discussions were held at this time with school staff to consider any emotional or behavioural reasons why any pupils should not partake. Some minor concerns were noted and considered at this time regarding the potential duration of the interview process.

A number of participatory and traditional methods of obtaining views were presented to pupils during this visit. These included diamond ranking, life grids, drawing, questionnaires, focus group discussion and interviews.

However no definitive majority preference emerged. Consensus was reached between pupils that they would like to 'just have a chat'; however it is acknowledged that some pupils may have felt peer pressure to conform to this option.

No clear preference was voiced for either individual interviews or focus group discussion. I selected individual interviews , due to concerns that focus groups may be dominated by more vociferous members, or be a difficult forum for reluctant speakers (Bryman, 2008). Furthermore, Cooper and Shea (1998) suggest that pupils in SEBD provision easily reproduce the dominant cultural voice, for fear of peer rejection. Group discussions were therefore rejected due to the potential for biased accounts of school experiences. Other limitations and advantages of focus groups are identified by (Robson, 2002,p284)

The methodology employed in a study should also be appropriate for the aims and informed by a researcher's epistemological position(Robson, 2002; Willig, 2008) . The empirical study employed the principles of emotionalist semi-structured interviewing (Silverman, 2011). By using this approach, insight to pupils' experiences is attempted by developing an atmosphere conducive to open and truthful communication, during which rapport is developed and manipulation of participants avoided. Whether this is achieved may depend on a researcher's critical awareness of potential methodological and ethical barriers (see 'Ethics', p52). Ethical concerns regarding verbal competence prompted the use of semi- structured interviews, which may be more comfortable for less articulate young people and support their competence (Louise Barriball & While, 1994).

Whilst embracing the principles of emotionalist interviewing, it remained important to create an atmosphere conducive to authentic discussion, balanced with a critical awareness of the ethical implications of pertaining to being a friend (Kvale, 2005). This was attempted by adopting a sensitive, empathetic approach to questioning, combined with complete transparency as to the purpose of the interviews. I did not wish pupils to be coerced into sharing information which they may otherwise have not shared. I suggest that a commitment to ethical practice with young people may require acknowledgment of inevitability in adult-child power relations (Christensen, 2004; McLeod, 2007) and an acceptance that young people's accounts should remain partial depending on what they wish to share. Such considerations required awareness of the nature and frequency of 'probes'- inquisitive comments used during interviews to elicit further information, beyond that initially offered by a participant.

Other limitations of individual interviews e.g. limited language skills; shyness and pressure for socially acceptable answers are also recognised (Robson, 2002; Willig, 2008). However I felt the potential confounding effects of focus groups outweighed the limitations of individual interviews. Semi-structured interviewing has also been used in past studies to explore the views of students described as displaying SEBD (Cefai & Cooper, 2010; Mainwaring & Hallam, 2010).

Interviews took place in a quiet room on two separate days to fit with school timetabling constraints. Only the researcher and interviewee were present.

Time was spent at the beginning of each interview reminding each participant of the nature of the study and of their rights as participants. Interviews lasted between 15 and 25 minutes. Paper and pens were provided as a conversation stimulus and to attempt to reduce suggested pressures induced by one to one dialogue and by the expectation of sustained eye contact (Stalker, 1998).

Each interview commenced with informal discussion, before open semi-structured questions (see Appendix G, pg 134) such as '*Can you tell me a bit about the students in your last school*?' were used to guide discussion regarding students' perceptions of themselves and with mainstream peers, and how they perceived their possible occupational options. Questions were rephrased if responses suggested that they were not understood. Participant welfare was paramount at all times. Students were given frequent reminders that questions could be passed and close observation of pupils' physical appearance for emotional discomfort was monitored (Robson, 2002; Seidman, 2012). Pupil perceptions of mainstream peers' possible occupational selves were not explored for fear of eliciting feelings of despondency should students consider their occupational options to be limited in comparison.

Following each interview each pupil shared that they had enjoyed the experience, however it is recognised that these positive accounts may have been influenced by an uneven power differential. Students were reminded of the option to withdraw data and given confectionary to thank them for participating. Over the following 6 weeks, interviews were transcribed verbatim and analysed.

In line with data protection protocols all recorded interviews and transcriptions were stored in a locked cabinet and are to be destroyed 6 months after the completion of the study.

3.3 Data Analysis

Transcribed interviews were analysed using Inductive Thematic Analysis (TA) and patterns of meaning, or themes, were interpreted from the data-set. This form of analysis is consistent with my epistemological stance in allowing for the imposition of direction, characteristic of more essentialist approaches (Braun & Clarke, 2006), whilst still acknowledging the role of interpretation in the generation of data. Miles and Huberman (1994) contend that data comparison across cases can help answer reasonable questions that make sense beyond the specific case. Equally however, concerns with comparing cases (Khan & VanWynsberghe, 2008) are that they may risk losing some contextual detail from interviews. This is countered by an argument (Ayres, Kavanaugh, & Knafl, 2003) that some loss of context is inevitable when reporting themes across cases and that this may be accepted dependant on the purpose of comparing accounts.

Procedures for analysis (see Table 8) were followed in accordance with the guidelines outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006) who argue that Thematic Analysis allows for a flexible approach, tailored to the researcher's specific epistemological position and theoretical frameworks.

1. Familiarisation with the data: Transcribing data, reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas.

2. Generating initial codes: Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code. (see Appendix C)

3. Searching for themes: Collating codes into basic themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme.

4. Reviewing themes: Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts and the entire data set.

5. Defining and naming organising themes: collection of basic themes into organising themes. On-going analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each organising theme.

6. Producing the report: 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.

Table 8: Stages of the Thematic Analysis process (adapted from Braun & Clarke, 2006)

I chose to use inductive analysis in keeping with a desire to explore the views of pupils. However it is accepted that authentic voice is likely to remain elusive, due to the process of interpreting pupils' interpretations (see page 52).

I did not wish to pursue a deductive line of investigation and fit data into pre-determined categories, however having guiding research questions inevitably introduces a research direction. Given the vulnerable nature and limited verbal confidence of some students, more verbal prompts were also necessary than was originally planned.

Data extracts which related to how the young people perceived their current selves in comparison with mainstream peers, and their future occupational

selves were first coded (see Appendix B, pg.120). Some codes were included in more than one basic theme if appropriate. The analysis involved a lengthy iterative process, which required much reorganisation of initial codes and renaming of basic and organising themes, while checking back with transcripts (see Appendix C, pg. 127). The analysis was semantic, recommended (Braun & Clarke, 2006) when initially exploring an under researched area, and cross-case. However, consistent with my critical realist position, I identified themes based on my interpretations of pupil's accounts.

Approximately two months after interviews, identified themes were discussed with students. This process was not for validation, as finding are my interpretation of pupil accounts, however I wished to discuss the findings with students in the interest of transparency (Arruda, 2003).

3.4 Findings and Discussion

3.4.1 RQ1 How do pupils attending Riverdale School perceive their current selves and those of mainstream peers?

Whilst discussing perceptions of themselves and peers, five global themes were interpreted from discussion with students. These were: Behavioural Perceptions, Academic Perceptions, Perceptions of Character, Perceptions of others and Perceptions of Normality. Each is discussed in turn.

	Global Themes	Organising themes	Example quotes
RQ1. How do pupils attending Riverdale school perceive their current selves and those of mainstream peers?	Behavioural Perceptions	• Behavioural Expectations, • Behaviour serves a purpose, • Behaviour is 'who they are', • Attitude to Behaviour • Comparison with mainstream.	*That's what's expected from kids here; that's why I'm here though coz I mess on* *It's a laugh, stops me getting bored* *It's just who I am, that just what I'm like* *Doesn't bother me really; it's not that bad; it's no big deal* *'They never do owt wrong, proper soft lads, they (mainstream pupils) wouldn't last two minutes*
	Academic Perceptions	• Academic Capability • Less Academic Effort , • Choice rather than ability	*I'm just as clever as other kids; the work is easy* *I can't be arsed; some lads just mess on* *There's bright lads here though; most just can't be bothered; I can do it if I want*
	Perceptions of Character	• Streetwise • Friendly • Masculinity	*They (mainstream pupils) wouldn't know how to go on in here; you've got to be able to stand up for yourself* *The kids here are sound; aye a proper laugh; he's a good lad* *They're proper soft lads; cry-babies; there are some hard kids here like*
	Perceptions of Others	• Negative perceptions of others • Nuisance • Favouritism	*They (teachers) think wa idiots though; they don't care anyway* *He was pleased to see me go; I'm not causing grief any more* *I'd get wrong but they wouldn't; it was always me*
	Perceptions of Normality		*That's not normal man; that's normal in here though isn't it*

Table 9: Global themes, organising themes and examples generated from transcript analysis.

3.4.1.1 Global Theme: Behavioural Perceptions

Each pupil spoke at least once about their behaviour when describing themselves and their peers (see Table 10). John, Michael, Paul and Billy gave examples of acting inappropriately in Riverdale; however a somewhat indifferent/relaxed attitude suggested that this may not concern them. I interpreted these accounts to suggest that these students may perceive lowered behavioural expectations in Riverdale and that although not necessarily condoning the behaviour, for them, this behaviour is almost expected within the context of Riverdale School.

CH: Do you think it's ok to mess on?
John: Well nah not really like, but it's no big deal in here is it
CH: Why do you think that might be?
John: Coz it's a laugh, everyone does, its nowt really

(Transcript 1: L32-35)

Michael: well I'm not usually like a trouble maker , you know
CH: Ok
Michael: but I can get a bit stupid sometimes n'that
CH: Ah I see, what do you mean 'a bit stupid'?
Michael: like messing on, you can get away with it in this school, not loads like but you don't get hassled for little stuff.
(Transcript 3: L143-148)

Stuart: People just go on like that in here though, it's just how it is
(Transcript 2: L111)

Table 10: Example transcript extracts- Behavioural perceptions

However, some pupils made reference to perceiving it hard to control their behaviour, which I interpreted to suggest some perceptions of inherent behavioural difficulties, rather than contextual influence (see Table 11).

> Stuart: 'Aye, I was like this in [previous school] as well, it's just how I am really'.
> (Transcript 2: L188-193)
>
> Steven: 'Oh I know I can be a proper radjee at times, I just can't help it'
> (Transcript 5 : L72)

Table 11: Example Transcript Extracts, Behavioural Perceptions

All but one pupil (Stuart) perceived the behaviour of mainstream peers as similar, or worse, than their own.

I interpreted this as possibly a desire for their behaviour to be considered no different from mainstream peers. These accounts may have been genuine perceptions of equality, or may suggest a desire to defend the status of their group (see Table 12).

> Steven: It's like, people expect that were all f**king nutters in here, but most of them [other pupils] are sound.
> CH: most of the lads seem sound to me… Which people?
> Steven: People that have never been here, so they wouldn't know would they… like they hear 'Riverdale' and shit themselves. Most of the time nowt ever happens… it just how the teachers treat you that's different.
> (Transcript 5: L203-214)
>
> CH: So how would you compare your behaviour with the lads in other schools?
> Paul: Well.. People think that they're all well behaved [mainstream], and we're not, but we are. Some of the lads in here never mess on at all.
> (Transcript 4: L174-181)

Table 12: Example transcript extracts- Behavioural Perceptions

However, despite contentions of no difference in behaviour between themselves and mainstream peers. I interpreted pupils' accounts as suggesting they were keen to find ways to derogate mainstream behaviour.

The reported good behaviour of mainstream peers appeared to be perceived negatively by some pupils, and an undesirable social quality in Riverdale, which perhaps contradicts a desire to be regarded as similar to them (see Table 13).

John: Like they never do anything wrong or get told off, proper soft lads
CH: How does that make you feel?
John: like... get a life (laughs)
(Transcript 1: L140-145)

Steven : They [mainstream pupils] probably wouldn't do owt, they're too scared
(Transcript 5: L97)

Stuart: Aye I used to know some proper swotty kids in my other school
CH: Swots?
Stuart: Aye, you know like never did owt wrong, proper swots
CH: Is that a bad thing
Stuart: (laughs), you'd get the piss seriously taken out of you in here if you went on like that
(Transcript 2: L131-137)

Table 13: Transcript Extract- Behavioural Perceptions

3.4.1.2 Global Theme: Academic Perceptions

Several comparisons were made by some pupils between their academic capability and that of mainstream peers. Both Stuart and John claimed that many mainstream peers were less academically competent than them, suggesting no sense of inferiority in this domain (see Table 14).

Stuart:: they think they're clever n'that [mainstream peers], some of them are like, but some of my mates [in Riverdale] are proper bright sparks as well, they just can't be arsed most of the time
(Transcript 2:L122-127)

John: '...If I didn't mess on id be fine, it's up to me really... I don't really need it [assistance] like, I know this sounds funny, but I reckon im probably cleverer than some of the kids at [name of previous school].
(Transcript 1: L51-60)

Table 14: Example Transcript Extract- Academic Perceptions

These accounts may be genuine perceptions, or interpreted as a desire to promote a positive self-image when comparing themselves with mainstream students. In this way, similar to perceptions of behaviour, this may suggest that pupils do not perceive being any less academically capable than their mainstream counterparts, with academic effort more an issue of choice, rather than ability. However these choices may also be interpreted as an excuse to not engage in academic tasks if fearing failure.

3.4.1.3 Global Theme: Perceptions of Character

Three pupils (Paul, Stuart, Billy,) made reference to mainstream peers as gay (T4:157) or using derogatory terms benders (T2:L66) or quinceys (T6:L59). When explored further, the boys explained that they perceived these as negative qualities and appeared to differentiate between the two groups based on perceptions of masculinity. Reference was also made to mainstream peers being soft (T1:L143), cry-babies (T3:L72) and goodie goodies (T1: L141).

I interpreted these accounts to suggest that although pupils did not wish to be differentiated from mainstream peers on measures of wider social value such as achievement or behaviour; they still wished to maintain some of the stereotypical characteristics of their group, such as masculinity and toughness (see Table 15). It may be that perceptions of superiority to mainstream peers in domains which are often of social value to young men (Jackson, 2003), is of value to some pupils, perhaps allowing feelings of superiority to mainstream peers.

> *Steven: they [mainstream peers] wouldn't have a clue how to go on in here, they wouldn't last five minutes'*
>
> *CH: How do you mean 'last five minutes'?*
>
> *Steven: Coz they'd get battered*
>
> *CH: Really, would they? Why is that?*
>
> *Steven: Coz they're soft as…Well maybe not battered, but they couldn't cope with the grief*
>
> *(Transcript 5: L80-94)*

Table 15: Example Transcript Extract – Perceptions of Character

However, Paul, Stuart, Michael and Billy also spoke of sharing similar characteristics to friends in mainstream school and spoke of them in positive terms (see Table 16). This may be regarded as slightly contradictory, and may suggest that some attitudes to mainstream peers are not directed at any particular individual, but instead an attempt to generally derogate mainstream attendance compared to Riverdale, perhaps due to feelings of rejection from these provisions.

> *Paul: wey [name of pupil] wants to come here, coz he hates [name of school]*
>
> *CH: Do you think he'd do ok here*
>
> *Paul: oh aye he's sound as, so are [names two pupils]*
>
> *CH: So when you said that [mainstream school] pupils were 'gay' you…*
>
> *Paul: (interrupts) (laughs) nah, nah not them, just some of the kids.*
>
> *(Transcript 4: L151-159)*
>
> *Michael: Some of the lads are alright like, like [name of pupil] he's a good lad, proper laugh.*
> *(Transcript 3: L123)*
>
> *Billy: Aye I've got mates in [mainstream school] who says he's coming here*
>
> *CH: what do you thing about that then*
>
> *Billy: Cush, he's just like me, like f**ks on, sorry messes on, but works as well. he doesn't like the teachers at [name of school]*
> *(Transcript 6: L102-106)*

Table 16: Example Transcript Extract – Perceptions of Character

3.4.1.4 Global Theme: Perceptions of others

The way in which some pupils feel they are perceived by mainstream peers and staff, was referred to several times during discussions. These perceptions were interpreted to be largely negative (see Table 17).

Comments such as these portrayed a sense that pupils may perceive negative regard from mainstream peers. However, none of the boys gave specific examples to support these views, and referred to what others probably thought. These views were interpreted as perceptions of being unwelcome in a mainstream environment and therefore may be argued to potentially strengthen affinity with Riverdale.

Billy: …not everyone, just the snobby kids, like when they know you come here they probably reckon you're a freak or something, it's no different though.
(Transcript 6: L71-77)

Michael: … the teachers [mainstream teachers] will be well pleased im here
CH: why do you think that?
Michael: coz im not causing them bother (nervous laugh).
(Transcript 3:L103- 119)

Steven: they [mainstream peers] think wa idiots'
(Transcript 5: L131-134)

Table 17: Transcript Extract, Perceptions of others

3.4.1.5 Global Theme: Perceptions of 'Normality'

What is regarded as normal to students was interpreted as important when discussing themselves and mainstream peers. Some comments suggested a difference in what pupils perceive as normal behaviour, but also difference in what is regarded as normal in terms of expectations between Riverdale School and mainstream school (see Table 18).

> *Stuart: I'd get a proper bollocking for that [answering back] in my last school,*
>
> *CH: Does that not happen here*
>
> *Stuart: Well its normal in here isn't it, it's just the usual stuff, the teachers here nah that's what im like.*
>
> *(Transcript 2, L143-147)*

Table 18: Transcript Extract, Perceptions of normality

Accounts such as these may suggest that students perhaps view who they are as congruent with the norms of Riverdale School, as any difficulties which they may experience are accepted in this environment, as evident in their views of what constitutes 'normal' behaviour in Riverdale. Seeing mainstream pupils 'fitting in' with the norms of mainstream school, something which they had found difficult themselves, may therefore serve to reinforce perceptions of difference between the two groups.

3.4.2 RQ1 Discussion

Pupil perceptions of themselves and those of mainstream peers were interpreted as suggesting a desire to protect their identity as Riverdale students. Evidence for this proposal is suggested through perceptions of equality on behavioural and academic attributes, but attempts to maintain group differences on attributes of apparent social value to Riverdale pupils, such as masculinity. Examples of this are suggested through contradictory accounts of similarity with mainstream peers on academic and behavioural measures, whilst also seemingly mocking the academic effort and behaviours of these peers. It may be therefore, that pupils wished to not be regarded as inferior to mainstream students, but may change how they value particular characteristics to maintain the status of their group.

However, pupils' accounts of their attributes and those of mainstream peers were interpreted as dependent on an image which they wished to portray, and therefore findings must be interpreted with caution.

Pupil perceptions of how they are viewed by mainstream peers may also influence how they view these students. Burkitt (2008) suggests that the image we perceive others have of us may elicit feelings of embarrassment. Riverdale pupils' derogation of mainstream peers may be regarded as an attempt to overcome such feelings. Differences between themselves and mainstream students tended to centre on social issues such as personality characteristics, sexuality and toughness.

Some research (Jackson, 2002, 2003) has suggested that the adoption of a laddish identity often seen in young men defined as having SEBD, to be a protective strategy against a fear of academic inferiority. Boys instead turn to becoming competitive with regard to physical strength and sexual prowess as indicators of their self-worth as a man.

Whilst such considerations may initially seem unrelated to occupational decision making, public presentations of masculinity/femininity have been suggested as important factors in adolescent career identification (Gottfredson, 2002), and future occupations which conflict with core elements of the self-concept may lead to their rejection.

The potential for both socially desirable answers and simple denial within student accounts is acknowledged. However, within student perceptions of their social identities, a general desire to protect their status as Riverdale

students was interpreted, as consistent with proposals of social identity development.

3.4.3 RQ2 How do pupils attending Riverdale School perceive their possible occupational selves?

Two global themes were generated from discussion with students regarding perceptions of Possible Occupational Selves: Expected Occupational Selves, and Unrealistic/Impossible Occupational selves (see Table 19). Each of these will be discussed in turn

	Global Themes	Organising themes	Example quotes
RQ2. How do pupils attending Riverdale school perceive their possible occupational selves?	Expected Occupational Selves	• Possible occupation identification • Unemployment • Further education, • Limited realistic alternatives • Occupational influences	*I'm gonna work here; Maybe the army; like painting and decorating* *I'll be on the dole, there's nee jobs these days* *Perhaps college or something; I had thought of stopping on* *Maybe a pilot…I don't think so; I can't think of owt;* *They teach stuff here that you can do; my dad's a joiner;*
	Unrealistic/ Impossible Occupational Selves	• Perceptions of self • Uncertainty of occupational requirements • Impossible occupations • Aspirational selves	*Kids who come here don't become bankers; we're more likely to become mechanics or something* *I haven't got a clue; you probably need loads of A levels and that;* *you reckon id be a head teacher (laughs), a footballer but that's not gonna happen, kids who come here don't become bankers* *a manager or something would be mint;*

Table 19: Global themes, organising themes and examples generated from transcript analysis

3.4.3.1 Global Theme: Expected Occupational Selves

During interviews each pupil shared their perceptions of post-school occupations, and spoke positively about attaining these goals. Interestingly, four pupils spoke of careers involving working with vulnerable young people (see Table 20).

Billy: '...im going to work here, im gonna get what qualifications I need and that, then work here'   CH: Really, that's interesting   Billy: Yeah, I reckon it would be good working here, and I already know the place so that's good   (Transcript 6: L93-99).   John: Aye M.C'ing and spray painting, I reckon that would be a cush job actually with kids and that, showing them how to do it ...I've been doing that with the YOT [Youth Offending Team] people'.   (Transcript 1: 64 -67)

Table 20: Example transcript extracts- expected occupational selves

The fact that four students spoke about working with vulnerable young people could be interpreted in different ways; possible affinity with young people displaying SEBD (see Table 21).

Steven: Well yeah coz I've had like experience, so I know what other kids would feel like, coz I know what it's like, so I think I'll be quite good at it   (Transcript 5 L183-185)

Table 21: Transcript Extract, Expected Occupational Selves

Alternatively, this could also be interpreted as suggesting that some pupils find it difficult generating alternative possible selves other than those based on Riverdale experiences.

When asked how they had become interested in particular occupations, some pupils spoke of parental occupations. Several accounts were also given in which Riverdale experiences had appeared to be influential (see Table 22).

CH: what got you interested in that then Steven?

Steven: ... I quite enjoy wood tech; my dad's a joiner as well, so I'll probably do that'

(Transcript 5: L183-186)

CH: so how did you become interested in painting?

Paul: the lessons here teach you stuff that's useful, for jobs n'that'

(Transcript 4: L151-154)

Table 22: Example transcript extracts - expected possible selves.

However when pupils were asked to think of alternative possible occupations, many appeared had difficulty generating realistic alternatives (see Table 23).

John: ...maybe a footballer but that's not gonna happen.

CH: why's that,

John: (laughs) haway man get real

(Transcript 1: L89- 92)

CH: what If you could be anything you wanted?

Michael: I canitt think really, a pilot would be cool though ay?

CH: Sounds good

Michael: Aye right O' (sarcastic tone)

(Transcript 3:L147-153)

Billy: dunno, there's not much out there for us lot is there

(Transcript 6 :103-107)

Table 23: Example transcript extracts- expected possible selves

These views were interpreted to suggest that pupils perceived that certain types of employment were unobtainable, possibly influenced by who they perceive themselves to be.

Both Michael and John also spoke of the possibility of unemployment when leaving school, or a general lack of available jobs (see Table 24). These perceptions may also be regarded as potentially restricting the occupational options which pupils perceive are available to them.

Michael: Aye that's it... like even clever kids can end up without jobs these days
CH: hmm, does that change what you might do?
Michael: (laughs) aye I'll probably end up on the dole
(Transcript 3: L121-131)

John: there'll be nee jobs anyway when we're done in school
CH: What makes you think that John?
John: everyone knows there's nee jobs these days
(Transcript 1: 92-94)

Table 24: Example transcript extracts - expected possible selves

3.4.3.2 Global Theme: Unrealistic/Impossible Occupational Selves

When sharing their perceptions of possible occupations, several mediating factors were interpreted to may make particular occupational options seem less accessible to some pupils.

For example, Billy, Stuart and Michael all spoke of occupations which may require further education, but a lack of knowledge in how to achieve these goals was inferred from their accounts (see Table 25).

Steven: I have thought about gannin to college
CH: oh right, what would you do?
Steven: Dunno, like sports stuff maybe.
CH: excellent, do you know what you would need to get into college?
Steven: Haven't got a clue to be honest
(Transcript 5: L162-169)
Michael: …I don't even know what qualifications I'd need
CH: Im sure if you stick in you could do it, and some courses might not need exams you should check it out
Michael: Im not that fussed
(Transcript 3: L101-113)

Table 25: Transcript Extract: Unrealistic/Impossible Occupational Selves

John, Paul, Michael, and Stuart all made reference to occupations which were interpreted as being unobtainable for them (see Table 26). Although some occupations were interpreted as appealing to pupils, these accounts may suggest that some pupils have some pre-conceived limitations about possible occupations for their social group (Burkitt, 2008; Oyserman & Fryberg, 2006)

Paul: Err, I don't think I could be a business man, well I would like to be but it's not something that I could really do'
CH: Why is that like Paul?
Paul: its just not what we do
(Transcript 4:L127-131)
Stuart: …like a scientist or something, it's probably alright, but you've got to be proper clever
CH: Do you feel that's something you could do?
Stuart: Probably not
CH: What makes you feel like that?
Stuart: im not clever enough, I just don't think that's the type of job I could do.
(Transcript 2: L174-179)

Table 26: Example transcript extracts - Unrealistic/Impossible Occupational Selves

During interviews, ideal occupations or the characteristics of ideal occupations were raised several times. For instance, John, Paul and Michael spoke of the material rewards of jobs (see Table 27).

CH: So money is important?
John: Aye if you want to buy stuff
CH: …how are you going to you get rich then John?
John: Nee idea, i reckon ill have to rob a bank (laughs)
CH: Or by getting a good job. Which type of jobs do you think you get paid well?
John: oooh, err, like bankers they get paid stacks don't they, or like… a singer or celebrity… aye must be nice
(Transcript 1: L96-102)
Paul: id want a job where I drive round like in a BM all the time,
CH: like a salesman or something?
Paul: maybe I guess, so long as I get the car
CH: is that something you think you'll do?
Paul: Hmmm probably not
(Transcript 4: 161-165)

Table 27: Example transcript extracts- Unrealistic/Impossible Occupational Selves

Steven and Michael both made reference to occupations which were interpreted to be attractive to them as they afford a position of power (see Table 28). Many of these occupations were considered to be 'ideal' or aspirational; as when these lines of enquiry were explored in more detail, the boys generally appeared to feel that these occupations were not realistic options. I interpreted this to suggest that although students do have some awareness of other occupations; there are perhaps limitations on those they perceive as possible for them.

> *Michael: I'd love to be the head teacher like that would be mint.*
> *CH: right, what would be good about it?*
> *Michael: then I could boss people aboot*
> *CH: (laughs) im sure there's a bit more to it than that*
> *Michael: oh aye not really.. you reckon id be a head teacher (laughs)*
> *CH: If you wanted to be*
> *Michael: don't be silly man*
> *(Transcript 4: L162-170)*
>
> *Steven: I want a job where I can boss people aboot, like a manager that would be canny*
> *CH: why is that?*
> *Steven: so I could tell people what to do, well, more so I didn't have to do what they said*
> *(Transcript 6: L182-187)*

Table 28: Example transcript extracts- Unrealistic/Impossible Occupational Selves

3.4.4 RQ2 Discussion

During interviews, each pupil identified at least one future occupational self which they felt was possible for them, many of which were interpreted to be linked to their Riverdale experiences. The clearest example of this came through four pupils' desire to work either in Riverdale or with troubled young people. This might suggest the potential influence of Riverdale school experiences on pupil perceptions of possible occupational futures.

It may be reasonable to suggest that attending Riverdale could develop an affinity for the school, possibly through feelings of acceptance (as opposed to potential feelings of rejection from mainstream), reported positive relationships with staff, or through their social identity as a Riverdale pupil. Limitations upon possible occupational selves may therefore potentially develop, not necessarily because of *limited* exposure to positive role models or experiences (Oyserman

92

& Fryberg, 2006), but instead through an inclination to follow the guidance of staff whose opinions are trusted and valued.

These considerations may prove valuable to Riverdale staff when planning the curriculum/occupational guidance that pupil's access. A curriculum which directs pupils towards occupations which they perceive as more 'relevant' to them (Burton et al., 2009), or less academically challenging options designed help to ameliorate behavioural difficulties , may inadvertently contribute to the process of occupational circumscription (Gottfredson, 2002). Some support for this proposition comes from the fact that five of seven Riverdale school leavers in 2012 began apprenticeships for the same local construction firm. This may be indicative of the potential influence of school structure, but perhaps also of pupils own occupational expectations. Whilst several pupils were able to identify aspirational occupations, these were interpreted as being unrealistic or unobtainable to pupils. Reference made to occupations not being achievable for 'us', or 'kids here', may suggests a potential role for pupils' self-perceptions in occupations they perceive as possible.

It may also be that pupil perceptions of behaviour and their occupational aspirations are genuinely not perceived as a difficulty by pupils, perhaps evidenced by frequent reference to normality in discussions. What is and isn't considered to be normal behaviour to the boys, is proposed of particular importance within the context of the study. Comparisons between this understanding of normality and what Bourdieu (1977) refers to as 'habitus' are contended here, a notion originating from Aristotle's notion of *hexis* or 'state' (Malikail, 2003).

These ideas are further explored by Burkitt (2008) who suggests that we are each raised and live within varying social fields that shape our perceptions and valuations of our world, which consequently shape our actions within it. Different groups in society have different habitus which predispose them to different types of behaviour, aspirations and values. In this way, that which is perceived a problem, or of value, within a mainstream school environment, may not necessarily be the case the boys in Riverdale. Alternatively, it could also be that pupils use a strategy of normalising behaviour as a defensive strategy to sustain an acceptable social identity and protect their self-image

A further potential additional important influence upon pupil perceptions of their possible selves may be the 'social capital' available to them. Bourdieu (1986) speaks of the influence of this upon adolescent occupational aspirations, describing it as 'the aggregate of actual or potential resources' (pg.51) which are available to a young person. This may come in the form of occupational encouragement, advice, and mentorship from knowledgeable adults or peers, both within and outside of school. Two important factors are key: the size of the social network that can be mobilised and the quality of resources available through these ties.

It may be considered that attending Riverdale School could potentially reduce the size and diversity of these social networks when compared to a mainstream school, given the much smaller number of attendees and teaching staff. This narrowing of the spectrum of potential social influences might mean that Riverdale pupils only become exposed to adults who hold particular views regarding suitable career paths for pupils (Casey et al., 2006). Some research

(Stanton-Salazar & Spina, 2005) also suggests that the parents of disadvantaged youth are more likely to take a passive role in their child's educational and occupational planning, and that other adults in these young peoples' social networks may share this cultural orientation(Lareau, 2002). In such cases the social capital of these young people may be reduced as they encounter difficulty obtaining occupational information and mentoring opportunities. Whilst this is not necessarily the case for all pupils, these suggestions perhaps further emphasise the important role of teachers in widening and heightening occupational expectations.

Social capital is also defined by its functions (Coleman, 1988), these being: the development of obligations and trust, the production of information, and the enforcement of norms (Dika & Singh, 2002). These functions are produced within a closed system of networks where ongoing interaction and exchange between members enforce reciprocity. These suggestions perhaps place further responsibility on education professionals working within Riverdale to develop a culture of positivity. The generation of a collective efficacy (Bandura, 1986, 2000) amongst pupils regarding their perceptions of self and possible future occupations may prove vital, as popular attitudes, beliefs and norms of peers may be embraced by other pupils seeking social acceptance (Abrams & Hogg, 1990) .

3.5 Implications of the Study

Potential implications of this study's findings are proposed for the Local Education Authority, Riverdale School and my practice as a trainee educational psychologist. Pupil perceptions of themselves may suggest the potential for development of an SEBD identity within Riverdale, the effects of which need to be considered. This leads to questions as to whether schools designed to deal with behavioural issues perhaps reinforce stereotypes, and also pupil perceptions of what is possible for them.

Several pupils in the study had difficulty explaining the routes to achieving their career goals, and in the generation of alternative occupational options. There may be implications for Riverdale School to explore the mechanisms which contribute to widening occupational knowledge and the belief that these career options are possible. Literature exploring structures of opportunity (Furlong, Biggart, & Cartmel, 1996; McKendrick, Scott, & Sinclair, 2007) points out that pupils can only aspire to those professions which they know exist in the first place. Future initiatives might therefore focus upon providing the experiences and opportunities for pupils to widen their scope of what they believe to be possible Access to the types of experience proposed to enhance student Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy (see pages 15- 16), may therefore prove of value, rather than prescriptive curriculum options which may be inadvertently restricting student perceptions of possible careers.

Outcomes of my research have also raised significant implications for my practice as a trainee educational psychologist. One of my responsibilities is to

contribute to assessment processes which may result in SEBD school placements. Given that my research suggests specialist placement may affect the self-concept or possible selves of pupils, and as an advocate of inclusive practice, this presents a level of discomfort for me.

Billett and Somerville (2004) make the pertinent observation that few people in caring professions are able to distance themselves from the role or take a pragmatic approach to their work. They make the point that the work becomes more than just 'work' but instead becomes a part of their sense of self and their values are reflected in their practice. This raises implications for one's epistemological positioning as an educational psychologist and what is expected of the role within different educational psychology services (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004).

Implications also arise from this study for how educational psychologists respond to practice that they may not necessarily agree with. For example, in questioning whether true voice can ever be accessed, this research has raised implications for me working in a local authority which promotes this practice. Raising methodological, ethical and philosophical issues may help avoid, tokenistic initiatives which seek to gather information under the guise of pupil voice. However, taking the position of 'critical friend' within schools may not always be easy, as systemic change may lead to additional work or cause unease for school staff used to working in a particular way. Encouraging regular review of teaching practice within schools may also prove additionally difficult in a time of constricting budgets and increased time pressures (Hall-Kenyon, Bullough, MacKay, & Marshall, 2014; Travers & Cooper, 1996).

It perhaps then falls to the educational psychology profession to continue to conduct and disseminate the findings of new research, to help schools guard against pragmatism and to consider the potential important latent effects of school experiences. Since presenting my research to them, Riverdale School have begun looking at ways in which they can widen the occupational knowledge of their students, including inviting key figures from local industry into the school to talk to students about possible career paths. Examples such as this perhaps indicate the value of the research element of the educational psychologists' role. Future studies employing participatory methods (Cornwall & Jewkes, 1995; Minkler & Wallerstein, 2010), with the EP in an advisory role, may to help to address some of the potential problems encountered with adult/child power differentials (see page 57) . They may also help widen the popular view of the EP role within some local authorities from one of a gatekeeper of additional resources for special educational needs (Fallon, Woods, & Rooney, 2010).

3.6 Issues of Quality

The qualitative methods in this study aimed to provide insights to an area not previously explored, through exploration of student experience (Willig, 2008). The quality of the current study may be analysed through a set of qualitative principles, as outlined by Yardley (2000).

3.6.1 Sensitivity to Context

As a trainee educational psychologist, I work regularly within local schools, including with students displaying SEBD and am therefore sensitive to the

context of the educational setting of the boys. Living locally, I am sensitive to the socio-economic and cultural setting, and have worked in several schools for pupils displaying SEBD. This is important as student perceptions of me, such as perceived class or status may impact on pupil talk because of these social factors.

It is also particularly important to remain mindful of the particular considerations of conducting research with children and how the quality of such research can be enhanced. I believe this was achieved through giving particular consideration to the three key areas of consent, competence and issues of power in the design of the study (see pages 52-54 for detailed discussion of these issues).

3.6.2 Commitment and rigour

I would argue the present research meets commitment requirements through thorough engagement with the topic, not only during the research but also through personal interest and commitment to the area, evidenced by justification for the study (see page 45) and experience of working with young people displaying SEBD (7 years). Rigour refers to the completeness of the data collection and analysis. The principle of saturation (data collection continues until new cases result in no new themes or patterns) is considered a sound determinate of rigour (Glaser & Strauss, 1999).

Conducting the thematic analysis of data was a lengthy and rigorous process. However it is acknowledged that longer interviews or further probing questions

may have satisfied a goal of data saturation, but this may have required some ethical compromise.

3.6.3 Transparency and Coherence

Transparency and coherence are considered in relation to how the research is presented. I would argue that the reality interpreted here is meaningful to practitioners in the local authority, through potential implications for practice.

I believe the study was explicit in its purpose (see page 48) and clear in how data was interpreted (see Appendix B, pg. 112). I have also attempted to give the reader a sense of the students' perspectives through the inclusion of data extracts throughout the results. Findings were also discussed with pupils.

Coherence refers to the relationship between the research question and the methodology adopted. Exploring perspectives of pupils displaying SEBD and listening to their perspectives therefore required a qualitative methodology.

3.6.4 Impact and Importance

The practical and theoretical importance of research can determine its quality (Yardley, 2000). Practical use is also one of the aims of practitioner research. Discussions of this study's findings have been held with Local Authority officers, who commented on the studies relevance in terms of how Riverdale School is conceptualised within the authority.

In terms of contributing to academic literature, this research is one of few studies to explore pupils' perceptions of future occupations in an SEBD school. It has highlighted the influence of social pressures upon what pupils believe

they can/should do in the future. The research has also contributed to the literature comparing special schools and mainstream provision. These studies have largely focused on retrospective reports of SEBD school experiences, however this this study suggests that pupils are capable of valuable introspection which could be used to inform current practice and policy.

3.7 Limitations of the study

The methodological and ethical complexities of exploring pupil perspectives, means a critical view of findings is strongly advised. For instance, the ethical principle of avoiding participant stress/harm (The British Psychological Society, 2009) perhaps lead to an overly cautious approach to interviews, in that I didn't press for more detail.

By presenting my interpretation of pupil views I may also be adding to unequal power differentials, therefore exploiting pupils for my own agenda. However by exploring perspectives which often go unheard, these risks are hopefully outweighed by the potential benefits for these pupils.

Other methodological limitations of the study are acknowledged. For example future studies may consider working in a neutral setting, to reduce the potential for socially desirable answering. Some contradictions in pupil accounts suggest that this may have been an issue for this study. Participants were also those who volunteered to share their views- and who had parental consent - meaning participants were only those motivated to share their views, and had permission to do so.

3.8 Conclusions

Findings of this exploratory study are offered to suggest that the self-perceptions of 6 Riverdale pupils may differ from their perceptions of mainstream peers, contributing to a distinct identity. Furthermore, potential links are proposed between pupil self-perceptions and future occupations which are deemed compatible/incompatible with social identities. These findings are offered tentatively given the many methodological and ethical considerations of gaining the views of vulnerable young people.

Meeting the needs of pupils who display SEBD may prove a challenge for local authorities. However listening to the perspectives of these pupils may help highlight the difference between students' experience of education as it was intended, compared with how it is actually experienced and encourage improvements in the educational experiences of these young people. If it is deemed that pupil's needs are best met in SEBD schools, we must remain critical of the physical, social and cultural environment of SEBD schools, to ensure that young people are not marginalised or disadvantaged in other ways.

References

Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1990). Social Identification, Self-Categorization and Social Influence. *European Review of Social Psychology, 1*(1), 195-228. doi: 10.1080/14792779108401862

Anderson, K. T., & Zuiker, S. J. (2010). Performative identity as a resource for classroom participation: Scientific Shane vs. Jimmy Neutron. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 9*(5), 291-309.

Arruda, A. (2003). Living is dangerous: research challenges in social representations. *Culture & Psychology, 9*(4), 339-359.

Ayres, L., Kavanaugh, K., & Knafl, K. A. (2003). Within-case and across-case approaches to qualitative data analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 13*(6), 871-883.

Bae, B. (2009). Children's Right to Participate–challenges in everyday interactions. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 17*(3), 391-406.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action:A social cognitive approach* . Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*: Cambridge University Press.

Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current directions in psychological science, 9*(3), 75-78.

Bandura, A. (2006). Adolescent development from an agentic perspective. In F. Pajares & T. C. Urdan (Eds.), Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents (Vol. 5, pp. 1-43): Information Age Publishing.

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (2001). Self-Efficacy Beliefs as Shapers of Children's Aspirations and Career Trajectories. *Child Development, 72*(1), 187-206. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00273

Bennett, P. L. (2005). A broad conceptual framework for the development and management of young people's behavioural difficulties. *Educational and Child Psychology, 22*(3), 6.

Betz, N. E. (2007). Career Self-Efficacy: Exemplary Recent Research and Emerging Directions. *Journal of Career Assessment, 15*(4), 403-422. doi: 10.1177/1069072707305759

Betz, N. E., & Schifano, R. S. (2000). Evaluation of an Intervention to Increase Realistic Self-Efficacy and Interests in College Women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56*(1), 35-52. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1999.1690

Betz, N. E., & Voyten, K. (1997). Efficacy and outcome expectations influence career exploration and decidedness. *The Career Development Quarterly, 46*(2), 179-189.

Bhaskar, R. (1975). *A realist philosophy of science*. Leeds: Leeds Books.

Bikos, L. H., & Furry, T. S. (1999). The Job Search Club for International Students: An Evaluation. *The Career Development Quarterly, 48*(1), 31-44. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.1999.tb00273.x

Billett, S., & Somerville, M. (2004). Transformations at work: identity and learning. *Studies in Continuing Education, 26*(2), 309 - 326.

Blustein, D. L. (1989). The role of goal instability and career self-efficacy in the career exploration process. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 35*(2), 194-203. doi: 10.1016/0001-8791(89)90040-7

Borsboom, D. (2005). *Measuring the mind: Conceptual issues in contemporary psychometrics*: Cambridge University Press.

Borsboom, D., Cramer, A. O., Kievit, R. A., Zand Scholten, A., Franic, S., & Lissitz, R. (2009). The end of construct validity. *The concept of validity: Revisions, new directions, and applications*, 135-170.

Borsboom, D., Mellenbergh, G. J., & Van Heerden, J. (2003). The theoretical status of latent variables. *Psychological review, 110*(2), 203.

Borsboom, D., Mellenbergh, G. J., & van Heerden, J. (2004). The concept of validity. *Psychological review, 111*(4), 1061.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Vol. 16): Cambridge university press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. *Handbook of Theory and Research of for the Sociology of Education*.

Bozgeyikli, H., & Dogan, H. (2010). The effect of computer assisted career group guidance on the self- efficacy levels of career decision making in students. *European Journal of Educational Studies, 2*(2), 77-86.

Bradley, R., Doolittle, J., & Bartolotta, R. (2008). Building on the data and adding to the discussion: The experiences and outcomes of students with emotional disturbance. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 17*(1), 4-23.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burke, C. (2005). "Play in focus": Children researching their own spaces and places for play. *Children Youth and Environments, 15*(1), 27-53.

Burkitt, I. (2008). *Social selves: Theories of self and society*. London: SAGE Publications Limited.

Burton, D. M., Bartlett, S. J., & Anderson de Cuevas, R. (2009). Are the contradictions and tensions that have characterised educational provision for young people with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties a persistent feature of current policy? *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 14*(2), 141-155. doi: 10.1080/13632750902921963

Buunk, A. P., & Gibbons, F. X. (2007). Social comparison: The end of a theory and the emergence of a field. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 102*(1), 3-21.

Casey, L., Davies, P., Kalambouka, A., Nelson, N., & Boyle, B. (2006). The influence of schooling on the aspirations of young people with special educational needs. *British Educational Research Journal, 32*(2), 273-290.

Cefai, C., & Cooper, P. (2010). Students without voices: the unheard accounts of secondary school students with social, emotional and behaviour difficulties. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 25*(2), 183-198. doi: 10.1080/08856251003658702

Christensen, P. (2004). Children's participation in ethnographic research: Issues of power and representation. *Children & Society, 18*(2), 165-176. doi: 10.1002/chi.823

Christensen, P., & James, A. (2008). *Research with Children*. London: Routledge.

Christensen, P., & Prout, A. (2005). Anthropological and sociological perspectives on the study of children. In S. Green & D. Hogan (Eds.), *Researching children's experience: Approaches and methods* (pp. 42-60). London: Sage.

Cocks, A. J. (2006). The Ethical Maze: Finding an inclusive path towards gaining children's agreement to research participation. *Childhood, 13*(2), 247-266.

Coe, R. (2002). It the effect size, stupid: What effect size is and why it is important Retrieved 10/02/12, 2012, from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00002182.htm

Cohen, J. (1992). A Power Primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155-159.

Cole, R. L. (2008). A systematic review of cognitive-behavioural interventions for adolescents with anger-related difficulties. *Educational and Child Psychology, 25*(1), 27-47.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American journal of sociology*, S95-S120.

Collier, D., & Mahoney, J. (1996). Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research. *World Politics, 49*(01), 56-91. doi: doi:10.1353/wp.1996.0023

Cooper, P. (1999). Changing perceptions of EBD: Maladjustment, EBD and beyond. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 4*(1), 3-11.

Cooper, P., & Jacobs, B. (2011). Evidence of Best Practice Models and Outcomes in the Education of Children with Emotional Disturbance/Behavioural Difficulties. *An International Review. Research Report No, 7*.

Cooper, P., & Shea, T. (1998). Pupils' perceptions of ADHD. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties: A Peer Reviewed Journal, 3*(3), 36-48.

Cornwall, A., & Jewkes, R. (1995). What is participatory research? *Social science & medicine, 41*(12), 1667-1676.

Coyne, I. (2010). Research with Children and Young People: The Issue of Parental (Proxy) Consent. *Children & Society, 24*(3), 227-237. doi: 10.1111/j.1099-0860.2009.00216.x

Crites, J. O. (1961). A model for the measurement of vocational maturity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 8*(3), 255-259.

Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin, 52*(4), 281.

Cruddas, L. (2007). Engaged voices—dialogic interaction and the construction of shared social meanings. *Educational Action Research, 15*(3), 479-488.

Dawes, M. E., Horan, J. J., & Hackett, G. (2000). Experimental evaluation of self-efficacy treatment on technical/scientific career outcomes. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 28*(1), 87-99. doi: 10.1080/030698800109637

Day, R. E. (2005). Clearing up "implicit knowledge": Implications for knowledge management, information science, psychology, and social epistemology. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 56*(6), 630-635.

de Jong, T., & Griffiths, C. (2006). The role of alternative education programs in meeting the needs of adolescent students with challenging behaviour: characteristics of best practice. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 16*(01), 29-40.

Department for Education. (2012a). *Improving Alternative Provision*. London: Department for Education.

Department for Education. (2012b). Statistical First Release: Special Educational Needs in England. Retrieved 7th March, 2013, from http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s001075/sfr14-2012v2.pdf

Department for Education. (2013). Statistical First Release: GCSE and equivalent attainment by pupil characteristics Retrieved 3rd January, 2013, from http://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/m/sfr04-2013.pdf

Department for Education and Skills. (2001). *Special Educational Needs: Code Of Practice*. London: Department for Education and Skills.

Dika, S. L., & Singh, K. (2002). Applications of social capital in educational literature: A critical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 72*(1), 31-60.

Dotterer, A. M., McHale, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (2009). The Development and Correlates of Academic Interests From Childhood Through Adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(2), 509-519. doi: 10.1037/a0013987

Dunkel, C., & Kerpelman, J. (2006). *Possible selves: Theory, research, and applications*. Nova Publishers.

Eccles, J. (2009). Who Am I and What Am I Going to Do With My Life? Personal and Collective Identities as Motivators of Action. *Educational Psychologist, 44*(2), 78-89.

Erikson, E. (1968). *Youth, identity and crisis*. New York: W.W Norton.

Eva, K. W., Munoz, J., Hanson, M. D., Walsh, A., & Wakefield, J. (2010). Which Factors, Personal or External, Most Influence Students' Generation of Learning Goals? *Academic Medicine, 85*, S102-S105. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0b013e3181ed42f2

Fallon, K., Woods, K., & Rooney, S. (2010). A discussion of the developing role of educational psychologists within Children's Services. *Educational Psychology in Practice: theory, research and practice in educational psychology, 26*(1), 1 - 23.

Farrell, P., & Polat, F. (2003). The long-term impact of residential provision for pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 18*(3), 277-292.

Forlin, C. (2010). The role of the school psychologist in inclusive education for ensuring quality learning outcomes for all learners. *School Psychology International, 31*(6), 617-630. doi: 10.1177/0143034310386535

Fouad, N., Cotter, E. W., & Kantamneni, N. (2009). The Effectiveness of a Career Decision-Making Course. *Journal of Career Assessment, 17*(3), 338-347. doi: 10.1177/1069072708330678

France, A. (2004). Young People. In S. Fraser (Ed.), *Doing research with children and young people*. London: Sage.

Furlong, A., Biggart, A., & Cartmel, F. (1996). Neighbourhoods, opportunity structures and occupational aspirations. *Sociology, 30*(3), 551-565.

Gainor, K. A. (2006). Twenty-Five Years of Self-Efficacy in Career Assessment and Practice. *Journal of Career Assessment, 14*(1), 161-178. doi: 10.1177/1069072705282435

Gallacher, L.-A., & Gallagher, M. (2008). Methodological Immaturity in Childhood Research? Thinking through participatory methods. *Childhood, 15*(4), 499-516.

Gati, I., Krausz, M., & Osipow, S. H. (1996). A taxonomy of difficulties in career decision making. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*(4), 510-526.

Gati, I., & Saka, N. (2001). High School Students' Career-Related Decision-Making Difficulties. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 79*(3), 331-340. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.2001.tb01978.x

Glaser, B. T., & Strauss, A. L. (1999). *Discovery of Grounded Therory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Transaction.

Goodman, R. L., & Burton, D. M. (2010). The inclusion of students with BESD in mainstream schools: teachers' experiences of and recommendations for

creating a successful inclusive environment. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 15*(3), 223-237. doi: 10.1080/13632752.2010.497662

Gottfredson, L. S. (2002). Gottfredson's Theory of Circumscription, Compromise, and Self-Creation. In D. Brown (Ed.), Career Choice and Development (4th ed.). New York: Wiley.

Greene, S., & Hogan, D. (2005). *Researching children's experience: Approaches and methods*. London: Sage.

Groundwater-Smith, S., & Mockler, N. (2007). Ethics in practitioner research: An issue of quality. *Research Papers in Education, 22*(2), 199-211.

Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research. *Qualitative inquiry, 10*(2), 261-280.

Hall-Kenyon, K. M., Bullough, R. V., MacKay, K. L., & Marshall, E. E. (2014). Preschool Teacher Well-Being: A Review of the Literature. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 42*(3), 153-162.

Hastings, R. P., & Oakford, S. (2003). Student Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Inclusion of Children with Special Needs. *Educational Psychology, 23*(1), 87-94. doi: 10.1080/01443410303223

Hill, M. (2006). Children's Voices on Ways of Having a Voice: Children's and young people's perspectives on methods used in research and consultation. *Childhood, 13*(1), 69-89. doi: 10.1177/0907568206059972

Hoyle, R. H., & Sherrill, M. R. (2006). Future Orientation in the Self-System: Possible Selves, Self-Regulation, and Behavior. *Journal of Personality, 74*(6), 1673-1696. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2006.00424.x

Jackson, C. (2002). 'Laddishness' as a self-worth protection strategy. *Gender and Education, 14*(1), 37-50.

Jackson, C. (2003). Motives for'laddishness' at school: Fear of failure and fear of the'feminine'. *British Educational Research Journal, 29*(4), 583-598.

Johnson, P., & Duberley, J. (2000). *Understanding management research: An introduction to epistemology*. London: Sage.

Kenway, J., & Hickey-Moody, A. (2011). Life chances, lifestyle and everyday aspirational strategies and tactics. *Critical Studies in Education, 52*(2), 151-163. doi: 10.1080/17508487.2011.572828

Kerr , B., & Robinson Kurpius, S. E. (2004). Encouraging talented girls in math and science: effects of a guidance intervention. *High Ability Studies, 15*(1), 85-102. doi: 10.1080/1359813042000225357

Khan, S., & VanWynsberghe, R. (2008). Cultivating the under-mined: Cross-case analysis as knowledge mobilization. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research* Retrieved 7th November, 2013, from http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/viewArticle/334/729

Koivisto, P., Vinokur, A. D., & Vuori, J. (2011). Effects of Career Choice Intervention on Components of Career Preparation. *The Career Development Quarterly, 59*(4), 345-366. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.2011.tb00074.x

Kortesluoma, R. L., Hentinen, M., & Nikkonen, M. (2003). Conducting a qualitative child interview: methodological considerations. *Journal of advanced nursing, 42*(5), 434-441.

Krumboltz, J. D. (1993). Integrating Career and Personal Counseling. *The Career Development Quarterly, 42*(2), 143-148. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.1993.tb00427.x

Kvale, S. (2005). The dominance of dialogical interview research. *Impuls, 1*, 5-13.

Lareau, A. (2002). Invisible inequality: Social class and childrearing in black families and white families. *American sociological review*, 747-776.

Larkin, M., Watts, S., & Clifton, E. (2006). Giving voice and making sense in interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative research in psychology, 3*(2), 102-120. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp062oa

Lent, R., & Brown, S. (1996). Social Cognitive Approach to Career Development: An Overview. *The Career Development Quarterly, 44*(4), 310-321. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.1996.tb00448.x

Lent, R., Brown, S., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 45*(1), 79-22.

Lent, R., & Hackett, G. (1987). Career self-efficacy: Empirical status and future directions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 30*(3), 347-382. doi: 10.1016/0001-8791(87)90010-8

Lent, R., Lopez, F. G., & Bieschke, K. J. (1993). Predicting mathematics-related choice and success behaviors: Test of an expanded social cognitive model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 2*(2), 223-236.

Lewis, R., & Burman, E. (2008). Providing for student voice in classroom management: teachers' views. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 12*(2), 151-167.

Lloyd, G., & O'Regan, A. (2000). 'You Have to Learn to Love Yourself Cos No One Else Will'. Young Women with 'Social, Emotional or Behavioural Difficulties' and the Idea of the Underclass. *Gender and Education, 12*(1), 39-52.

Lorig, K., & Holman, H. (2003). Self-management education: History, definition, outcomes, and mechanisms. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 26*(1), 1-7. doi: 10.1207/s15324796abm2601_01

Louise Barriball, K., & While, A. (1994). Collecting Data using a semi-structured interview: a discussion paper. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 19*(2), 328-335.

Lundberg, O., & Manderbacka, K. (1996). Assessing reliability of a measure of self-rated health. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 24*(3), 218-224.

Lundy, L. (2007). 'Voice' is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *British Educational Research Journal, 33*(6), 927-942. doi: 10.1080/01411920701657033

Lundy, L., & McEvoy, L. (2012). Children's rights and research processes: Assisting children to (in) formed views. *Childhood, 19*(1), 129-144.

MacBeath, J., Demetriou, H., Rudduck, J., & Myers, K. (2003). *Consulting pupils: A toolkit for teachers*. Cambridge: Pearson

Macfadyen, L. P. (2011). PERILS OF PARSIMONY: The problematic paradigm of 'national culture'. *Information, Communication & Society, 14*(2), 280-293.

Mainwaring, D., & Hallam, S. (2010). 'Possible selves' of young people in a mainstream secondary school and a pupil referral unit: a comparison. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 15*(2), 153-169.

Malikail, J. (2003). Moral character: hexis, habitus and 'habit'. *An Internet Journal of Philosophy, 7*, 1-22.

Maples, M. R., & Luzzo, D. A. (2005). Evaluating DISCOVER's Effectiveness in Enhancing College Students' Social Cognitive Career Development. [Article]. *Career Development Quarterly, 53*(3), 274-285.

Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist, 41*(9), 954-969.

Marsh, H. W. (1989). Age and sex effects in multiple dimensions of self-concept: Preadolescence to early adulthood. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*(3), 417.

McKendrick, J., Scott, G., & Sinclair, S. (2007). Dismissing disaffection: young people's attitudes towards education, employment and participation in a deprived community. *Journal of youth studies, 10*(2), 139-160.

McLeod, A. (2007). Whose agenda? Issues of power and relationship when listening to looked-after young people. *Child & Family Social Work, 12*(3), 278-286.

McWhirter, E. H., Crothers, M., & Rasheed, S. (2000). The effects of high school career education on social–cognitive variables. *Journal of Counselling Psychology, 47*(3), 330-341.

Michael, S., & Frederickson, N. (2013). Improving pupil referral unit outcomes: pupil perspectives. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 1-16. doi: 10.1080/13632752.2013.801112

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. London: Sage.

Minkler, M., & Wallerstein, N. (2010). *Community-based participatory research for health: From process to outcomes*: John Wiley & Sons.

Muntean, A., Roth, M., & Iovu, M. B. (2010). The role played by the social environment within the future's plans of youth. *Revista De Cercetare Si Interventie Sociala, 28*, 7-22.

Nakagawa, S., & Cuthill, I. C. (2007). Effect size, confidence interval and statistical significance: a practical guide for biologists. *Biological Reviews, 82*(4), 591-605. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-185X.2007.00027.x

Norwich, B. (2008). SPECIAL SCHOOLS: What future for special schools and inclusion? Conceptual and professional perspectives. *British Journal of Special Education, 35*(3), 136-143. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8578.2008.00387.x

O'Brien, K. M., Bikos, L. H., Epstein, K. L., Flores, L. Y., Dukstein, R. D., & Kamatuka, N. A. (2000). Enhancing the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy of Upward Bound Students. *Journal of Career Development, 26*(4), 277-293. doi: 10.1023/a:1022902307328

O'Brien, K. M., Dukstein, R. D., Jackson, S. L., Tomlinson, M. J., & Kamatuka, N. A. (1999). Broadening Career Horizons for Students in At-Risk Environments. *The Career Development Quarterly, 47*(3), 215-229. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.1999.tb00732.x

O'Connor, M., Hodkinson, A., Burton, D., & Torstensson, G. (2011). Pupil voice: listening to and hearing the educational experiences of young people with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties (BESD). *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 16*(3), 289-302. doi: 10.1080/13632752.2011.595095

Ofsted. (2011). Alternative Provision   Retrieved 4th May, 2013, from http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/alternative-provision

Osipow, S. H., Carney, C. G., & Barak, A. (1976). A scale of educational-vocational undecidedness: A typological approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 9*(2), 233-243. doi: 10.1016/0001-8791(76)90081-6

Oyserman, D., Bybee, D., & Terry, K. (2006). Possible selves and academic outcomes: How and when possible selves impel action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*(1), 188.

Oyserman, D., & Fryberg, S. (2006). The possible selves of diverse adolescents: Content and function across gender, race and national origin. In C. Dunkel & J. Kerpelman (Eds.), *Possible selves: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 17-39). New York: Nova

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-Efficacy Beliefs in Academic Settings. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(4), 543-578. doi: 10.3102/00346543066004543

Pajares, F., & Miller, D. M. (1995). Mathematics self-efficacy and mathematics performances: The need for specificity of assessment. . *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*(2), 190-198.

Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2008). *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Polat, F., & Farrell, P. (2002). What was it like for you? *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 7*(2), 97-108. doi: 10.1080/1363275020050709

Punch, S. (2002). Research with children: The same or different from research with adults? *Childhood, 9*(3), 321-341.

Renold, E., Holland, S., Ross, N. J., & Hillman, A. (2008). Becoming Participant'ProblematizingInformed Consent'in Participatory Research with Young People in Care. *Qualitative Social Work, 7*(4), 427-447.

Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research: A resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers* (2nd ed.): Blackwell Oxford.

Rubie-Davies, M. (2010). Teacher expectations and perceptions of student attributes: Is there a relationship? *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(1), 121-135.

Rust, J., & Golombok, S. (1999). *Modern Psychometrics The Science of Psychological Assessment.* LOndon: Routledge.

Sayer, A. (2000). *Realism and social science.* London: Sage.

Sayid Dabbagh, G. (2011). Relationships between academic self-concept and academic performance in high school students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15*(0), 1034-1039. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.235

Scott, D. (2007). Resolving the quantitative–qualitative dilemma: a critical realist approach. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 30*(1), 3-17.

Seidman, I. (2012). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences.* New York: Teachers college press.

Sellman, E. (2009). Lessons learned: student voice at a school for pupils experiencing social, emotional and behavioural difficulties. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 14*(1), 33-48. doi: 10.1080/13632750802655687

Sharma, U., Forlin, C., & Loreman, T. (2008). Impact of training on pre-service teachers' attitudes and concerns about inclusive education and sentiments about persons with disabilities. *Disability & Society, 23*(7), 773-785. doi: 10.1080/09687590802469271

Silverman, D. (2011). *Interpreting qualitative data.* London: Sage.

Skattebol, J. (2006). Playing boys: The body, identity and belonging in the early years. *Gender and Education, 18*(5), 507-522.

Smith, J. A., & Osborn, M. (2003). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis.* London: Sage.

Speight, J. D., Rosenthal, K. S., Jones, B. J., & Gastenveld, P. M. (1995). Medcamp's Effect on Junior High School Students' Medical Career Self-Efficacy. *The Career Development Quarterly, 43*(3), 285-295. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.1995.tb00869.x

Spicer, N., & Evans, R. (2006). Developing children and young people's participation in strategic processes: The experience of the Children's Fund Initiative. *Social Policy and Society, 5*(02), 177-188.

Spiteri, D. (2009). Forging an identity over the life-course. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 14*(3), 239-249. doi: 10.1080/13632750903073541

Spyrou, S. (2011). The limits of children's voices: From authenticity to critical, reflexive representation. *Childhood, 18*(2), 151-165. doi: 10.1177/0907568210387834

Stalker, K. (1998). Some ethical and methodological issues in research with people with learning difficulties. *Disability & Society, 13*(1), 5-19.

Stanton-Salazar, R. D., & Spina, S. U. (2005). Adolescent peer networks as a context for social and emotional support. *Youth & Society, 36*(4), 379-417.

Strahan, E. J., & Wilson, A. E. (2006). Temporal comparisons, identity, and motivation: The relation between past, present, and possible future selves. In C. Dunkel & J. Kerpelman (Eds.), *Possible selves: Theory, research and applications* (pp. 1-15). New York: Nova.

Sullivan, K. R., & Mahalik, J. R. (2000). Increasing Career Self-Efficacy for Women: Evaluating a Group Intervention. [Article]. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 78*(1), 54-62.

Super, D. E., & Hall, D. T. (1978). Career development: Exploration and planning. *Annual Review of Psychology, 29*(1), 333-372.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup relations. .

Tansley, D. P., Jome, L. M., Haase, R. F., & Martens, M. P. (2007). The Effects of Message Framing on College Students' Career Decision Making. *Journal of Career Assessment, 15*(3), 301-316. doi: 10.1177/1069072707301204

Taveira, M. D. C., Silva, M. C., Rodriguez, M. L., & Maia, J. (1998). Individual characteristics and career exploration in adolescence. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 26*(1), 89-104. doi: 10.1080/03069889808253841

Taylor, K. M., & Betz, N. E. (1983). Applications of self-efficacy theory to the understanding and treatment of career indecision. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 22*(1), 63-81. doi: 10.1016/0001-8791(83)90006-4

The British Psychological Society. (2009). Code of Ethics and Conduct

The Social Emotional and Behavioural Difficuties Association. (2006). Definitions - SEBD and its overlap with disruptive and anti-social behaviour, mental health difficulties and ADHD Retrieved January 4th, 2013, from www.sebda.org/index.php/download_file/view/32/85/

Thomas, D. (2007). *Breaking Through The Sound Barrier: difficulties of voiced research in schools uncommitted to pupil voice*. Paper presented at the Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference.

Travers, C. J., & Cooper, C. L. (1996). *Teachers under pressure: Stress in the teaching profession*: Psychology Press.

Turner, & Lapan. (2005). Evaluation of an intervention to increase non-traditional career interests and career-related self-efficacy among middle-school adolescents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*(3), 516-531.

Turner, J. C., Brown, R. J., & Tajfel, H. (1979). Social comparison and group interest in ingroup favouritism. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 9*(2), 187-204.

Turner, S. L., & Conkel, J. (2010). Evaluation of a Career Development Skills Intervention With Adolescents Living in an Inner City. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 88*(4), 457-465. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00046.x

Turner, S. L., & Laplan, R. T. (2005). Evaluation of an intervention to increase non-traditional career interests and career-related self-efficacy among middle-school adolescents. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 66*(3), 516.

Uffelman, R. A., Subich, L. M., Diegelman, N. M., Wagner, K. S., & Bardash, R. J. (2004). Effect of Mode of Interest Assessment on Clients' Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Career Assessment, 12*(4), 366-380. doi: 10.1177/1069072704266651

Walsh, W. B., Walsh, W., & Osipow, S. (1990). A summary and integration of career counseling approaches. *Career counseling: Contemporary topics in vocational psychology*, 263-281.

Westwood, P., & Graham, L. (2003). Inclusion of students with special needs: Benefits and obstacles perceived by teachers in new South Wales and South Australia. *Australian Journal of Learning Disabilities, 8*(1), 3-15. doi: 10.1080/19404150309546718

Wilkins, W. E. (1976). The Concept of a Self-Fulfilling Prophecy. *Sociology of Education, 49*(2), 175-183. doi: 10.2307/2112523

Willig, C. (2008). *Introducing Qualitative Research In Psychology*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill International (UK) Ltd.

Winer, R. S. (1999). Experimentation in the 21st Century: The Importance of External Validity. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 27*(3), 349-358. doi: 10.1177/0092070399273005

Woodward, K. (1997). *Identity and difference* (Vol. 3). London: Sage.

Woolford, C. (2012). A North East Pupil Referral Unit's Response to the Challenge of NEETs. *International Perspectives on Inclusive Education* Retrieved 2nd March, 2013, from http://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=MPMpjKO8K5EC&oi=fnd&pg=PA223&ots=D4oU7TqNid&sig=Szd2Bi1P4W7pD3MIwbVtwk1kC1E#v=onepage&q&f=false

Woolfson, R. C., Bryce, D., Mooney, L., Harker, M., Lowe, D., & Ferguson, E. (2008). Improving methods of consulting with young people: Piloting a new model of consultation. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 24*(1), 55-67. doi: 10.1080/02667360701841270

Yardley, L. (2000). Dilemmas in qualitative health research. *Psychology & Health, 15*(2), 215-228. doi: 10.1080/08870440008400302

Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). *Self- efficacy in changing societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Newcastle University

Appendix A

<u>Information about this study</u>

How do pupils attending a school for SEBD perceive their Current Selves and Possible Occupational Selves?

(Please retain this sheet for your information)

In this study your child will be invited to take part in discussions about school life and their hopes for the future. I am particularly interested in the career goals that young people have set for themselves, and how they have arrived at these goals.

Discussions are estimated to take approximately 30 minutes to complete, during which time your child is free to contribute as much or as little to the conversation as they wish. They are also free to leave the group at any point, should they wish to do so.

Your child's participation in this study is completely voluntary. You or your child can also choose to have any data that provided in this study completely destroyed at any stage, either during or after the study before data is processed. Otherwise, all responses will be kept anonymous and confidential, subject to any legal requirements. Only the principal investigator working on this project will have access to your child's responses. All responses will be reported using pseudonyms; therefore no pupil responses will be identifiable in any way, in the reporting of the results of this study.

All of the views recorded during interviews will be fully deleted following the completion of the study.

Thank you

Mr. Chris Heslop

University of Newcastle Upon Tyne and North Tyneside Educational Psychology Service(0191) 643 8739   c.heslop1@ncl.ac.uk

Appendix B – Example from transcript with initial coding

Transcript 1 (John)

Informal introductions and explanation of the interview process, such as the right to withdraw from the study at any point etc, were undertaken before recording began. Recording was stopped before distribution of confectionary

Initial coding written in orange text

** *Blue text indicates coding cross reference with Appendix C, for an example of theme generation*

1. Ok John well thanks for having a chat with me today, do you remember when I came in and spoke about what it was that I hoped to do?
2. Yeah about school and that.
3. Yeah about how things are going at riverdale, things you like, things you don't like, whatever is important to you really, and what you hope to do when you leave. That seem ok?
4. Yeah fine.
5. So can we just start by telling me a bit more about Riverdale in general, do you like being here?
6. Aye, like coz of the rewards and that in xxxx you wouldn't get them, and you don't get as much support and that (enjoys attending riverdale; motivated by rewards; doesn't perceive that he gets rewards in mainstream; less support in mainstream)
7. So is that important?
8. Mm hmm (support is important)
9. So which school did you used to go to John?
10. Err xxxx then xxxx
11. Right ok, so you find that you get more support here than you used to... Is that support with work, or with other things
12. Support with everything really, like if you've got a problem you can go see your link worker or you've usually got another member of staff in the class with the teacher, so you've got two people to help you with your work and that (support is easily accessible in riverdale; wider support options)
13. Does that help
14. Aye they're (teachers) just used to people going on like that (teachers expect poorer behaviour)
15. Like what?
16. Like messing on and stuff, people think that's how it is here, but it's not, not all the time and the teachers are quality coz they 'get me' (perceptions of public misconception of behaviour in riverdale; teachers more understanding in riverdale)
17. Ah I see, nice one well it's good that they understand... So what would you say was your favourite thing about Riverdale then
18. Ermm (pause)… don't know that's hard… It could be Friday rewards, but just everything really (enjoys attending; extrinsically motivated by rewards)

119

19. You just like being here

20. Aye

21. Good stuff… So how did you feel when you first found out you were coming here?

22. Well my mam wasn't (happy), cox she'd heard like loads of stuff, like this, like that this was a shit school for naughty kids and that and erm, then they sent iz here (wider perception of riverdale being a poor school; school for naughty kids; was 'sent' to riverdale)

23. Erm, and then I… (distracted by noise) started improving on me work and that, and actually going to school coz when I was in xxxx and xxxx I was always getting kicked out (more effort in riverdale; better attendance at riverdale; regular exclusion from mainstream school) . I done like 12 – 5 at xxxx coz they couldn't manage iz in mainstream, and then they came up with the decision that I was going to xxxx (PRU), then I went to xxxx. And then, I just never really went there, I just used to skive all the time and that (mainstream can't cope with his behaviour; behaviour is within child; poor attendance at mainstream

24. What for?

25. I used to get dead wound up n'that if the work was hard and the teachers wouldn't help iz (behaviour related to frustration; lack of support in mainstream)

26. And what about here?

27. Good, Aye its good (enjoys attending)

28. Excellent, So would you say it's been a good thing moving?

29. Mmmm Hmm … I mess on sometimes, but everyone does, its nowt (behaviour can be bad; lowered behavioural expectations in riverdale).

30. Everyone?

31. John: Pretty much, we wouldn't be here would we if we didn't (laughs)(riverdale for naughty kids)

32. Do you think it's ok to mess on?

33. Well nah not really like, but it's no big deal in here is it (influence of context, Poor behaviour not always acceptable; behaviour no big deal, normalisation of poor behaviour)

34. Why do you think that might be?

35. Coz it's a laugh, everyone does.(behaviour is a source of amusement)

36. So how do you find the other lads then, who come here?

37. Some can be dicks like when they haven't had their medication and that, but most of them are sound (riverdale peers can be annoying; riverdale peers can be pleasant)

38. Right, I see. Some of them take medication?

39. Aye for adhd and that. They need it (perceives medication is needed for some pupils to behave; within child difficulty)

40. Right that's interesting

41. Do you?

42. Me nah, I'm alright most of the time, but I can lose it like a proper nut job sometimes (difficulties controlling behaviour; poor behaviour associated with not being normal)

43. Has that always been the case?

44. Pretty much that's probably why im here I cannit help it (poor behaviour the reason for riverdale attendance; behaviour is uncontrollable)

45. Do you know why you're here?

46. To help me with my behaviour, but I don't really think it's that bad, not all the time anyway (riverdale attendance is to help behaviour, behaviour isn't bad; poor behaviour not a permanent feature)

47. How was it at your last school

48. Me behaviour?

49. Yeah

50. Not as bad as the teachers used to make out, it's just coz they were shit teachers really, they'd go off it with me for nowt.. There were kids worse than me who should be here (mainstream teachers over exaggerated poor behaviour; teacher's inadequacy to blame for poor behaviour; treat unfairly in mainstream)

51. Right, well we all have good and bad days don't we. So what about school work then John, how do you find it?

52. If I didn't mess on id be fine, it's up to me really (Behaviour is a choice; Acceptance of poor behaviour)

53. How was it in your last school?

54. Just the same, you get more help if you need it here (no difference between his behaviour in mainstream or riverdale; more support in riverdale)

55. that's good

56. I don't really need it, like I know this sounds funny, but I reckon im probably cleverer than some of the kids at [name of previous school] (more academically capable than mainstream, support unnecessary)

57. Right

58. I know that sounds like, a bit, ermm (long pause)

59. I think I know what you mean

60. It's true though, it's like [name of Riverdale pupil] he's well clever (perceptions of riverdale pupils being academically capable)

61. Well I've worked with some of the lads here and I know they seemed clever to me… So what do you think you'll be doing after you leave here then, you're in year 10 now aren't you. Do you have any plans for the future?

62. Er, I want to be like a graffiti mentor, to mentor kids that graffiti, to learn how to do it and that (identification of career, helping other kids)

63. Right yeah, is that something which you enjoy doing

64. Is music one of your main interests like John?

65. Aye M.C'ing and spray painting, I reckon that would be a cush job actually with kids and that, showing them how to do it …I've been doing that with the YOT [Youth Offending Team] people(identified career interest, influence of support received)

66. Sounds good, is that something that you could do?

67. Definitely Coz I was on the YOT (youth offending team), and I done this course in the 6 weeks holidays, for three weeks, and all it was like dj-ing and spray painting and just stuff like that, I do it like every Friday, so I'll be doing it tonight(influence of support on career interest)…I dunno, I just think it would be a good job doing something that I like to do and people have helped me so I reckon I would know how to go on (career enjoyment is important; influence of own experiences)

68. Yeah I think that dead important doing something that you'll enjoy, I would agree with that because you'll be working for a long time so best to do something which you enjoy.

69. So where abouts do you do the spray painting then?

70. Erm do you know where the sage is in town?

71. Yeah

72. Just a little place behind there, it's like a youth project where they've got a massive wall for spray painting and a cabin for dj ing and that

73. Sounds good, nice one. So if all went well in the future that's what you could see yourself doing?

74. aye it would be canny (positive emotions regarding career future),

75. Nice one

76. So is that something which you'll need any particular qualifications or experience to get into, or can you just go straight into it?

77. Err, I've already got a qualification off it from doing the three week course, it's like a Arts and music or something like that, but im not sure I might need other stuff (unsure of career requirements for desired occupation)

78. Excellent, good stuff… (Pause)…So I know you're into the painting and DJ ing that great. Is there anything that you think you'll not be doing

79. I wouldn't be a police officer

80. Right

81. Any particular reason

82. Don't like them… plus I'd never be forgiven in my hoose (influence of family career expectations)

83. Do you think if you wanted to be one you could?

84. If I didn't have a criminal record and that (potential barrier to employment)

85. Hmm, Right ok, so apart from the police is there anything which you think you fancy or don't think you could do?

86. Er not really, there might be but I don't know what it is yet (limited awareness of career options, hasn't really considered the future)

87. Ha ha good point yeah. (CH laughs)

88. (john laughs) ..

89. Let's have a think though…is there anything else you would fancy doing for a job john, anything in the world?

90. Nah not really, Id be a footballer but that's not gonna happen (ideal career identified, impossible career)

91. why's that,

92. (john laughs) haway man get real (self-doubt regarding career obtainability) there'll be nee jobs anyway when we're done in school (limited future employment opportunities for his generation)

93. What makes you think that John?

94. Everyone knows there's nee jobs these days (perceived limited availability of jobs)

95. Hmm I think there are, but you're right I think they're harder to come by than maybe it used to be. Nothing else you might fancy?

96. I want to be rich, not just like a bit rich proper loaded (motivated by financial rewards)

97. So money is important?

98. Aye if you want to buy stuff (motivated by material gain)

99. I suppose, how are you going to get rich then John?

100. Nee idea, i reckon I'll have to rob a bank (laughs) (can only obtain money through criminality)

101. Or by getting a good job. Which type of jobs do you think you get paid well?

102. oooh, err, like bankers they get paid stacks don't they, or like... a singer or celebrity... aye must be nice (identification of ideal jobs; well paid jobs are unobtainable to him)

103. Money isn't everything though believe me John, but you could be a banker if you wanted

104. errr I don't think so (doubts he can achieve more financially prestigious jobs)

105. Why is that

106. People who come here don't become bankers (limited career expectations for riverdale pupils)

107. What do they do?

108. Be more, I divn't knaa, be more… Like most people in (name of school) are more likely to be a business man. But people in this school are more likely to work with cars or go in the army or something , I don't know it's weird (perception of different career paths for mainstream and riverdale, associates riverdale with more manual jobs)

109. Do you think you could be a business man?

110. Er I don't think I could be a business man, well I would like to be but it's not something that I could really do (has aspiration for other roles; doubts obtainability)

111. Why do you think that?

112. I don't know...I just don't… (long pause) (defensive, embarrassed?)

113. Fair enough , that's fine… hey there are loads of jobs that I just wouldn't fancy

114. So moving on a bit john, what would you say about the teachers in riverdale and in (name of school) school?

115. Here they're more like, dunno.. dunno how to explain it (perceived difference)

116. Have a think see if you can, there's no hurry

117. Erm,

118. What would you say?

119. Erm, like, like teachers at mainstream don't really understand us, like but the teachers here do, it's just we're different really (riverdale teachers more understanding of difficulties; mainstream teachers don't understand; perception of being different to mainstream)

120. So when you say 'understand us', what do you mean?

121. Just whatever really, like if I was getting a bollocking, they try to make it like a bollocking but like banter as well (riverdale teachers firm; riverdale teachers friendly)

122. I think I know what you mean yeah

123. it's like they're teachers but mates as well, well not really mates they'll still bollock you if you mess up like, but like that's their job isn't it'. And erm like, mainstream its just something that they've (teachers) never seen before so they don't know how to go on (riverdale teachers are friendly; being strict is part of their job; lack of understanding from mainstream teachers; mainstream teachers unexperienced in dealing with difficulties)

124. yeah, I guess understanding people is important

125. totally , yeah) (long pause), but a lot of the teachers (mainstream) can't handle kids like us, they can only cope with ones who never do owt (being understood is important; mainstream teachers don't have necessary skills)

126. How do you mean?

127. Like the kids that behave all the time.. wey I mean we're not that bad it's just how it is, but some teachers just won't have even like banter, they're proper strict (behaviour isn't really bad; mainstream teachers wont engage with 'banter')

128. Are the teachers strict here?

129. Well aye, but like I say, you can have craic with them as well (riverdale teachers firm but friendly)

130. Hmmm, I think that's important

131. It is yeah.

132. So, again moving on a bit John. What do you think about the kids in other schools?

133. Swots, like xxxx he's a right swot , im different (mainstream pupils are swots; mainstream pupils are different)

134. Why is that?

135. Just behaviour and that (behaviour is different to mainstream pupils)

136. What about other stuff?

137. Well im the same in like lots of ways coz some of the kids I knock about with, but they can keep out of bother (similar to mainstream pupils in other areas; socialises with mainstream pupils; mainstream pupils better at staying out of trouble)

138. But you can't?

139. Na, I just cannit shut up sometimes (pause) (being quiet is difficult/not possible)

140. So you still know people in [name of mainstream school] John?

141. Yeah loads, most of them are proper goody goodies' though (mainstream pupil behaviour is compliant)

142. How do you mean?

143. Like they never do anything wrong or get told off, proper soft lads (perceptions of weakness; derision of behaviour)

144. How does that make you feel

145. like… get a life (laughs) (mocks behavioural compliance; good behaviour not a desirable quality)

146. So in terms of your future how do you feel about it,

147. Sweet, like I think I'll be able to handle it, it'll be good (positive attitude towards future prospects)

148. Nice one, so is there anything else about Riverdale or your future that you think is important.

149. Anything particularly good or particularly bad?

150. Nowt really bad in this school really… like all the kids in the school are treated the same, they don't treat you differently or nowt. But where in mainstream, like if you were the naughty one in mainstream, they (teachers) wouldn't really have the time of day for you or were always on at you for no reason (perceptions of equality/fairness in riverdale; reputation gets you singled out in mainstream; not helped if you have reputation for bad behaviour in mainstream; told off for no reason)

151. Right, But they've got time for everybody in here?

152. Aye , It's just an everyday thing in this school really isn't it (accepted in riverdale; accepted as 'the norm')

153. Hmm maybe here I guess, not everywhere though. Do you think the pupils like that?

154. Aye if you think people are bothered about you then you're bothered more... well some of us are, some of the kids still go on like nobs sometimes. I don't really mess on that much (respect is reciprocal; some riverdale pupils aren't respectful; doesn't misbehave)

155. Hmmm, is that fair people going on like that?

156. No its out of order... the teachers are sound so it's not on really. It's hard sometimes though coz it's a laugh when you're bored and it makes you look soft if you behave (behaviour protects identity; misbehaviour not acceptable; respect for teachers; difficulty controlling behaviour; poor behaviour can be funny; boredom reason for misbehaviour)

157. So how would you describe the guys in [name of school]?

158. Same as us, they're nee different, some of them are worse than us actually, a lot worse (behaviour same as mainstream; no difference in behaviour; mainstream behaviour is worse than riverdale)

159. Really, how do you mean?

160. Like, they mess on as well, but not get caught. I still knock about with [name of pupil] at home and he's always in bother but he's still in [name of school] coz the teachers liked him (mainstream pupils better at hiding behaviour; socialises with mainstream pupil; perceptions of preferential treatment depending if liked or not)

161. but he's worse than you?

162. Wey he's not worse, but not better, but the teachers liked him though (behavioural similarity with mainstream pupil; disliked by mainstream teachers)

163. Ah I See

164. How long we gonna be here for?

165. Just as long as you want really John. Is there anything else you want to tell me about school, stuff you like or don't like

166. Na not really like, I think that's it.

167. Ok, do you want to go now

168. Aye

169. well I think we've covered lots of stuff. Its been great talking with you John so thanks a lot for helping me out today.

170. No bother

Appendix C

Example of Global theme generation process. – 'Behavioural Perceptions'

cross reference blue text with Appendix B transcript for initial code examples

Data Extract (source of Initial coding)	Refined Initial coding (basic themes)	Organising theme	Global theme
They're (teachers) just used to people going on like that T1, L14... he'd expect that though T3,L83... they know that's what im like T4,L92... the teachers here wouldn't be bothered by it T5,L134... it's like they know us better T6,L43... if I kick off its nothing coz they expect it T4,154... they (teachers) expect us to mess on T6,L56	• Perceived teacher behavioural expectations	Behavioural Expectations	
Messing on and stuff, people think that's how it is here, but it's not T1, L16... People expect we're fu**ing nutters T5,L203... that's what people think though isn't it, that we're all bad T3,L101... people think they're (mainstream)well behaved and we're not T4,L174-175... people; like they hear Riverdale and shit themselves T5,L207...they think wa idiots T5,L131... this was a shit school for naughty kids T1,L22	• Perceived societal view of Riverdale and mainstream behaviour		Behavioural Perceptions
It's just what we do here T2,L23...you get used to it happening so it's weird if it's not T3,L162...it's what people expect T4,L211... people kick off, it's just how it is here T5,L119... wey I wouldn't be here if my behaviour was good would I T2,L45... I mess on sometimes, but everyone does, its nowt T1,L29...you can get away with more in this school T6,L94... we're not that bad T1,L127	• Pupil expectations of Riverdale behaviour		

It's a laugh T3, L61... I know I shouldn't but it's well funny sometimes T6, L92... 'Class' T5, L72...coz It's a laugh when you're bored T1, 156...I got bollocked but it was such a laugh T5, L118... it's a laugh T2, L221... *You get the piss seriously taken out of you if you went on like that T2,L136 ...totally mocked T6, L45... wouldn't be my mate T4,L116... makes you look soft if you behave T1,L156... it puts a message out T3,L122... sometimes you've got to join in or people will think you're like scared T3,L93*	• Behaviour is a source of amusement • Identity protection	Behaviour serves a purpose	
They couldn't manage iz in mainstream T1, L23... It's just how I've always gone on T2, L189 .... It's just how I am T2, L192... that's just me though T3, L42... that's what im like but T5, L71... Some of them take medication? Aye for adhd and that. They need it T1,L38-39 *I cannit help it T1, L44... I just cannit shut up sometimes T1, 139... I just lose it sometimes T4, L213... I can be a proper radjee T5, L72... I just blow I can't help it T3, L181 ... I go off on one T4, 177... there's nowt I can do sometimes T2, L162... I know it's probably me but I can't help it T3, L51... I find it hard to bite my tongue T6, L128... I can flip like T6,L139* *Didn't see the big deal to be honest T2,L204... it's just how it is T1,L127, didn't even do anything ,I do that all the time T4,L211... on my case for nowt T5,L23... always on at you for no reason T1,L150... It's just normal T5,L132... that's normal for here though, its nowt T4,L113*	• Behaviour is inherent • Behaviour is out of their control • Behaviour is 'normal'	Behaviour is 'who they are'	

I know its wrong T3,L201… yeah it's out of order T1,L156…only the knackers think it's ok T5,L142… he shouldn't be going on like that T3,L241… the teachers are sound so it's not on really T1,L156… id be pissed off if someone was going on like that T2,L161… you get some proper idiots though T6,L45	• Behaviour not acceptable	Attitude towards behaviour	
I don't really mess on that much T1, L154… Im well behaved sometimes T3, L70… I don't mess on half as much as some of them T4,L116… you've got to join in or you'll get this piss taken T6,L129…you've got to stick up for yourself even if it's just banter T5,L88	• Defence of behaviour		
People might think they're (mainstream) different but tha not T5, L203… nee difference T3, L223… they're nee different. T1, L158… people think they're well behaved and we're not T4,L174-175…just the same really T2,L231	• No behaviour difference with mainstream peers	Comparison with mainstream	
some of the kids I know would get kicked out of here T3,L192…their behaviour is worse, well sometimes it is T6,L122… like xxxx at xxxx, …I don't even know why im here, there's kids at xxxx far worse than me T2,L134… some of them are worse than us actually T1, 158	• Mainstream behaviour is worse than Riverdale		
Proper goodie, goodies T1,L141… they never kick off they just accept it T5,L131… swots… they're scared to do anything wrong or get told off T6,L136…they just get on and say nowt like proper swots T2,L169… like xxxx he's a right swot T1,L133	• Mainstream behaviour is compliant or 'swotty'		

Appendix D

Consent form for persons participating in research projects

Project Title: How do pupils attending a school for SEBD perceive their Current Selves and Possible Occupational Selves?

Name of Investigator: Mr. Chris Heslop

Name of Supervisors: Mrs Wilma Barrow and Dr. Simon Gibbs

1. I consent to participation in the above project, the particulars of which - including details of tests or procedures - have been explained to me.

2. I understand that my views will be recorded on tape, for purposes of analysis. These tape recordings will be held securely, and full erased once the project is complete

3. I acknowledge that:

    (a) The possible effects of the procedures have been explained to me to my satisfaction.

    (b) I have been informed that I am free to withdraw my consent from the project at any time and to request the withdrawal of any unprocessed data previously supplied.

    (c) The project is for the purpose of research and not for treatment.

    (d) I have been informed that the confidentiality of the information provided will be safeguarded, subject to any legal requirements.

Name of Participant …………………………………………………………………….

Signed ……………………………………………………………………………………

Thank you.

Appendix E

Consent form for parents/carers of persons participating in research projects

Project Title: How do pupils attending a school for SEBD perceive their Current Selves and Possible Occupational Selves?

Name of Investigator: Mr. Chris Heslop
Name of Supervisors: Mrs. Wilma Barrow and Dr. Simon Gibbs

1.   I give consent for my child to participate in the above project, the particulars of which - including details of tests or procedures - have been explained to me.

2.   I authorise the involvement of my child with the procedures referred to under (1) above.

3.   I understand that the views of my child will be recorded on tape, for purposes of analysis. These tape recordings will be held securely, and deleted once the project is complete

4.   I acknowledge that:

    (a)   The possible effects of the procedures have been explained to me to my satisfaction.

    (b)   I have been informed that I am free to withdraw my consent from the project at any time and to request the withdrawal of any unprocessed data previously supplied.

    (c)   The project is for the purpose of research and not for treatment.

    (d)   I have been informed that the confidentiality of the information provided will be safeguarded, subject to any legal requirements.

Name of Child (Participant) …………………………………………………………………..

Name of Parent/Carer …………………………………………………………………..

Signed …………………………………………………………………………………………..

Appendix F

How do pupils attending a school for SEBD perceive their Current Selves and Possible Occupational Selves?

Debriefing Sheet

Thank you for participating in this study.

One of the main aims in this study was to gather the views of young people, with regards to how the perceive their 'current self' as a Riverdale pupil, compare with other pupils, and what their future plans are for when they leave school.

The study utilised 'semi structured interviewing as the primary method for collecting the views of students. This method was chosen as it was selected by the students as the preferred method of expressing their views. It is hoped that the experience was enjoyable, and also allowed students only to share information which they are comfortable in sharing. The process was designed to be as stress free as possible and hopefully enjoyable.

One of the reasons for my interest in the views of students attending the school is that very little research has been carried out on obtaining the views of young people attending SEBD schools, with regards to their future. I am interested in trying to understand if particular 'futures' are considered more or less possible to students, and the thought processes which might underlie these beliefs.

My overall interpretation of pupil's perspectives with regards to comparison with mainstream school pupils was that they perceive themselves as similar to mainstream pupils in many ways, such as their academic ability and behaviour. However, they appeared keen to promote some of the individual personality traits which they feel differentiates them from mainstream students. These students also appeared to perceive fairly negative expectations of them, from wider society.

All participants were able to identify a career which they hoped to follow when they finish school, and appeared positive about their futures. However, the paths to achieving these careers, and alternative career options were not always known. These skills may be an appropriate area for future exploration/development within the school.

Thank you again for helping with this study, your participation is valued and very much appreciated.

If you would like more information, or have any further questions about any aspect of this study, then please feel free to contact Mr. Chris Heslop:

Educational Psychology Department,   Ph. 0191 643 8739

Newcastle University,   Email: c.heslop1@ncl.ac.uk

King George VI Building,

Queen Victoria. Road,

Newcastle,

NE1 7RU

Appendix G

Examples of Semi-Structured Guiding Questions.

- Can you tell me a bit about what school is like at the moment for you?

- What are your favourite things about school?

- Is there anything you don't like about school?

- Why do you think you're at Riverdale School?

- What's the work like here?

- How was it at your last school?

- Can you tell me about the other pupils in Riverdale?

- How did you find the kids at your last school?

- What are the teachers like at this school?

- What were the teachers like at your last school?

- What would you think you'll do when you leave school?

- Is there anything you think you couldn't do/why?

- If you could do anything what would it be?

Appendix H

Study	Included or rejected	Reason if rejected
Oyserman, Terry and Bybee (2002)	Rejected	Age of participants unclear
Bozgeyikli & Dogan (2010)	Included	Meets inclusion criteria
Prideaux (2003)	Rejected	Not published in peer reviewed Journal (Thesis) – theoretical not empirical
O'Brien (1999)	Included	Meets inclusion criteria
Shea, Ma,Yeh,Lee & Pituc (2009)	Rejected	Age of participants crossed age limits criteria
Creed, Wong & Hood (2009)	Rejected	Age of participants crossed age limits criteria
Kerr & Robinson Kurpius (2004)	Included	Meets inclusion criteria
Chung (2002)	Rejected	Conceptual focus of study not CDSME enhancment (testing of a scale)
Scott & Ciani (2008)	Rejected	Incorrect age range, too old
Dawes, Horan & Hackett (2000)	Included	Meets inclusion criteria
Speight, Rosenthal, Jones & Gastenveld (1995)	Included	Meets inclusion criteria
Fouad & Smith (1996)	Rejected	CDSME development not the conceptual focus
McWhirter, Rasheed & Crothers (2000)	Included	Meets inclusion criteria
Brown, Darden, Shelton & Dipoto (1999)	Rejected	Age range of participants and conceptual focus of study. (comparison of urban/suburban CDSME)
O'Brien et al (2000)	Included	Meets inclusion criteria
Powel & Luzzo (1998)	Rejected	CDSME is used as an independent variable on career maturity
Turner & Laplan (2004)	Included	Meets inclusion criteria
Turner & Conkel (2010)	Included	Meets inclusion criteria
Reese & Miller (2006)	Rejected	Wrong age range
Koivisto,Vinokur & Vuori (2011)	Included	Meets inclusion criteria

Appendix I - Examples of EPPI Centre Weight of Evidence (WoE) Tool

Bozgeygklg & Dogan (2010)

N.1 Are there ethical concerns about the way the study was done? *Consider consent, funding, privacy, etc.*	N.1.1 Yes, some concerns (please specify) N.1.2 No (please specify)	No mention of consent. Lowest 60 of 215 participants with low CDMSE chosen to access intervention, what about others?
N.2 Were students and/or parents appropriately involved in the design or conduct of the study? *Consider your answer to the appropriate question in module B.1*	N.2.1 Yes, a lot (please specify) N.2.2 Yes, a little (please specify) N.2.3 No (please specify)	No neither were involved
N.3 Is there sufficient justification for why the study was done the way it was? *Consider answers to questions B1, B2, B3, B4*	N.3.1 Yes (please specify) N.3.2 No (please specify)	No, particpants were selected based on a subjective view of which pupils had high/low CDSME
N.4 Was the choice of research design appropriate for addressing the research question(s) posed?	N.4.1 yes, completely (please specify) N.4.2 No (please specify)	No comparisons were only made between groups, no mention of pre/post individual scores
N.5 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data collection methods or tools? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the reliability or repeatability of their data collection tools and methods (K7)*	N.5.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.5.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.5.3 No, none (please specify)	Pre- test equivalence of control and experimental groups was done. Control group Participants not randomly allocated or selected Measures of internal consistency are given
N.6 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data collection tools and methods? *Consider your answers to*	N.6.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.6.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.6.3 No, none (please	Measures of validity are not given

previous questions: *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of their data collection tools/ methods (K6)*	==specify)==	
N.7 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? (L7)*	N.7.1 Yes (please specify) ==N.7.2 No (please specify)==	None are given
N.8 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? (L8, L9, L10, L11)*	N.8.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.8.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) ==N.8.3 No, none (please specify)==	None are given
N.9 To what extent are the research design and methods employed able to rule out any other sources of error/bias which would lead to alternative explanations for the findings of the study? *e.g. (1) In an evaluation, was the process by which participants were allocated to, or otherwise received the factor being evaluated, concealed and not predictable in advance? If not, were sufficient substitute procedures employed with adequate rigour to rule out any alternative explanations of the findings which arise as a result?*	N.9.1 A lot (please specify) ==N.9.2 A little (please specify)== N.9.3 Not at all (please specify)	The research design and methods leave the study open to many potential sources of bias. Particularly in the allocation of participants to control and experimental groups

e.g. (2) Was the attrition rate low and, if applicable, similar between different groups?		
N.10 How generalisable are the study results?	N.10.1 Details	To a degree.
N.11 In light of the above, do the reviewers differ from the authors over the findings or conclusions of the study?	N.11.1 Not applicable (no difference in conclusions) N.11.2 Yes (please specify)	concerns with the size of t scores, efficacy of intervention appears unrealistic No limitations of the study are given
N.12 Have sufficient attempts been made to justify the conclusions drawn from the findings, so that the conclusions are trustworthy?	N.12.1 Not applicable (results and conclusions inseparable) N.12.2 High trustworthiness N.12.3 Medium trustworthiness N.12.4 Low trustworthiness	
N.13 Weight of evidence A: Taking account of all quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering the study question(s)? *In some studies it is difficult to distinguish between the findings of the study and the conclusions. In those cases, please code the trustworthiness of these combined results/conclusions.*	N.13.1 High trustworthiness N.13.2 Medium trustworthiness N.13.3 Low trustworthiness	
N.14 Weight of evidence B: Appropriateness of research design and analysis for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this specific systematic review.	N.14.1 High N.14.2 Medium N.14.3 Low	
N.15 Weight of evidence C: Relevance of particular focus of the study	N.15.1 High N.15.2 Medium	

(including conceptual focus, context, sample and measures) for addressing the question of this specific systematic review	N.15.3 Low	
N.16 Weight of evidence D: Overall weight of evidence *Taking into account quality of execution, appropriateness of design and relevance of focus, what is the overall weight of evidence this study provides to answer the question of this specific systematic review?*	N.16.1 High <mark>N.16.2 Medium</mark> N.16.3 Low	

Dawes et al (2000)

N.1 Are there ethical concerns about the way the study was done? *Consider consent, funding, privacy, etc.*	<mark>N.1.1 Yes, some concerns (please specify)</mark> N.1.2 No (please specify)	Study states that some 'special needs' students data was not included, as they were unable to fill complete assessments. No details of consent, or debriefing are given
N.2 Were students and/or parents appropriately involved in the design or conduct of the study? *Consider your answer to the appropriate question in module B.1*	N.2.1 Yes, a lot (please specify) N.2.2 Yes, a little (please specify) N.2.3 No (please specify)	No details were given regarding the involvement of students or parents in the design of the study.
N.3 Is there sufficient justification for why the study was done the way it was? *Consider answers to questions B1, B2, B3, B4*	<mark>N.3.1 Yes (please specify)</mark> N.3.2 No (please specify)	Authors give explanation of why the study was done in classes (naturalistic opportunity) and explain reasoning behind student grouping
N.4 Was the choice of research design appropriate for addressing the research question(s) posed?	<mark>N.4.1 yes, completely (please specify)</mark> N.4.2 No (please specify)	Good attempts made to study students in a naturalistic environment
N.5 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data collection methods or tools?	<mark>N.5.1 Yes, good (please specify)</mark> N.5.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify)	Reliability statistic are given for the tools used

Consider your answers to previous questions: *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the reliability or repeatability of their data collection tools and methods (K7)*	N.5.3 No, none (please specify)	
N.6 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data collection tools and methods? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of their data collection tools/ methods (K6)*	N.6.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.6.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.6.3 No, none (please specify)	Validity statistics are stated for the measures used
N.7 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? (L7)*	N.7.1 Yes (please specify) N.7.2 No (please specify)	Doctoral student, experimentally blind to hypothesis and participant treatment conditions, used to classify responses.
N.8 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? (L8, L9, L10, L11)*	N.8.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.8.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.8.3 No, none (please specify)	Doctoral student, experimentally blind to hypothesis and participant treatment conditions, used to classify responses.
N.9 To what extent are the research design and methods employed able to rule out any other sources of error/bias which would lead to alternative explanations for the findings of the study? *e.g. (1) In an evaluation, was the process by which*	N.9.1 A lot (please specify) N.9.2 A little (please specify) N.9.3 Not at all (please specify)	• Random allocation to groups. • Implementation of study done in naturalistic conditions.

participants were allocated to, or otherwise received the factor being evaluated, concealed and not predictable in advance? If not, were sufficient substitute procedures employed with adequate rigour to rule out any alternative explanations of the findings which arise as a result? *e.g. (2) Was the attrition rate low and, if applicable, similar between different groups?*		
N.10 How generalisable are the study results?	N.10.1 Details	Not really
N.11 In light of the above, do the reviewers differ from the authors over the findings or conclusions of the study? *Please state what any difference is.*	<mark>N.11.1 Not applicable (no difference in conclusions)</mark> N.11.2 Yes (please specify)	
N.12 Have sufficient attempts been made to justify the conclusions drawn from the findings, so that the conclusions are trustworthy?	<mark>N.12.1 Not applicable (results and conclusions inseparable)</mark> N.12.2 High trustworthiness N.12.3 Medium trustworthiness N.12.4 Low trustworthiness	Conclusions only really comment on how the study could be improved and suggesting reason for the absence of significant results
N.13 Weight of evidence A: Taking account of all quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering the study question(s)? *In some studies it is difficult to distinguish between the findings of the study and the conclusions. In those cases, please code the trustworthiness of these combined results/conclusions.*	N.13.1 High trustworthiness <mark>N.13.2 Medium trustworthiness</mark> N.13.3 Low trustworthiness	
N.14 Weight of evidence B: Appropriateness of	N.14.1 High	

research design and analysis for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this specific systematic review.	N.14.2 Medium N.14.3 Low	
N.15 Weight of evidence C: Relevance of particular focus of the study (including conceptual focus, context, sample and measures) for addressing the question of this specific systematic review	N.15.1 High N.15.2 Medium N.15.3 Low	
N.16 Weight of evidence D: Overall weight of evidence *Taking into account quality of execution, appropriateness of design and relevance of focus, what is the overall weight of evidence this study provides to answer the question of this specific systematic review?*	N.16.1 High N.16.2 Medium N.16.3 Low	

Kerr & Kurpius (2004)

N.1 Are there ethical concerns about the way the study was done? *Consider consent, funding, privacy, etc.*	N.1.1 Yes, some concerns (please specify) N.1.2 No (please specify)	Students 'identified' as not reaching potential. Parental consent gained but no mention of opt out for students. Study funded by National Science Foundation. Vested interest in the study yielding positive results
N.2 Were students and/or parents appropriately involved in the design or conduct of the study? *Consider your answer to the appropriate question in module B.1*	N.2.1 Yes, a lot (please specify) N.2.2 Yes, a little (please specify) N.2.3 No (please specify)	Consent was gained from parents, no involvement in the design of the study
N.3 Is there sufficient justification for why the study was done the way it was? *Consider answers to*	N.3.1 Yes (please specify) N.3.2 No (please specify)	Yes justification was given, as students were at risk of underachievement. However study was funded by national Science Foundation

questions B1, B2, B3, B4		so a vested interest may be considered
N.4 Was the choice of research design appropriate for addressing the research question(s) posed?	N.4.1 yes, completely (please specify) N.4.2 No (please specify)	Lack of control group. Particularly as gains were assessed after 3 -4 months, many other confounding variables on results
N.5 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data collection methods or tools? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the reliability or repeatability of their data collection tools and methods (K7)*	N.5.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.5.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.5.3 No, none (please specify)	Cronbach's alpha statistics are given for the tools used
N.6 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data collection tools and methods? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of their data collection tools/ methods (K6)*	N.6.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.6.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.6.3 No, none (please specify)	Tools used are published materials
N.7 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? (L7)*	N.7.1 Yes (please specify) N.7.2 No (please specify)	No attempts made
N.8 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any*	N.8.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.8.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.8.3 No, none (please specify)	No attempts made

ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? (L8, L9, L10, L11)		
N.9 To what extent are the research design and methods employed able to rule out any other sources of error/bias which would lead to alternative explanations for the findings of the study? *e.g. (1) In an evaluation, was the process by which participants were allocated to, or otherwise received the factor being evaluated, concealed and not predictable in advance? If not, were sufficient substitute procedures employed with adequate rigour to rule out any alternative explanations of the findings which arise as a result?* *e.g. (2) Was the attrition rate low and, if applicable, similar between different groups?*	N.9.1 A lot (please specify) N.9.2 A little (please specify) <mark>N.9.3 Not at all (please specify)</mark>	• No control group • Students individually identified for study. • Different rates of attrition in responses.
N.10 How generalisable are the study results?	N.10.1 Details	Not at all
N.11 In light of the above, do the reviewers differ from the authors over the findings or conclusions of the study? *Please state what any difference is.*	N.11.1 Not applicable (no difference in conclusions) <mark>N.11.2 Yes (please specify)</mark>	Yes, the conclusions of the programme have been shaped around the significant findings. They don't really address the initial research question.
N.12 Have sufficient attempts been made to justify the conclusions drawn from the findings, so that the conclusions are trustworthy?	N.12.1 Not applicable (results and conclusions inseparable) N.12.2 High trustworthiness N.12.3 Medium trustworthiness <mark>N.12.4 Low trustworthiness</mark>	Conclusions have been shaped around significant findings. Non- significant findings have been largely ignored

N.13 Weight of evidence A: Taking account of all quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering the study question(s)? *In some studies it is difficult to distinguish between the findings of the study and the conclusions. In those cases, please code the trustworthiness of these combined results/conclusions.*	N.13.1 High trustworthiness N.13.2 Medium trustworthiness N.13.3 Low trustworthiness	
N.14 Weight of evidence B: Appropriateness of research design and analysis for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this specific systematic review.	N.14.1 High N.14.2 Medium N.14.3 Low	
N.15 Weight of evidence C: Relevance of particular focus of the study (including conceptual focus, context, sample and measures) for addressing the question of this specific systematic review	N.15.1 High N.15.2 Medium N.15.3 Low	
N.16 Weight of evidence D: Overall weight of evidence *Taking into account quality of execution, appropriateness of design and relevance of focus, what is the overall weight of evidence this study provides to answer the question of this specific systematic review?*	N.16.1 High N.16.2 Medium N.16.3 Low	

Koivisto et al 2011

N.1 Are there ethical concerns about the way the study was done? *Consider consent, funding, privacy, etc.*	N.1.1 Yes, some concerns (please specify) N.1.2 No (please specify)	No students were given option of whether or not to fill out questionnaires
N.2 Were students and/or parents appropriately involved in the design or conduct of the study? *Consider your answer to the appropriate question in module B.1*	N.2.1 Yes, a lot (please specify) N.2.2 Yes, a little (please specify) N.2.3 No (please specify)	Parental were given details of the study before intervention took place
N.3 Is there sufficient justification for why the study was done the way it was? *Consider answers to questions B1, B2, B3, B4*	N.3.1 Yes (please specify) N.3.2 No (please specify)	Yes full details and justification are given regarding the Finnish school system and modification of tools used
N.4 Was the choice of research design appropriate for addressing the research question(s) posed?	N.4.1 yes, completely (please specify) N.4.2 No (please specify)	Yes, control groups were used and design was based on previous studies.
N.5 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data collection methods or tools? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the reliability or repeatability of their data collection tools and methods (K7)*	N.5.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.5.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.5.3 No, none (please specify)	Yes Cronbach's alpha statistics are given
N.6 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data collection tools and methods? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of their data collection tools/ methods (K6)*	N.6.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.6.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.6.3 No, none (please specify)	Yes details of the same methods have been used in previous studies, and are explained. Face validity was assessed by student reaction to questionnaires All workshop trainers had taken 3 day training course Structured workbooks to deliver from
N.7 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data analysis?	N.7.1 Yes (please specify) N.7.2 No (please specify)	Yes data was subject to further analysis.

Consider your answer to the previous question: *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? (L7)*		
N.8 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? (L8, L9, L10, L11)*	N.8.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.8.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.8.3 No, none (please specify)	
N.9 To what extent are the research design and methods employed able to rule out any other sources of error/bias which would lead to alternative explanations for the findings of the study? *e.g. (1) In an evaluation, was the process by which participants were allocated to, or otherwise received the factor being evaluated, concealed and not predictable in advance? If not, were sufficient substitute procedures employed with adequate rigour to rule out any alternative explanations of the findings which arise as a result?* *e.g. (2) Was the attrition rate low and, if applicable, similar between different groups?*	N.9.1 A lot (please specify) N.9.2 A little (please specify) N.9.3 Not at all (please specify)	• Randomised group allocation • Attrition was analysed • Large sample size • Control group
N.10 How generalisable are the study results?	N.10.1 Details	The fact that the questionnaire was altered to suit the finnish education system limits the generalizability of the findings

N.11 In light of the above, do the reviewers differ from the authors over the findings or conclusions of the study? *Please state what any difference is.*	<mark>N.11.1 Not applicable (no difference in conclusions)</mark> N.11.2 Yes (please specify)	
N.12 Have sufficient attempts been made to justify the conclusions drawn from the findings, so that the conclusions are trustworthy?	N.12.1 Not applicable (results and conclusions inseparable) <mark>N.12.2 High trustworthiness</mark> N.12.3 Medium trustworthiness N.12.4 Low trustworthiness	
N.13 Weight of evidence A: Taking account of all quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering the study question(s)? *In some studies it is difficult to distinguish between the findings of the study and the conclusions. In those cases, please code the trustworthiness of these combined results/conclusions.*	<mark>N.13.1 High trustworthiness</mark> N.13.2 Medium trustworthiness N.13.3 Low trustworthiness	
N.14 Weight of evidence B: Appropriateness of research design and analysis for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this specific systematic review.	<mark>N.14.1 High</mark> N.14.2 Medium N.14.3 Low	
N.15 Weight of evidence C: Relevance of particular focus of the study (including conceptual focus, context, sample and measures) for addressing the question of this specific systematic review	N.15.1 High <mark>N.15.2 Medium</mark> N.15.3 Low	
N.16 Weight of evidence D: Overall weight of evidence *Taking into account quality of execution,*	<mark>N.16.1 High</mark> N.16.2 Medium N.16.3 Low	

appropriateness of design and relevance of focus, what is the overall weight of evidence this study provides to answer the question of this specific systematic review?		

McWhirter, Rasheed & Crothers (2000)

N.1 Are there ethical concerns about the way the study was done? *Consider consent, funding, privacy, etc.*	N.1.1 Yes, some concerns (please specify) N.1.2 No (please specify)	No mention of consent
N.2 Were students and/or parents appropriately involved in the design or conduct of the study? *Consider your answer to the appropriate question in module B.1*	N.2.1 Yes, a lot (please specify) N.2.2 Yes, a little (please specify) N.2.3 No (please specify)	Parents were not involved.
N.3 Is there sufficient justification for why the study was done the way it was? *Consider answers to questions B1, B2, B3, B4*	N.3.1 Yes (please specify) N.3.2 No (please specify)	Justification given and reasoning behind study is given
N.4 Was the choice of research design appropriate for addressing the research question(s) posed?	N.4.1 yes, completely (please specify) N.4.2 No (please specify)	No, nonrandomised selection and lack of control
N.5 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data collection methods or tools? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the reliability or repeatability of their data collection tools and methods (K7)*	N.5.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.5.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.5.3 No, none (please specify)	Yes statistics are given Test –retest reliability carried out on devised scales
N.6 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data collection tools and methods? *Consider your answers to*	N.6.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.6.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.6.3 No, none (please	Published tools, widely used in other research were used Concurrent vailidity was assessed of the new measures devised.

previous questions: *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of their data collection tools/ methods (K6)*	specify)	Convergent and discriminative validity estimates were also taken for sub scales
N.7 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? (L7)*	<mark>N.7.1 Yes (please specify)</mark> N.7.2 No (please specify)	Test retest reliability measures were taken
N.8 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? (L8, L9, L10, L11)*	N.8.1 Yes, good (please specify) <mark>N.8.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify)</mark> N.8.3 No, none (please specify)	Further data analysis was undertaken
N.9 To what extent are the research design and methods employed able to rule out any other sources of error/bias which would lead to alternative explanations for the findings of the study? *e.g. (1) In an evaluation, was the process by which participants were allocated to, or otherwise received the factor being evaluated, concealed and not predictable in advance? If not, were sufficient substitute procedures employed with adequate rigour to rule out any alternative explanations of the findings which arise as a result?*	N.9.1 A lot (please specify) <mark>N.9.2 A little (please specify)</mark> N.9.3 Not at all (please specify)	- Pre- test equivalence of groups was assessed - Differences in teacher support were assessed But - No control group - No randomised allocation

e.g. (2) Was the attrition rate low and, if applicable, similar between different groups?		
N.10 How generalisable are the study results?	N.10.1 Details	A little
N.11 In light of the above, do the reviewers differ from the authors over the findings or conclusions of the study? *Please state what any difference is.*	N.11.1 Not applicable (no difference in conclusions) N.11.2 Yes (please specify)	
N.12 Have sufficient attempts been made to justify the conclusions drawn from the findings, so that the conclusions are trustworthy?	N.12.1 Not applicable (results and conclusions inseparable) N.12.2 High trustworthiness N.12.3 Medium trustworthiness N.12.4 Low trustworthiness	
N.13 Weight of evidence A: Taking account of all quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering the study question(s)? *In some studies it is difficult to distinguish between the findings of the study and the conclusions. In those cases, please code the trustworthiness of these combined results/conclusions.*	N.13.1 High trustworthiness N.13.2 Medium trustworthiness N.13.3 Low trustworthiness	
N.14 Weight of evidence B: Appropriateness of research design and analysis for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this specific systematic review.	N.14.1 High N.14.2 Medium N.14.3 Low	
N.15 Weight of evidence C: Relevance of particular focus of the study (including conceptual focus, context, sample	N.15.1 High N.15.2 Medium N.15.3 Low	

and measures) for addressing the question of this specific systematic review		
N.16 Weight of evidence D: Overall weight of evidence *Taking into account quality of execution, appropriateness of design and relevance of focus, what is the overall weight of evidence this study provides to answer the question of this specific systematic review?*	N.16.1 High N.16.2 Medium N.16.3 Low	

Obrien et al, (1999)

N.1 Are there ethical concerns about the way the study was done? *Consider consent, funding, privacy, etc.*	N.1.1 Yes, some concerns (please specify) N.1.2 No (please specify)	Parental consent gathered. Students applied to be involved
N.2 Were students and/or parents appropriately involved in the design or conduct of the study? *Consider your answer to the appropriate question in module B.1*	N.2.1 Yes, a lot (please specify) N.2.2 Yes, a little (please specify) N.2.3 No (please specify)	Yes in the application procedure for the study, and in parts of the programme
N.3 Is there sufficient justification for why the study was done the way it was? *Consider answers to questions B1, B2, B3, B4*	N.3.1 Yes (please specify) N.3.2 No (please specify)	Yes
N.4 Was the choice of research design appropriate for addressing the research question(s) posed?	N.4.1 yes, completely (please specify) N.4.2 No (please specify)	Within subjects study, no control group. Students selected for study, selection bias possible
N.5 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data collection methods or tools? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any*	N.5.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.5.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.5.3 No, none (please specify)	Yes reliability figures for scales used are given

ways they have addressed the reliability or repeatability of their data collection tools and methods (K7)		
N.6 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data collection tools and methods? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of their data collection tools/ methods (K6)*	N.6.1 Yes, good (please specify) <mark>N.6.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify)</mark> N.6.3 No, none (please specify)	Yes internal consistency figures are given for each of the scales used
N.7 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? (L7)*	N.7.1 Yes (please specify) <mark>N.7.2 No (please specify)</mark>	No attempts made
N.8 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? (L8, L9, L10, L11)*	N.8.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.8.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) <mark>N.8.3 No, none (please specify)</mark>	Authour do not mention how they may have addressed this issue
N.9 To what extent are the research design and methods employed able to rule out any other sources of error/bias which would lead to alternative explanations for the findings of the study? *e.g. (1) In an evaluation, was the process by which participants were allocated to, or otherwise received the factor being evaluated, concealed and not*	N.9.1 A lot (please specify) <mark>N.9.2 A little (please specify)</mark> N.9.3 Not at all (please specify)	Participants volunteered for study and were then hand-picked. Considerable potential for selection bias

predictable in advance? If not, were sufficient substitute procedures employed with adequate rigour to rule out any alternative explanations of the findings which arise as a result? *e.g. (2) Was the attrition rate low and, if applicable, similar between different groups?*		
N.10 How generalisable are the study results?	N.10.1 Details	A little.
N.11 In light of the above, do the reviewers differ from the authors over the findings or conclusions of the study? *Please state what any difference is.*	N.11.1 Not applicable (no difference in conclusions) N.11.2 Yes (please specify)	No, as the authors make reference to the limitations of the study and some methodological shortcomings
N.12 Have sufficient attempts been made to justify the conclusions drawn from the findings, so that the conclusions are trustworthy?	N.12.1 Not applicable (results and conclusions inseparable) N.12.2 High trustworthiness N.12.3 Medium trustworthiness N.12.4 Low trustworthiness	
N.13 Weight of evidence A: Taking account of all quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering the study question(s)? ***In some studies it is difficult to distinguish between the findings of the study and the conclusions. In those cases, please code the trustworthiness of these combined results/conclusions.***	N.13.1 High trustworthiness N.13.2 Medium trustworthiness N.13.3 Low trustworthiness	
N.14 Weight of evidence B: Appropriateness of research design and analysis for addressing	N.14.1 High N.14.2 Medium N.14.3 Low	

the question, or sub-questions, of this specific systematic review.		
N.15 Weight of evidence C: Relevance of particular focus of the study (including conceptual focus, context, sample and measures) for addressing the question of this specific systematic review	N.15.1 High N.15.2 Medium N.15.3 Low	
N.16 Weight of evidence D: Overall weight of evidence ***Taking into account quality of execution, appropriateness of design and relevance of focus, what is the overall weight of evidence this study provides to answer the question of this specific systematic review?***	N.16.1 High N.16.2 Medium N.16.3 Low	

O'Brien et al (2000)

N.1 Are there ethical concerns about the way the study was done? *Consider consent, funding, privacy, etc.*	N.1.1 Yes, some concerns (please specify) N.1.2 No (please specify)	No, parental consent was obtained. Students agreed to participate
N.2 Were students and/or parents appropriately involved in the design or conduct of the study? *Consider your answer to the appropriate question in module B.1*	N.2.1 Yes, a lot (please specify) N.2.2 Yes, a little (please specify) N.2.3 No (please specify)	Yes, students provided feedback from a pilot study undertaken before the main study.
N.3 Is there sufficient justification for why the study was done the way it was? *Consider answers to questions B1, B2, B3, B4*	N.3.1 Yes (please specify) N.3.2 No (please specify)	Yes, decisions taken in the study are largely explained
N.4 Was the choice of research design appropriate for addressing the research question(s) posed?	N.4.1 yes, completely (please specify) N.4.2 No (please specify)	Matched control groups from the same university could have been used.
N.5 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the	N.5.1 Yes, good (please	Measures of reliability of instruments used are given

repeatability or reliability of data collection methods or tools? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the reliability or repeatability of their data collection tools and methods (K7)*	==specify)== N.5.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.5.3 No, none (please specify)	.81 - .93
N.6 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data collection tools and methods? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of their data collection tools/ methods (K6)*	N.6.1 Yes, good (please specify) ==N.6.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify)== N.6.3 No, none (please specify)	Measures of concurrent validity are stated as adequate, but no figures are given Face validity could be questioned as some participants in each group did not complete measures.
N.7 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? (L7)*	N.7.1 Yes (please specify) ==N.7.2 No (please specify)==	No, none given
N.8 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? (L8, L9, L10, L11)*	N.8.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.8.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.8.3 No, none (please specify)	No , none given.
N.9 To what extent are the research design and methods employed able to rule out any other sources of error/bias which would lead	N.9.1 A lot (please specify) N.9.2 A little (please specify)	No real attempt made to 'match' groups. Control group attended a different setting, therefore many confounding variable

to alternative explanations for the findings of the study? *e.g. (1) In an evaluation, was the process by which participants were allocated to, or otherwise received the factor being evaluated, concealed and not predictable in advance? If not, were sufficient substitute procedures employed with adequate rigour to rule out any alternative explanations of the findings which arise as a result?* *e.g. (2) Was the attrition rate low and, if applicable, similar between different groups?*	<mark>N.9.3 Not at all (please specify)</mark>	possibilities
N.10 How generalisable are the study results?	N.10.1 Details	Minimal
N.11 In light of the above, do the reviewers differ from the authors over the findings or conclusions of the study? *Please state what any difference is.*	N.11.1 Not applicable (no difference in conclusions) <mark>N.11.2 Yes (please specify)</mark>	Control procedures were not tight enough to have full confidence in the research findings
N.12 Have sufficient attempts been made to justify the conclusions drawn from the findings, so that the conclusions are trustworthy?	N.12.1 Not applicable (results and conclusions inseparable) N.12.2 High trustworthiness <mark>N.12.3 Medium trustworthiness</mark> N.12.4 Low trustworthiness	Honest assessment of findings, and acceptance of how the study could have been improved.
N.13 Weight of evidence A: Taking account of all quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering the study question(s)? *In some studies it is difficult to distinguish between the findings of the study and the conclusions. In those cases, please code the trustworthiness of these combined*	N.13.1 High trustworthiness <mark>N.13.2 Medium trustworthiness</mark> N.13.3 Low trustworthiness	

results/conclusions.		
N.14 Weight of evidence B: Appropriateness of research design and analysis for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this specific systematic review.	N.14.1 High N.14.2 Medium N.14.3 Low	
N.15 Weight of evidence C: Relevance of particular focus of the study (including conceptual focus, context, sample and measures) for addressing the question of this specific systematic review	N.15.1 High N.15.2 Medium N.15.3 Low	
N.16 Weight of evidence D: Overall weight of evidence *Taking into account quality of execution, appropriateness of design and relevance of focus, what is the overall weight of evidence this study provides to answer the question of this specific systematic review?*	N.16.1 High N.16.2 Medium N.16.3 Low	

Speight & Rosenthal, 1995

N.1 Are there ethical concerns about the way the study was done? *Consider consent, funding, privacy, etc.*	N.1.1 Yes, some concerns (please specify) N.1.2 No (please specify)	No mention of consent
N.2 Were students and/or parents appropriately involved in the design or conduct of the study? *Consider your answer to the appropriate question in module B.1*	N.2.1 Yes, a lot (please specify) N.2.2 Yes, a little (please specify) N.2.3 No (please specify)	Parents were not involved.
N.3 Is there sufficient justification for why the study was done the way it was? *Consider answers to questions B1, B2, B3, B4*	N.3.1 Yes (please specify) N.3.2 No (please specify)	Justification given and reasoning behind study is given

N.4 Was the choice of research design appropriate for addressing the research question(s) posed?	N.4.1 yes, completely (please specify) ==N.4.2 No (please specify)==	No, lack of control, selection open to bias
N.5 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data collection methods or tools? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the reliability or repeatability of their data collection tools and methods (K7)*	==N.5.1 Yes, good (please specify)== N.5.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.5.3 No, none (please specify)	Yes Cronenbachs alpha statistics are given
N.6 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data collection tools and methods? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of their data collection tools/ methods (K6)*	N.6.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.6.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) ==N.6.3 No, none (please specify)==	Measures were developed for this intervention, but no validity measures are given
N.7 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? (L7)*	N.7.1 Yes (please specify) ==N.7.2 No (please specify)==	No, no details are given
N.8 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? (L8, L9, L10, L11)*	N.8.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.8.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) ==N.8.3 No, none (please specify)==	No this was not addressed

N.9 To what extent are the research design and methods employed able to rule out any other sources of error/bias which would lead to alternative explanations for the findings of the study? *e.g. (1) In an evaluation, was the process by which participants were allocated to, or otherwise received the factor being evaluated, concealed and not predictable in advance? If not, were sufficient substitute procedures employed with adequate rigour to rule out any alternative explanations of the findings which arise as a result?* *e.g. (2) Was the attrition rate low and, if applicable, similar between different groups?*	N.9.1 A lot (please specify) N.9.2 A little (please specify) ==N.9.3 Not at all (please specify)==	Selection bias Repeated measures design does not employ any form of control or random allocation. Student selection taken from specific groups, not generalisable to wider population.
N.10 How generalisable are the study results?	N.10.1 Details	They arent
N.11 In light of the above, do the reviewers differ from the authors over the findings or conclusions of the study? *Please state what any difference is.*	N.11.1 Not applicable (no difference in conclusions) N.11.2 Yes (please specify)	Not entirely as reference is made by the authors to the methodological shortcomings of the research.
N.12 Have sufficient attempts been made to justify the conclusions drawn from the findings, so that the conclusions are trustworthy?	N.12.1 Not applicable (results and conclusions inseparable) N.12.2 High trustworthiness ==N.12.3 Medium trustworthiness== N.12.4 Low trustworthiness	Yes the authors are honest about the findings and their wider applicability.
N.13 Weight of evidence A: Taking account of all quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in	N.13.1 High trustworthiness ==N.13.2 Medium trustworthiness==	

answering the study question(s)? *In some studies it is difficult to distinguish between the findings of the study and the conclusions. In those cases, please code the trustworthiness of these combined results/conclusions.*	N.13.3 Low trustworthiness	
N.14 Weight of evidence B: Appropriateness of research design and analysis for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this specific systematic review.	N.14.1 High N.14.2 Medium N.14.3 Low	
N.15 Weight of evidence C: Relevance of particular focus of the study (including conceptual focus, context, sample and measures) for addressing the question of this specific systematic review	N.15.1 High N.15.2 Medium N.15.3 Low	
N.16 Weight of evidence D: Overall weight of evidence *Taking into account quality of execution, appropriateness of design and relevance of focus, what is the overall weight of evidence this study provides to answer the question of this specific systematic review?*	N.16.1 High N.16.2 Medium N.16.3 Low	

Turner & Conkel (2010)

N.1 Are there ethical concerns about the way the study was done? *Consider consent, funding, privacy, etc.*	N.1.1 Yes, some concerns (please specify) N.1.2 No (please specify)	No mention of gained consent in the study
N.2 Were students and/or parents appropriately involved in the design or conduct of the study? *Consider your answer to the*	N.2.1 Yes, a lot (please specify) N.2.2 Yes, a little (please specify)	Parents and students were not involved in the design of the study. Student involvement was

appropriate question in module B.1	N.2.3 No (please specify)	done as part of timetabled classes and so made no additional time demands on them.
N.3 Is there sufficient justification for why the study was done the way it was? *Consider answers to questions B1, B2, B3, B4*	<mark>N.3.1 Yes (please specify)</mark> N.3.2 No (please specify)	Yes, intervention was designed to have positive effect on students, and utilised an existing target population.
N.4 Was the choice of research design appropriate for addressing the research question(s) posed?	N.4.1 yes, completely (please specify) <mark>N.4.2 No (please specify)</mark>	Pre- test measures would have given a measure of individual gains as well as between groups
N.5 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data collection methods or tools? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the reliability or repeatability of their data collection tools and methods (K7)*	<mark>N.5.1 Yes, good (please specify)</mark> N.5.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.5.3 No, none (please specify)	Reliability statistics for the data collection tolls used in the study are published.
N.6 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data collection tools and methods? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of their data collection tools/ methods (K6)*	N.6.1 Yes, good (please specify) <mark>N.6.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify)</mark> N.6.3 No, none (please specify)	No figures are stated, but all measures are published and commercially available
N.7 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the repeatability or reliability*	<mark>N.7.1 Yes (please specify)</mark> N.7.2 No (please specify)	Yes data samples were re-analysed using 'jack-knifing' sampling methods, which supported findings

of data analysis? (L7)		
N.8 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? (L8, L9, L10, L11)*	N.8.1 Yes, good (please specify) <mark>N.8.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify)</mark> N.8.3 No, none (please specify)	Validity stats are given
N.9 To what extent are the research design and methods employed able to rule out any other sources of error/bias which would lead to alternative explanations for the findings of the study? *e.g. (1) In an evaluation, was the process by which participants were allocated to, or otherwise received the factor being evaluated, concealed and not predictable in advance? If not, were sufficient substitute procedures employed with adequate rigour to rule out any alternative explanations of the findings which arise as a result?* *e.g. (2) Was the attrition rate low and, if applicable, similar between different groups?*	N.9.1 A lot (please specify) <mark>N.9.2 A little (please specify)</mark> N.9.3 Not at all (please specify)	• Control group • Pre- test comparison of groups • Random allocation but • Treatment 2 implemented over longer period of time (time effects) • Researchers ,rather than usual counsellors as administrators (compliance effects) •
N.10 How generalisable are the study results?	N.10.1 Details	Reasonably
N.11 In light of the above, do the reviewers differ from the authors over the findings or conclusions of the study? *Please state what any difference is.*	<mark>N.11.1 Not applicable (no difference in conclusions)</mark> N.11.2 Yes (please specify)	
N.12 Have sufficient attempts been made to justify the conclusions drawn from the findings, so that the conclusions are	N.12.1 Not applicable (results and conclusions inseparable) <mark>N.12.2 High</mark>	Honest assessment of findings, and acceptance of how the study could have been improved.

trustworthy?	==trustworthiness== N.12.3 Medium trustworthiness N.12.4 Low trustworthiness	
N.13 Weight of evidence A: Taking account of all quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering the study question(s)? *In some studies it is difficult to distinguish between the findings of the study and the conclusions. In those cases, please code the trustworthiness of these combined results/conclusions.*	==N.13.1 High trustworthiness== ==N.13.2 Medium trustworthiness== N.13.3 Low trustworthiness	
N.14 Weight of evidence B: Appropriateness of research design and analysis for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this specific systematic review.	N.14.1 High ==N.14.2 Medium== N.14.3 Low	
N.15 Weight of evidence C: Relevance of particular focus of the study (including conceptual focus, context, sample and measures) for addressing the question of this specific systematic review	N.15.1 High ==N.15.2 Medium== N.15.3 Low	
N.16 Weight of evidence D: Overall weight of evidence *Taking into account quality of execution, appropriateness of design and relevance of focus, what is the overall weight of evidence this study provides to answer the question of this specific systematic review?*	N.16.1 High ==N.16.2 Medium== N.16.3 Low	

Turner & Laplan (2005)

N.1 Are there ethical concerns about the way the study was done? *Consider consent, funding, privacy, etc.*	N.1.1 Yes, some concerns (please specify) N.1.2 No (please specify)	No, students given option whether to participate or not. Control group also benefitted from programme at a later date.
N.2 Were students and/or parents appropriately involved in the design or conduct of the study? *Consider your answer to the appropriate question in module B.1*	N.2.1 Yes, a lot (please specify) N.2.2 Yes, a little (please specify) N.2.3 No (please specify)	No, neither was involved in the design or conduct of the study.
N.3 Is there sufficient justification for why the study was done the way it was? *Consider answers to questions B1, B2, B3, B4*	N.3.1 Yes (please specify) N.3.2 No (please specify)	Yes, the study was conducted in regular school hours, and attempted to raise the career self-efficacy of students
N.4 Was the choice of research design appropriate for addressing the research question(s) posed?	N.4.1 yes, completely (please specify) N.4.2 No (please specify)	Non-equivalent groups used, rather than random allocation. Only short term gains were measured. The study may have benefitted from a later 'follow up' to see if gains were maintained.
N.5 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data collection methods or tools? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the reliability or repeatability of their data collection tools and methods (K7)*	N.5.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.5.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.5.3 No, none (please specify)	Yes, reliability statistics are given for all measures.
N.6 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data collection tools and methods? *Consider your answers to previous questions:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of their data*	N.6.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.6.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.6.3 No, none (please specify)	Yes, validity statistics are given for all measures

collection tools/ methods (K6)		
N.7 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the repeatability or reliability of data analysis? (L7)*	N.7.1 Yes (please specify) N.7.2 No (please specify)	No, this issue has either not been addressed or is simply not referred to in the paper.
N.8 Have sufficient attempts been made to establish the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? *Consider your answer to the previous question:* *Do the authors describe any ways they have addressed the validity or trustworthiness of data analysis? (L8, L9, L10, L11)*	N.8.1 Yes, good (please specify) N.8.2 Yes, some attempt (please specify) N.8.3 No, none (please specify)	No, this issue has either not been addressed or is simply not referred to in the paper.
N.9 To what extent are the research design and methods employed able to rule out any other sources of error/bias which would lead to alternative explanations for the findings of the study? *e.g. (1) In an evaluation, was the process by which participants were allocated to, or otherwise received the factor being evaluated, concealed and not predictable in advance? If not, were sufficient substitute procedures employed with adequate rigour to rule out any alternative explanations of the findings which arise as a result?* *e.g. (2) Was the attrition rate low and, if applicable, similar between different groups?*	N.9.1 A lot (please specify) N.9.2 A little (please specify) N.9.3 Not at all (please specify)	• Standardised instructions across groups. • MVC delivered only by the authors. • Control group
N.10 How generalisable are the study results?	N.10.1 Details	Reasonably

N.11 In light of the above, do the reviewers differ from the authors over the findings or conclusions of the study? *Please state what any difference is.*	<mark>N.11.1 Not applicable (no difference in conclusions)</mark> N.11.2 Yes (please specify)	No, but the maintenance of the effects may be questioned. This was however highlighted in the study
N.12 Have sufficient attempts been made to justify the conclusions drawn from the findings, so that the conclusions are trustworthy?	N.12.1 Not applicable (results and conclusions inseparable) <mark>N.12.2 High trustworthiness</mark> N.12.3 Medium trustworthiness N.12.4 Low trustworthiness	Honest assessment of findings, and acceptance of how the study could have been improved.
N.13 Weight of evidence A: Taking account of all quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering the study question(s)? *In some studies it is difficult to distinguish between the findings of the study and the conclusions. In those cases, please code the trustworthiness of these combined results/conclusions.*	N.13.1 High trustworthiness <mark>N.13.2 Medium trustworthiness</mark> N.13.3 Low trustworthiness	
N.14 Weight of evidence B: Appropriateness of research design and analysis for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this specific systematic review.	N.14.1 High <mark>N.14.2 Medium</mark> N.14.3 Low	
N.15 Weight of evidence C: Relevance of particular focus of the study (including conceptual focus, context, sample and measures) for addressing the question of this specific systematic review	<mark>N.15.1 High</mark> N.15.2 Medium N.15.3 Low	
N.16 Weight of evidence D: Overall weight of evidence *Taking into account quality of execution,*	N.16.1 High <mark>N.16.2 Medium</mark> N.16.3 Low	

appropriateness of design and relevance of focus, what is the overall weight of evidence this study provides to answer the question of this specific systematic review?	167	