Behaving Badly: Psychiatric and Sociological Perspectives on Young People with 'Conduct Disorder'

Dominique Harvey

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Glasgow

MRC Social and Public Health Sciences Unit

March 2006

Abstract

Background. Despite its status within internationally agreed psychiatric systems, the extent to which the behavioural symptoms of Conduct Disorder are indicative of mental disorder is debatable. The current study investigates this controversial diagnostic category through an investigation of competing psychiatric and sociological perspectives on behaving badly. Specifically, the aim of this thesis is to assess the extent to which the collection of behaviours currently defined as Conduct Disorder might be better understood within a sociological framework.

Methods. In-depth semi-structured interviews were carried out to explore young people's perspectives on behaving badly. Most of the participants interviewed met DSM-IV criteria for Conduct Disorder, which was identified on the basis of Voice-DISC profiles at two earlier phases of the West of Scotland 11-16/ 16+ study (West, Sweeting, Der et al., 2003).

Findings. The findings highlighted that behaving badly was generally perceived as normative, purposive and adaptive, therefore reflecting more sociological interpretations of behaving badly. Two participants appeared to link their behaviour to mental distress, which provided limited support for the view that some forms of antisocial behaviour might be indicative of mental disorder. Since young people often depicted behaving badly as adaptive and purposive, the findings suggested that epidemiological research may be neglecting the positive functions of antisocial behaviour for young people.

Implications. An in-depth exploration of young people's accounts led to the conclusion that the current diagnostic criteria for Conduct Disorder are over-inclusive. Four amendments to the criteria were proposed which might help to distinguish between individuals with disorderly conduct and those with Conduct Disorder before the publication of DSM-V and ICD-11.

<u>Declaration</u>

I declare that, except where acknowledged, all the work has been undertaken by myself.

Dominique M. Harvey M.A. (SocSci)

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Appendices

Chapter One: Literature Review

1.1. Introduction

This chapter will assess the evidence for classifying Conduct Disorder (CD) as a mental disorder by providing a critical evaluation of the diagnostic criteria in the context of epidemiological findings and competing perspectives on antisocial behaviour.

The introduction of the diagnosis of CD into the DSM and ICD nosologies was prompted by Rutter's seminal paper 'Classification and categorization in child psychiatry,' which was published in 1965. Following its appearance in ICD-9 and DSM-III, the diagnostic criteria for CD have undergone a number of revisions, culminating in a list of 15 behavioural symptoms. However, in the most recent version of the DSM (DSM-IV, APA, 1994), clinicians are directed to consider the social context of the behaviours. This has been considered controversial due to the lack of guidance for operationalising the social context clause (Kirk and Hsieh, 2004; Spitzer and Wakefield, 1999), raising concerns about whether the diagnostic criteria are accurate and specific for identifying CD. This issue will be explored within the context of the nature and purpose of psychiatric classification, and in relation to the conclusions which can be drawn from epidemiological findings in this area. The chapter will then review sociological perspectives on delinquency in order to explore alternative ways of conceptualising antisocial behaviour, before outlining the aim and research questions driving the current study.

1.1.1. Terminology

Throughout the thesis, the term "antisocial behaviour" and "conduct problems/ disturbances" will be used to refer to one or more antisocial acts (which may relate to behaviour listed as symptoms of CD, but will also include other behaviours mentioned in the interviews such as alcohol and drug abuse). These terms will not, however, be used interchangeably with CD. "Delinquency" and "deviance" will be

used when discussing sociological theories in recognition of their specific meaning in this context. "Crime" will only be used to describe behaviour which has been officially labelled in accordance with its legal definition. Finally, the terms "behaving badly" and "bad behaviour" will be used in reference to the young people's accounts since this was the term used in the interviews. The terms used to describe other studies will reflect those researchers' own choice of language.

1.2. The Purpose and Nature of Psychiatric Classification

Taylor and Rutter (2002) described psychiatric nosology as a language, which "provides an aid to thinking about complex problems" (p.3). In his seminal paper, "Classification and categorization in child psychiatry," Rutter (1965) outlined three basic principles of psychiatric classification: that it is based on 'facts' rather than concepts; that it accurately predicts the course of a disorder; and that it categorises disorders rather than individuals. These principles remain largely unchanged in more recent literature, except that Taylor and Rutter (2002) make reference to "concepts" rather than "facts." This terminology reflects the division between natural science methodology, aimed at establishing causal relationships, and the phenomenological approach to psychiatry, which seeks to study and describe signs and symptoms of disorder without theorising about cause (Jaspers, 1963). The phenomenological model continues to influence psychiatric practice although the importance of empirical evidence for refining and revising psychiatric classifications has been acknowledged (Taylor and Rutter, 2002).

Spitzer (2001) outlined the rationale for incorporating a classification in the DSM from his experience as chairperson of the DSM-III and DSM-III-R work groups. He described the principle of "inclusiveness," wherein a category would be considered for inclusion in the manual if a large proportion of clinicians deemed the symptom or disorder clinically significant. Shaffer (2001) vividly described his experience at a DSM-III-R meeting:

The atmosphere was heated, closer to my idea of a tobacco auction than to a scholarly debate. Bob Spitzer, the auctioneer, stood at the head of a long table, crowded with experts, as if looking for bids... Spitzer would put forward a suggestion or a question and would wait for the bids to come in. At the end of the day, he and Williams would repair to their office and rewrite the text and criteria in the spirit of whatever gestalt his formidable intelligence had taken from the meeting. (p.110)

Therefore, theoretically, a category could appear in the DSM in the absence of empirical research demonstrating its validity. Butler (1999) labelled this categorical approach to classification as "diagnostic line-drawing" since there is no empirical basis for differentiating between disorder and nondisorder. Similarly, Kutchins and Kirk (1997) have suggested "that the process of developing diagnostic categories has been similar to other types of professional decision making, where status, reputation, and turf are dominant considerations" (p.18). The dimensional approach addresses these criticisms by identifying behaviour which deviates from the norm on the basis of statistics. However, this approach has also been criticised on the grounds of "the arbitrary nature of the clinical threshold, based as it will be on social and cultural constructions about deviance and impairment" (Sonuga-Barke, 1998, p.129).

While the DSM-IV acknowledges a move towards a more categorical classification system, others have pointed out that psychiatric practice is underscored by both approaches (Earls and Mezzacappa, 2002; Taylor and Rutter, 2002). Earls and Mezzacappa (2002) have stated that "[i]n relation to conduct disorder, the issue concerns the nature of the disorder. Is it more like a deviation from normal, or a category with boundaries that separate it from normal behaviour as well as other types of disorder" (p.421). This theme is central to the aim of the current study, which seeks to explore alternative perspectives on antisocial behaviour.

1.2.1. Defining Disorder

Mental disorder is defined in DSM-IV as "a clinically significant behavioural or psychological syndrome or pattern that occurs in an individual and that is associated with present distress (e.g., a painful symptom) or disability (i.e., impairment in one

or more important areas of functioning) or with a significantly increased risk of suffering death, pain, disability, or an important loss of freedom" (p.xxi). Wakefield (1992a) criticised this definition and suggested the alternative conceptualisation of disorder as "harmful dysfunction." Incorporating a developmental perspective, Wakefield described the necessary conditions for presence of disorder as the failure of an internal mechanism to perform its evolutionary function, together with evidence that the behaviour is detrimental to the individual, taking into account social and cultural factors. Wakefield's definition has been challenged on the grounds that he did not clarify what constitutes an internal mechanism (Kirmayer and Young, 1999). However, Spitzer (1999), who in his role as chairman of the DSM-III work group, introduced the definition of mental disorder into the manual in 1987, stated that the original definition is flawed and suggested that Wakefield's harmful dysfunction analysis may be more appropriate. Spitzer (1999) also cautioned that the furious debate on classification is pointless since it will not impact on psychiatric practice. This suggests that diagnosing disorder involves a subjective judgement which is not captured in the criteria.

1.2.2. Defining Conduct Disorder: Criteria and Controversies

1.2.2.1. Diagnostic Criteria

Rutter coined the term 'conduct disorder' in 1965 to describe antisocial behaviour in young people and under his direction, it was introduced into official psychiatric nosology in 1975 when it appeared in the ninth revision of the International Classification of Diseases (World Health Organization, 1975). The distinction between the subtypes of CD (socialized, unsocialized, compulsive and mixed disturbance of conduct and emotions), and the accompanying symptomatology attached to each in ICD-9, represented a considerable leap from the scant reference to "behaviour disorders of childhood" which featured in ICD-8 (WHO, 1965; see Appendix A). At that time, symptoms thought to be indicative of childhood mental disorder were listed in ICD-8 as jealousy, masturbation, tantrum and truancy. The current version of the ICD (ICD-10; WHO, 1993) has preserved the socialized-unsocialized distinction which is featured alongside the subtypes of 'conduct

disorder confined to the family context' and oppositional defiant disorder, but the number of symptoms of CD have increased to fifteen, ranging from lying and initiating fights to forced sexual activity (see Table 1.1). CD first appeared in the third edition of the DSM (DSM-III, APA, 1980) which listed five main symptoms: physical violence against persons or property; theft; violation of rules; running away; and persistent lying. DSM-IV (APA, 1994) now lists fifteen symptoms, which are the same as those listed in ICD-10 (see Table 1.1), but employs a developmental approach to subtyping where classification is based on the age of onset, with the pivotal age to differentiate between child and adolescent-onset being ten years (see Appendix A).

Table 1.1: DSM and ICD symptoms of CD

Bullying, threatening or intimidating others
Initiating physical fights
Weapon use
Physical cruelty to people
Physical cruelty to animals
Stealing while confronting a victim
Forced sexual activity
Fire setting
Destruction of property
Breaking into house, building or car
Lying
Non-confrontational theft
Staying out
Running away
Truancy

Therefore, while the symptoms of CD listed in the DSM and ICD are identical, the systems employ a different approach to subtyping, with the context of the behaviour being an important factor under ICD guidelines whilst the DSM emphasises the importance of the age of onset. Besides the discrepancy in the systems of subtyping,

other differences between ICD and DSM classifications relate to the duration of symptoms. For a DSM-IV diagnosis of CD, three symptoms must have been present over twelve months, with at least one persisting over the preceding six months. By comparison, a shorter period of antisocial behaviour may characterise an ICD diagnosis of CD since symptoms need only have been present for six months. This effectively lowers the threshold for an ICD diagnosis, and illustrates that a pattern of behaviour which warrants the label of CD according to DSM-IV criteria might not meet criteria for diagnosis under ICD guidelines.

1.2.2.2. Time Trends

The application of different diagnostic criteria across different countries and over time has complicated the effort to track secular trends in rates of CD (Collishaw, Maughan, Goodman and Pickles, 2004). This problem has been further compounded by the increase in the number of symptoms of CD in successive revisions of the diagnostic criteria (Robins, 2001). Collishaw and his colleagues were able to overcome these methodological problems by comparing the level of conduct problems across three studies conducted over 25 years, which all used the same interview materials. They found evidence for a large increase in conduct problems over this time, which affected both males and females, and individuals from all social classes. This raises the question of whether increasing levels of conduct problems are indicative of deteriorating mental health, or whether some forms of antisocial behaviour (e.g. status offences such as staying out late or truancy) have become more socially acceptable and therefore more prevalent over time. If the latter applies then this suggests that the diagnostic criteria for CD may be over-inclusive, and therefore ineffective for identifying disorder.

1.2.2.3. Social Context

Before diagnosing CD, clinicians are directed to consider the social context of behaviour. Under ICD-10 guidelines, the context of behaviour is considered under Axis 5 for all disorders, and therefore is not specific to the diagnosis of CD. However, unlike for other DSM disorders where symptoms are considered

separately from their context, DSM-IV explicitly states that "[t]he Conduct Disorder diagnosis should be applied only when the behavior in question is symptomatic of an underlying dysfunction within the individual and not simply a reaction to the immediate social context" (DSM-IV; APA, p.88). This clause has been criticised on the grounds that the DSM provides no guidance on assessing the clinical significance of the symptoms (Spitzer and Wakefield, 1999), and that it prompts clinicians to consider the causes of behaviour despite efforts to discourage this practice through the production of symptom checklists (Kirk and Hsieh, 2004). Spitzer and Wakefield (1999) have suggested that, even with strict adherence to the diagnostic guidelines, there is a high probability that clinicians will mistakenly diagnose normal reactions to adverse circumstances as CD.

CD has therefore been described as an unreliable diagnostic category. Kutchins and Kirk (1997) have asserted that problems with operationalising the criteria are likely to lead to variation in clinicians' judgements about the presence or absence of disorder. The view that the failure of the DSM to operationalise the social context clause leads to erroneous diagnoses, together with the argument that the symptoms of CD do not necessarily reflect an internal dysfunction (Richters and Cicchetti, 1993), highlights the problematic nature of the CD diagnosis. In fact, Huffine (2002) has argued that CD should be dropped from DSM-V due to its failure to meet DSM criteria for a mental disorder.

1.2.2.4. Impairment

Another important consideration in the diagnosis of CD is whether the individual shows signs of significant impairment and distress. Evidence of "clinically significant impairment in social, academic, or occupational functioning" is necessary for diagnosis of CD under DSM-IV criteria (APA, 1994, p.91) despite the fact that there are no recommended procedures for operationalising this criterion (Widiger and Clark, 2000). Shaffer, Fisher, Dulcan et al. (1996) investigated the impact of DSM-IV impairment criteria on prevalence rates and found that, in comparison with other disorders, its inclusion had only a negligible effect on rates of CD. This

finding may be attributable to the nature of the behaviours associated with CD, which are more likely to result in concrete outcomes (such as incarceration and academic failure), and may therefore imply that impairment is an intrinsic feature of CD symptomatology. Alternatively, it is possible that methodological features of this study account for this finding since other studies report lower prevalence rates when impairment criteria are applied (e.g. West et al, 2003; discussed further below). Regardless of the explanations for the difference in rates reported in epidemiological studies, the impairment criteria, like the social context clause, are regarded by some to be difficult to operationalise.

1.2.3. Subtypes of CD

Appendix A displays the subtypes of CD which have appeared in successive revisions of the ICD and DSM. In ICD-10, severity (as judged by reference to the number of symptoms) is regarded as a more important consideration for predicting long-term outcomes of CD than subtypes, however, it lists four main subdivisions of CD: CD confined to the family context; unsocialized CD; socialized CD; and Oppositional Defiant Disorder (ODD; which is listed as a separate disorder in DSM-IV although there has been some debate about the nature of the link between ODD and CD; Angold and Costello, 2001). In respect of the first subdivision, all CD behaviours must be limited to the family context. Whilst symptoms of CD are accompanied with positive peer affiliations in the socialized group, poor peer relationships, isolation, rejection, and unpopularity characterise individuals in the unsocialized group. An additional list of eight milder symptoms is provided for diagnosing ODD (including, for example, often argues with adults; is often angry or resentful). Rather than focusing on the context of the behaviour, which formed the basis of categorising subtypes in DSM-III and DSM-III-R (and in contrast to the ICD), the DSM-IV subtypes are based on the age of onset of the behaviours. Childhood-onset CD is diagnosed in individuals displaying at least one behaviour before the age of 10. DSM-IV states that individuals in this group are typically males who demonstrate physically aggressive behaviours, have poor peer relationships, meet criteria for CD before puberty, and are likely to develop

Antisocial Personality Disorder (APD) in adulthood. Adolescent-onset CD is associated with later age of onset, normal peer relationships, less persistent problems, and a more even gender ratio.

1.2.4. "Adolescence-Limited" versus "Life-Course-Persistent" Pathways

Moffitt (1993) proposed two discrete developmental trajectories of antisocial behaviour in the attempt to explain two apparently conflicting epidemiological facts about antisocial behaviour, namely that most antisocial adults have a history of disruptive behaviour in adolescence whilst the majority of teenagers grow out of this behavioural pattern by adulthood. Firstly, she proposed a "life-course-persistent" (LCP) pathway encompassing those offenders who begin their careers early, possibly as a result of "internal vulnerabilities," which increase sensitivity to the effects of maltreatment in childhood, or as a consequence of neurological impairment. Through either a lack of understanding of, or exposure to, socially normative behaviours, or due to an unwillingness to shirk their reputation for badness and reverse the "deviant" label, Moffitt posited that "the constant process of reciprocal interaction between personal traits and environmental reactions to them" (p. 684) ensures a continuity in antisocial behaviour among this group. However, the opposite is true of the "adolescence-limited" (AL) group among whom a "maturity gap" accounts for antisocial traits during adolescence. This period was defined by Moffitt as the time between the onset of puberty and the granting of adult status in society, and is characterised by an attempt to seek independence and material gain, factors which reinforce engagement in antisocial behaviour.

Moffitt's ideas incorporate a number of perspectives on antisocial behaviour, and combine both epidemiological findings and sociological theories on delinquency. In addition, her classifications broadly map onto the DSM-IV subtypes of CD, although she provides a much more detailed analysis of the course and correlates of antisocial behaviour for these discrete groups. Although her typology has been criticised on the grounds that it cannot accommodate data on sex differences in trajectories of antisocial behaviour (Silverthorn and Frick, 1999; Silverthorn, Frick and Reynolds,

2003), that the theory does not account for adults who engage in criminal acts without a history of antisocial behaviour in adolescence (White, Bates and Buske, 2001), and that it cannot account for delinquency abstention throughout adolescence (Piquero, Brezina and Turner, 2005), her ideas have had an enormous impact in the research literature, both fuelling debate and impacting research designs.

1.2.5. Summary

This review has shown that the category of CD is problematic due to the lack of guidance for operationalising the diagnostic criteria. Problems associated with interpreting the social context clause, recognising clinically significant levels of impairment, and identifying internal dysfunction have led to the assertion that CD is an unreliable diagnostic category. However, the suggestion that rates of CD are rising over time illustrates the need to refine the criteria, particularly to identify those with early-onset problems, who may have more complex and longer-term problems (Moffitt, 1993).

1.3. Epidemiology of CD

1.3.1. Prevalence of CD

Whilst DSM-III-R (APA, 1987) estimated the population prevalence of CD as 9% in males and 2% in females, the fourth edition (APA, 1994) reported rates with a wider margin of error: 6 – 16% of males and 2 – 9% of females, based on a number of epidemiological studies. However, as acknowledged for the first time in the most recent version of the DSM (DSM-IV; APA, 1994), the variation in design features across different epidemiological studies renders the attempt to make any generalisations very difficult.

Summarised in the table in Appendix B are a number of studies which have estimated the population prevalence of CD. In order to facilitate comparison, the table presents rates of CD based on symptoms only since some of the studies did not report rates based on impairment criteria. These studies vary along a number of

dimensions, namely age (range) of participants, sample size, measures used, key informants, criteria applied, inclusion of impairment criteria, interviewing procedures, and form of presentation of results, thus making the results difficult to analyse and compare (Roberts, Attkisson and Rosenblatt, 1998). These studies collectively suggest a prevalence rate of between 4-16% in males and 1-14% in females, however, this is based on a very wide age range (5 – 20 years), and fails to take into account how the rates differ according to the study design and key informants. Many of the studies included two or more informants in line with diagnostic assessment procedures, although DSM-IV states that as "many of the behaviors may be concealed, caregivers may underreport symptoms and overestimate the age at onset" (p. 86). This is supported by the studies reviewed here, since the rates based on self report generally yielded higher prevalence estimates (Breton et al., 1999; Shaffer et al., 1996; Verhulst et al., 1997).

1.3.2. Comorbidity

Many studies have reported high rates of co-occurrence of CD and a second psychiatric disorder, including high rates of ADHD (Anderson et al., 1987; Fergusson et al., 1993; Ford, Goodman and Meltzer, 2003); depression, (Costello et al., 1996; McGee et al., 1990; Simonoff et al., 1997); and anxiety (Ford, Goodman and Meltzer, 2003). Very few of the studies featured in Table 2 included a measure of substance abuse, presumably due to the age of participants, but one recent study found high comorbidity between CD and all categories of abuse and dependence (West et al., 2003), and comorbid CD with substance abuse was more common than "pure" CD in another study (Feehan et al., 1993). These findings mirror those reported in the wider literature, which has fuelled debate on the implications of comorbidity for defining disorders. For example, Angold and Costello (2001) described comorbidity as a marker for the level of severity of mental disorders and suggested that the DSM and ICD inappropriately separate symptoms into diagnostic groups (e.g. ODD, CD etc.) given that these categories may represent a subset of the symptoms of a more general diagnostic category (e.g. "antisocial problem dimension"). Although they did not find support for this hypothesis, their

comprehensive review of the epidemiological findings led them to propose a new category of "disruptive personality disorder," which they argued would identify those individuals with the most enduring and problematic antisocial behaviour profiles. This illustrates the ways in which epidemiological research can stimulate debate about classification and generate ideas about refining criteria.

1.3.3. British Context

Two recent studies carried out in the UK produced very similar estimates of the prevalence of CD. Based on symptoms only, West et al. (2003) reported a prevalence rate of 8.7% among 15 year olds in the West of Scotland. This rate fell to 4.6% when a strict definition of impairment was applied. This study used the Voice-DISC, a computerised diagnostic tool, which was self-administered by young people in the school setting to measure psychiatric profiles. Among 15-year-olds in the ONS study, which administered a combination of specially designed questionnaires, structured and semi-structured interviews to young people and their parents and teachers, a similar prevalence rate of 4.3% was reported (ESRC data archive project no. 343; cited in West et al. 2003). This estimate was also based on strict impairment criteria. The equivalence of these rates may be explained by the privacy afforded by the computerised instrument, which may have resulted in a greater likelihood of young people disclosing less socially acceptable behaviours (Shaffer et al, 1996), so compensating for the single informant design. Taken together, these studies suggest that approximately 4% of young people in Britain engage in antisocial behaviour at a level which causes clinically significant levels of impairment.

1.3.4. Risk Factors Associated with CD

Despite the wealth of literature on risk factors for developing CD, there have been surprisingly few comprehensive reviews carried out. Besides Hill and Maughan's (2001) edited collection, which provides a comprehensive overview of research findings in this area, other reviews have been brief and descriptive (e.g. Burke, Loeber and Birmaher, 2002; Hill, 2002; Loeber, Burke, Lahey et al., 2000),

seemingly reflecting the research interests of the authors rather than the breadth of the field. This has led Dodge and Pettit (2003) to call for a critical review of research into the risk factors for CD, although to date there have been none published, and so far the only systematic reviews relate to treatment efficacy (Cochrane Systematic Reviews Database). In short, Dodge and Pettit (2003) have argued that research into CD "has been produced largely without regard to other influences. The result is a loose array of diverse predictors of antisocial development, without integration or an understanding of how these predictors operate together" (p.349). This sentiment has been echoed by others, with Rutter (2003) claiming that "most of the research falls well short of identifying the crucial mediators of the causal processes" (p.337). Thus, despite the large amount of research in this area, some researchers have argued that it crucially fails to disentangle the risk processes that give rise to antisocial behaviour.

As a systematic review of the risk factors associated with conduct problems is outwith the scope of this study, the aim is to provide a brief summary of the work in this area, drawing on existing reviews and recent research. This section is organised under the headings of individual, social and environmental risk factors although, as discussed below, it is recognised that researchers have increasingly considered the joint effects of a range of factors on the development of conduct problems.

1.3.4.1. Individual Risk Factors

Various individual risk factors have been linked to the development of CD, including genetic predisposition, neuropsychological impairment, cognitive functioning, verbal deficits and temperament (Hill, 2002). In particular, conduct problems have been associated with deficits in verbal skills and executive functioning (Lynam and Henry, 2001); abnormal neural responses (Sterzer, Krebs, Kleinschmidt and Poustka, 2005); low IQ (Moffitt, 1993); aggressive temperament (Rutter, 2003); poor information processing (Dodge, Pettit, Bates and Valente, 1995); and perinatal problems (Brennan, Hall, Bor et al., 2003). However, it has been argued that the effects of each individual risk factor are difficult to determine.

For example, Burke, Loeber and Birmaher (2002) reviewed research focusing on the relationship between biological factors and the development of CD and ODD. They concluded that, although there was evidence of an association, none of the studies considered the joint risk of a number of physiological influences (genetic factors, neurochemicals, pre- and perinatal problems etc.), therefore preventing any concrete conclusions in relation to aetiology.

In spite of the methodological problems associated with investigating the biological bases of antisocial behaviour, there has been growing interest in this area, which has led more recently to the investigation of the role of genetics. However, Rutter (2001) cautioned that:

> The fact that genetic influences are implicated in risk for conduct disorder does not, of course, mean that most such difficulties are directly caused by genes... [genes] may provide an important predisposing susceptibility but whether or not antisocial behaviour develops will depend on the interplay with other risk factors (p.558)

This suggests that individual risk factors are likely to have additive effects which contribute to the likelihood of developing CD, in association with other social and environmental risks (Hill, 2002). The extent to which genetic and environmental factors play a role has been investigated in studies involving monozygotic and dizygotic pairs of twins, which have enabled investigators to disentangle the influence of these factors. For example, Eley, Lichenstein and Stevenson (1999) reported that the development of externalising problems in children could only be partly explained by genetics whilst Thapar and McGuffin (1996) found no evidence of a link between genetics and the development of antisocial behaviour. Some researchers have been sceptical about the influence of genetics, for instance, suggesting that it is unlikely that changes in the gene pool can explain short-term increases in the rates of disorder (Collinshaw et al., 2000).

1.3.4.2. Social Risk Factors

1.3.4.2.1. Family Factors

Numerous studies have focused on the relationship between family structure and parenting practices on the development of CD in children. Parental divorce or separation (Juby and Farrington, 2001), having a father in prison (Farrington, Jolliffe, Loeber et al., 2001), parental alcoholism (Ohannessian, Hesselbrock, Kramer et al., 2004), experiencing harsh and inconsistent discipline (Frick, 1994), and coercive parenting (Bor and Sanders, 2004) have all been found to increase the risk for the development of conduct problems. Whilst these risk factors have been widely recognised and empirically validated, research efforts have increasingly focused on the processes underlying these associations. Investigating the influence of 25 diverse factors on the relationship between coercive parenting and child conduct problems, Bor and Sanders (2004) found that parental beliefs and parental mood states had a stronger influence than sociodemographic variables and child behaviour. These results seem quite surprising since it makes intuitive sense that child behaviour would have the strongest influence on parenting practices. However, such findings illustrate the difficulties of conducting research in this field and exhaustively investigating all of the potential mediating factors.

Dishion, Nelson and Bullock (2004) have criticised research into CD and parenting on the grounds that most studies have used static measures of parenting which fail to take into account the developmental effect of parenting practices on children or of child behaviour on parenting practices. Juby and Farrington (2001) noted a similar problem with research into the relationship between disrupted families and delinquency, claiming that most studies do not consider the complex range of factors surrounding the disruption, for example, the level of hostility between parents prior to, and following, the separation. This study found that the cause of the separation had an influence on antisocial behaviour but that the level of conflict had a greater impact. Following their review of research in this area, Burke, Loeber and Birmaher (2002) noted that much of the research has focused on boys, and that, since the nature of the relationship between boys and girls and their parents may differ, these

results might not be generalisable to girls. This may be particularly important since research in this area has focused on single-parent families.

1.3.4.2.2. Peer Affiliation

It has been reported that children with conduct problems are more likely both to associate with other deviant peers, and to experience rejection from non-deviant peers (Vitaro, Tremblay and Bukowski, 2001). Furthermore, Miller-Johnson, Coie, Maumary-Gremaud et al. (2002) reported that early peer rejection increases the likelihood of early onset conduct problems. However, there is also evidence to suggest that the association between affiliation with a delinquent peer group and engagement in antisocial behaviour is mediated by other factors. Buysse (1997) explored the effect of other characteristics of the delinquent peer group on antisocial behaviour, and found that individuals with highly supportive delinquent peers were more likely to engage in antisocial behaviour than those in conflictual groups. In addition, Henry, Tolan and Gorman-Smith (2001) found that young people's choice of peers is influenced by various family factors, including lack of emotional closeness, ineffective parenting skills and deviant beliefs.

Hill (2002) reviewed a number of studies in this area to investigate the nature of the relationship between deviant peers and conduct problems, and specifically whether a third factor might be responsible for both the tendency to befriend deviant peers and to engage in antisocial behaviour. He found it difficult to establish the causal direction of the influences due to methodological differences between studies; the confounding of early and late onset conduct problems; the absence of sophisticated models to test likely causation; the lack of consideration of other possible influences on children; and the failure to track these factors in longitudinal, prospective designs. Following their review of the factors contributing to affiliation with deviant peers, Fergusson and Horwood (1999) concluded that the:

> ...evidence suggests that the development of deviant peer affiliations in adolescence represents the endpoint of a process in which adverse social, family, and individual

ecologies combine to increase the likelihood that the young person will form attachments with delinquent or substance using peer groups in adolescence (p.582)

Thus, the view that antisocial behaviour is caused by peer pressure appears to be over-simplistic given that the association between antisocial behaviour and peer affiliation may be mediated by a variety of other social, family and individual factors.

1.3.4.3. Environmental Risk Factors

Some studies have shown that area characteristics such as level of deprivation (Ingoldsby and Shaw, 2002) and poor housing (Wilkstrom and Loeber, 2000) influence young people's tendency to engage in antisocial behaviour. The mechanism by which these factors exert an effect is more difficult to ascertain, particularly since there is evidence to suggest that neighbourhood effects have a greater influence on boys than girls (Kroneman, Loeber and Hipwell, 2004). Furthermore, Aneshensel and Sucoff (1996) found that young people who felt threatened in their area were more likely to develop depression and anxiety, as well as ODD and CD. While this may be explained by the fear and worry which may have stemmed from these beliefs about their area, this finding also suggests that the effects of area characteristics may not be specific to CD.

1.3.4.4. Protective Factors

Protective factors can be defined as "influences that may cancel or attenuate the influence of known risk factors and, in some way, increase resilience" (Kazdin, 1995, p.63). Boyle and Lipman (2002) found that family social capital was a protective factor against the development of behavioural problems among children living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Other protective factors include having a relationship with a nondeviant partner (Woodward, Fergusson and Horwood, 2002); positive family relations (Henry, Tolan and Gorman-Smith, 2001); and employment (Sampson and Laub, 1993). The peer group has been described as both a risk and a protective factor. Bender and Losel (1997) reported results on the "two faces" of the

peer group, and suggested that the friendships of delinquents may function as both a risk factor for antisocial behaviour and a protective factor for nondelinquent behaviour.

1.3.5. CD and Gender

Of the studies reviewed in Table 2 which report rates of CD separately for girls and boys, there is a consistent pattern of higher rates in boys. Although not all of these are statistically significant, this is a common finding in the literature, prompting much debate about possible explanations for these sex differences (e.g. Moffitt, Caspi, Rutter and Silva, 2001). The DSM-IV, which states that rates of CD, and particularly childhood-onset, are higher in males, attributes a different pattern of behaviour to boys and girls; whilst confrontational behaviour such as fighting, stealing and vandalism is described as more common in boys, dishonesty, truancy and running away are listed as more frequent in girls. Such findings have prompted some researchers to question the applicability of the diagnostic criteria to girls' behaviour. For example, Zoccolillo (1993) suggested that including a range of school problems, in addition to truancy, would more accurately capture conduct problems in girls. This raises the question of whether the higher rate of conduct problems found in boys are an artefact of the criteria. However, Zahn-Waxler (1993) has suggested that there is no foundation for amending the criteria for CD since there may be other explanations for gender differences in rates of CD.

Three main hypotheses have been offered to explain sex differences in rates of CD: firstly, that the rates are an artefact of the classification system, which has a greater sensitivity for detecting CD in boys; secondly, that conduct problems are triggered by different risk factors in boys and girls; and thirdly, that girls are less likely to be exposed to common risk factors associated with CD or might have a different susceptibility to particular factors. Relatively few studies have been able to systematically address these competing explanations, often due to the tendency to collapse various dimensions of antisocial behaviour into one scale, thus losing the sensitivity of the measure to detect gender differences (Storvoll and Wichstrom,

2002). However, the rich set of longitudinal data collected for the Dunedin study allowed Moffitt and her colleagues (2001) to test the hypothesis that CD in girls is a different phenomenon from that in boys. Comparing social, health and inter-personal outcomes for males and females with subclinical levels of conduct problems, they reasoned that differential outcomes for males and females would lend support to the idea that CD is a sex-specific disorder. However, they found no evidence in support of this hypothesis. Specifically, the same individual, familial and environmental risk factors accounted for antisocial behaviour in boys and girls, but boys were more likely to be exposed to risk factors with the greatest impact on the development of antisocial behaviour, namely neuro-cognitive impairment, hyperactivity and peer problems. Storvoll and Wichstrom (2002) similarly suggested that different levels of exposure to risk factors in boys and girls might account for gender differences. Although they found that the strength of the association between the variables they measured and antisocial behaviour was different for boys and girls, they concluded that all risk factors were common to both genders.

In contrast, Lewin, Davis and Hops (1999) found support for the notion that conduct problems are triggered by different factors in boys and girls. They used a variety of measures (including a 23-item checklist, official crime records, and DSM criteria for CD and ODD) to capture different forms of behaviour which may be specific to girls and boys. Their results revealed that early disruptive behaviour and peer rejection were the strongest predictors of antisocial behaviour in boys, whilst early academic problems were the strongest predictor of conduct problems in girls. These findings support the notion that male and female antisocial behaviours are underscored by different risk factors. Although these studies provide some evidence that differential exposure to risk factors explains sex differences in antisocial behaviour, a major weakness relates to their failure to separate the effects of exposure to risk factors from the influence of internal characteristics such as personality traits, moral views and IQ.

Mears, Ploeger and Warr (1998) were able to explore the relationship between participation in delinquent acts, friends' delinquent behaviour and moral evaluations of antisocial acts. They hypothesised that girls' moral beliefs decrease the likelihood that they will be influenced by delinquent peers. The results supported this hypothesis and showed that girls' moral considerations regarding the propriety of certain behaviours served to dilute the influence of their peers. The nature of these data prevented the researchers from drawing any firm conclusions about the mechanism fuelling these judgements in girls, but they drew on this finding to warn against the creation of sex-specific theories of delinquent behaviour. However, the findings of this study may not be generalisable to all aspects of antisocial behaviour. Out of eleven indicators of antisocial behaviour, there was only one - petty theft - for which a marked difference in rates for girls and boys was accompanied by a significant number of female cases. As most of the analysis was based on this single behaviour, the findings may only relate to the example of theft.

These conflicting results on sex differences in antisocial behaviour again highlight the methodological problems to be overcome in order to clarify the causes and course of antisocial behaviour. While the weight of evidence points to different levels of exposure to risk factors and different socialisation processes as potential explanations of sex differences, research has not yet been able to conclusively suggest whether sex-specific or gender neutral theories might be appropriate in classifying and explaining antisocial behaviour.

1.3.6. CD and Social Class

Whilst there has been widespread belief in a link between low social class status and antisocial behaviour, perhaps fuelled by sociologists such as Merton (1938) and Cloward and Ohlin (1960), empirical research has revealed that the association may be more complex. Although much of the evidence suggests a link, the nature, strength and meaning of this relationship continues to be a source of debate. For example, Entner Wright, Caspi, Moffitt et al. (1999) have hypothesised that both high and low social class status operate as risk factors for involvement in antisocial

behaviour. Interestingly, they suggested that high social class status leads to greater risk taking, increased social power, and less adherence to mainstream values, all of which might instigate movement into crime. In addition, Rutter (2001) has pointed out that since the crime rate increased in the U.K. between the 1950s and 1970s, a period characterised by greater affluence, lower unemployment and narrowing social inequalities, "the risk factors accounting for individual differences in crime may not be the same as those accounting for differences in overall rates of crime over time" (p.562). This illustrates the problems associated with interpreting the relationship between social class and antisocial behaviour.

Investigators have attempted to disentangle the extent to which the relationship between social class and mental health outcomes is causal (that mental disorders result from the strain associated with lower socio-economic position), rather than explained by selection, that having a mental disorder limits an individual's movement up the socio-economic ladder or promotes downward mobility). Generally, studies have found evidence for both hypotheses. For example, Miech, Caspi, Moffitt et al. (1999) used educational achievement over a six year period (age 15 – 21) as a proxy measure for socio-economic progression ("status attainment") in order to investigate the relationship between social class (of origin or achievement) and CD. They found that CD appeared to impact negatively on educational attainment over the six year period (selection) while low SES was associated with CD at age 15, and with the likelihood of developing antisocial personality disorder by age 21 (causation). Using a prospective longitudinal design, Johnston, Cohen, Dohrenwend et al. (1999) investigated the link between class and mental disorder whilst controlling for a number of factors, including single parent status, parental psychopathology, and offspring age, gender and IQ. Specifically in relation to disruptive behaviour disorders (DBDs), they found evidence for both selection and causation processes. Results showed that school drop-out rates were double in young people with DBDs, who were four times less likely to continue their education after completing high school (selection), and that low parental education,

low parental income, and low parental occupation status predicted risk for offspring DBDs (causation).

Costello, Compton, Keeler and Angold (2003) exploited the opportunity to conduct a naturalistic experiment into the effect of changing poverty status on child psychopathology following the opening of a casino in an impoverished reservation in America, which was being investigated as part of the Great Smoky Mountains Study. As priority for employment was given to the inhabitants of the reservation, a large proportion of the population experienced a sudden change in their income level, and consequently their poverty status. This was tracked within the context of longitudinal data on child psychopathology and it was found that after the casino opened, the rate of behavioural problems among children from ex-poor families was almost identical to that in the never-poor group, and significantly lower than the rate in the persistently poor families. These findings therefore provide strong support for the social causation model, although the overall relationship between poverty and child psychopathology was found to be strongly mediated by the quality of the family interaction.

Fergusson, Swain-Campbell and Horwood (2004) used longitudinal data from the Christchurch study to investigate the class-crime association, and exploited the range of variables measured to test for a number of possible mediators of the relationship. After controlling for family factors (use of physical punishment, maternal care, changes of parents, parental attachment, parental history of criminal offending), individual factors (early conduct problems, early attentional problems), school factors (truancy, suspension, examination performance, scholastic ability), and deviant peer affiliation, these authors concluded that "with progressive control for family, individual, school and peer factors the association between SES and crime reduces to the point of statistical non-significance" (p.961).

These studies therefore reveal the range of factors which may explain the relationship between SES and conduct problems, with family functioning apparently

having a strong influence. The results on the association between CD and social class present a paradox when considered in the context of the diagnostic criteria since DSM-IV criteria state that CD should not be diagnosed if there is evidence that the environment (rather than an internal dysfunction within the individual) is influencing behaviour:

> Concerns have been raised that the Conduct Disorder diagnosis may at times be misapplied to individuals in settings where undesirable behavior are sometimes viewed as protective (e.g. threatening, impoverished, high-crime). Consistent with the DSM-IV definition of mental disorder, the Conduct Disorder diagnosis should be applied only when the behavior in question is symptomatic of an underlying dysfunction within the individual and not simply a reaction to the immediate social context... it may be helpful for the clinician to consider the social and economic context in which the undesirable behaviors have occurred. (DSM-IV, APA, 1994; p. 88)

The research reviewed above suggests that deprivation is part of a complex network of factors leading to the onset of conduct problems. However, since the diagnostic criteria direct clinicians to view individuals from deprived areas as nondisordered, those with the most complex needs may be getting overlooked in clinical practice.

1.3.7. Social and Economic Burden of CD

The latest edition of the DSM (DSM-IV; APA, 1994) states that "Conduct Disorder is one of the most frequently diagnosed conditions in outpatient and inpatient mental health facilities for children" (p.88). Although this is based on US figures, and therefore reflects a different system of referral, this illustrates the potential impact of CD and other disruptive behaviour disorders on public health resources in Britain, before the costs in terms of public safety and damage to property are even taken into account. In fact, Scott et al. (2001) have estimated that individuals with CD cost the state up to ten times more due to the associated criminality, school drop-out and unemployment, which highlights the enormous social and economic burden of this condition. Furthermore, it has been estimated that the National Health Service in Britain only absorbs around one-fifth of the costs associated with CD, with most of

the financial burden of CD falling on families (37%) and local education authorities (36%; Knapp, Scott and Davies, 1999). Therefore, these figures suggest that most of the needs of young people with CD are being met by their families and schools.

1.3.8. Summary

The evidence presented above on the epidemiology of CD highlights the difficulties in disentangling the multiplicity of risk factors associated with the development of CD, thus rendering it very difficult, or perhaps impossible, to establish causality. Other problems with interpreting this research relate to differences in the definition and measurement of antisocial behaviour; lack of statistical power to identify correlates when considering a wide range of variables; lack of understanding of the reasons for statistically significant associations; and failure to measure or identify the full range of possible mediating variables. In spite of these limitations, it has been demonstrated that epidemiological research represents a powerful tool for tracking the course, correlates and consequences of CD. Following his review, Hill (2002) concluded that "[t]here is a need... to enrich the conceptual framework in which conduct disorder research is carried out. Theoretical formulations and clinical reports have become unfashionable and yet in many ways this topic cries out for them" (p.156). The evidence presented in this section concurs with this view.

1.4. Sociological Perspectives on Delinquency

Sociological perspectives offer alternative ways of thinking about and conceptualising antisocial behaviour (or "delinquency" and "deviance" to use sociological terms). In line with the epidemiological research reviewed above, some sociological theories reflect a realist ontology, and seek to explain antisocial acts and understand the causes. However, other sociological theories challenge this determinist position, and suggest that deviance is a social construction, used by powerful others to exert control. These theories will now be described in order to present some alternative ways of conceptualising and understanding antisocial behaviour.

1.4.1. Positivist Paradigm: Structural and Subcultural Theories

1.4.1.1. Strain Theories

Merton (1968) proposed that individuals in society have a common goal to achieve success, defined in terms of wealth. He reasoned that a lack of opportunity to achieve success results in a situation of anomie, where rules are suspended, and where an individual will use any means to achieve their goals. This situation was said by Merton to result in deviant behaviour, particularly among the lower classes, who have less opportunity to achieve success by conventional means. Therefore, Merton effectively argued that social structure causes deviance. These ideas were reflected in Cohen's (1957) work on delinquent subculture, but he argued that Merton failed to account for the social nature of delinquency, or for engagement in behaviours which do not lead to financial gain (e.g. vandalism). Cohen postulated that working class males experience "status frustration," and use delinquency as a means to enhance status and gain rewards. In this way, young males reject normal routes to success, in favour of the benefits offered within the delinquent subculture.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960) developed Merton's anomie theory to describe "illegitimate opportunity structure," differentiating between criminal subcultures, conflict subcultures and retreatist subcultures. They reasoned that some young people have access to established groups, and are therefore initiated into criminal subcultures by adults who possess deviant values. In contrast, they depicted conflict subcultures as those groups of young people who cannot access existing criminal networks and therefore turn to gang violence to vent their anger and frustration. Finally, retreatist subcultures represent groups of young people whose activities revolve around drug use since they have not managed to achieve criminal status or gang membership. Taylor, Walton and Young (1973) criticised Cloward and Ohlin's theory on the basis of its assumption that all individuals share similar ideas of success, a criticism which extends to Cohen's and Merton's work. Miller (1962) also based his explanation of crime on lower class subculture, but argued that among lower class groups, conventional notions of success are suspended and criminal

lifestyles are actively encouraged. He based his subcultural theory on males from female-headed households whom he argued look to the peer group in the attempt to enhance their status and achieve a sense of belonging. In a similar way, Murray (1996) attributed crime to the "underclass," who he claimed reject the values of the higher classes. He suggested that crime tends to be committed by lower class males from single-parent households who have not been influenced by traditional socialisation processes associated with the institution of marriage and family responsibilities. Murray asserted that the welfare system created a sense among young men that they did not have to work, and that these types of values and a lack of sense of responsibility underpinned their involvement in crime. Murray's theory has been described as "'right realist' criminology," which blames lower class males for the majority of crime (McLaughlin, Muncie and Hughes, 2003). Furthermore, Mooney (1998) quoted a leaked cabinet paper which suggested that there was no evidence of an association between single-parent families and crime, and pointed out that the "fraction of single mothers who are on income support and have adolescent sons" cannot be blamed for rising crime rates.

1.4.1.2. Control Theory

Hirschi (1960) attempted to account for delinquency by considering the factors which prevent it in the vast majority of individuals. He posited that a lack of respect for the opinions of others; low levels of commitment and involvement, as evidenced in the failure to invest time and effort in conventional activities; and a lack of regard for societal rules all contribute to the likelihood of engaging in crime. Rock (1997) argued that there is "tautology and repetition in that formulation" but suggested that Hirschi's theory usefully re-oriented theorists to consider why most individuals shun crime. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) expanded on the original theory and suggested that crime is more common among individuals with low self-control who seek instant rewards and cannot inhibit their desire for self-fulfilment. Although they argued that crime was enjoyable, they also suggested that it failed to provide long-term rewards or a sense of purpose.

1.4.2. Interactionist Theories on Delinquency

The interactionist view of deviance surfaced in the 1960s, and represented a radical shift in thinking on criminology, through works such as Becker's (1963) on labelling and Lemert's (1972) on the theory of social reaction. Rather than focusing on behaviour, these theorists claimed that deviance is a product of the reaction to behaviour. In his analysis of marijuana users, Becker insisted that:

> ...*social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance*, and by applying these rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is *not* a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an 'offender' (p.9, original emphasis)

Lemert (1967) developed Becker's thesis by differentiating between primary and secondary deviance. While primary deviance represents acts which have not been labelled by others (the "secret" deviant, to use Becker's term), secondary deviance relates to those behaviours which have been recognised and labelled in the public domain. Since behaviour only becomes deviant when officially labelled, Becker and Lemert theorised that the social reaction is constitutive of the deviance, rather than the act itself. However, Taylor et al. (1973) were heavily critical of labelling theory, arguing that it removes purpose from deviance. They described the interactionist view as an "over-reaction" which has crucially failed to address the mechanism of social reaction and the reason for it surfacing in the first place.

The idea that mental disorders are constructed in social interaction was espoused by Foucault in his influential account of "Madness and Civilization" which was published in 1967. Foucault reasoned that the discipline of psychiatry represents one form of the exertion of power by the state, but that its influence is pervasive at all levels of society, therefore leading individuals to label others as mentally ill. At its most extreme, Foucault's theory posits that psychiatric discourse has created mental illness and suggests that psychiatry represents a process of social exclusion through the incarceration of mental patients in asylums. Similar themes arose in

Goffman's (1968) work on the treatment of psychiatric patients in institutions in which he suggested that the practices employed by staff encouraged people to consider themselves as ill, and that psychiatric labelling therefore served as a self-fulfilling prophecy. The basic premise of the anti-psychiatry movement in the 1960s was that the discipline of psychiatry threatens personal freedom (e.g. Szasz, 1961). Although these works were a response to institutionalisation, and therefore have less relevance to current clinical practice, these theorists raised the important issue of social control and the role of psychiatry.

1.4.3. Delinquency and Drift

Frustration with determinist accounts of deviance prompted Matza to propose his theory of neutralization in 1964. Matza reasoned that structural theories over-predict the number of individuals involved in delinquent activities. Moving away from the notion of criminal careers, Matza argued instead that delinquents "drift" in and out of criminal behaviours as a result of an "episodic release from moral constraint" (p. 69). Thus, although delinquents mostly uphold the same moral codes as the non-offending portion of society, such barriers can be temporarily removed through the application of "techniques of neutralization." Based on empirical research with young offenders, Sykes and Matza (1957) found that these neutralisations (i.e. justifications for behaviour) fell into the following groups: denial of responsibility, denial of injury, denial of victim, condemnation of the condemners, and appeal to higher loyalties.

Matza's focus on the concept of drift blurs the boundary between delinquent and nondelinquent, and therefore avoids labelling individuals as deviant. Matza criticised the medicalisation of deviance and the use of determinist theories to explain it:

> Did sociologists ever really believe that persons 'caught' deviation? Not really; they simply acted and wrote as if they did. As long as deviation was conceived as pathology, as long as the language of research used the terms of epidemiology, as long as man's environment was

likened to that of the ecological milieu of trees and foxes, what better inference regarding the *method of affiliation* could be imagined? (1969, p.102, original emphasis).

Matza's theory on drift has been criticised for its failure to account for more serious forms of delinquency (Taylor et al., 1973), and therefore it could be argued that his theory cannot fully substantiate his scathing attack on the positivist approach to conceptualising deviance. Hence, his view of delinquency and drift only weakly challenges the epidemiological approach and the classification of CD as a mental disorder.

1.4.4. Gender and Delinquency

Most classic theories of delinquency have been formulated exclusively around males' behaviour. For example, Cloward and Ohlin (1960) developed their thesis on strain theory on the basis of the behaviour of males from the lower social classes whilst Miller (1958) used subcultural theory to explain delinquency in males from female-headed households. Feminists in particular have criticised patriarchal conceptualisations of crime and criminals. For example, Smart (1995) emphasised the failure of "totalizing theory" and argued for a postmodern approach to the study of criminology, to address the biases inherent in this traditionally oppressive, male-dominated field. Similarly, Carrington (1998) pointed to the "misrepresentation of women within criminological discourse and the folly of biologically reductionist accounts of female crime that assign to the population fixed sex-related characteristics" (p.90). This quote is from a chapter contained in the follow-up to the seminal work "The New Criminology" (Taylor et al., 1973) which, in its original form, failed to consider gender issues at all. Some researchers have argued that criminological theories have been developed around criminal activity in men because crime committed by females accounts for such a small proportion of overall crime in official statistics (Burman, Batchelor and Brown, 2001). However, there is growing recognition of the need to formulate theories on the basis of crime committed by women (Laidler and Hunt, 2001).

1.4.5. The 'New' Criminology

"The New Criminology" (Taylor et al., 1973) represented a radical shift in thinking about crime and deviance. The authors were very highly critical of deterministic explanations, arguing that:

> ...crime is found to be well nigh ubiquitous. It is found to occur in all sections of society – amongst the rich and the poor, the young and the old – amongst men and women – and always in greater amounts and in different proportions than was previously assumed. Criminological theory, however, has largely worked on the assumption that crime is an overwhelmingly youthful, masculine, working class activity (p.15)

Rather than focusing on explaining crime, Taylor, Walton and Young aimed to provide an account of criminalisation, and the mechanism by which social inequalities lead to the labelling of crime and criminals by the economically and politically powerful segment of society. They therefore focused on the definition of crime, and attended to its meaning from the perspective of individual social actors, stating in the conclusion to their 1973 volume that "deviance is normal" (p.282). This sentiment was echoed by Young in the 1998 edited collection, "The New Criminology Revisited," who stated that:

> Crime has moved from the rare, the abnormal, the offence of the marginal and the stranger to a commonplace part of the texture of everyday life. It occupies the family, the heart-land of liberal democratic society as well as extending its anxiety into all areas of the city. It is revealed in the highest echelons of our economy and politics as well as in the urban impasses of the underclass. At times, it seems as frequent in the agencies set up to control crime as it does within the criminal fraternity itself (p.260)

Furthermore, Young (1998) argued that it is irrelevant to attempt to propose a parsimonious theory of the causes of crime since "[i]t is necessary to talk about discrete crimes in specific social situations" (p.33). Therefore, Taylor, Walton and Young raised the important issue of the definition and meaning of crime, arguing against the production of over-arching theories.

1.4.6. Summary

Sociological theories offer a range of alternative perspectives on antisocial behaviour, with determinist views, underpinned by a realist ontology, at one end of the spectrum and constructivist views at the other. While structural and strain theorists depict delinquency as caused by social and environmental factors, in line with the epidemiological model, interactionists frame deviance as a social construction. On the other hand, according to Taylor et al. (1973), deviance represents normal behaviour. In spite of the disagreement among sociologists about how to conceptualise deviance and delinquency, these theories inherently challenge the notion that delinquency is indicative of mental disorder.

1.5. The Medicalisation of Bad Behaviour

These contrasting psychiatric and sociological perspectives on behaving badly raise the following questions: firstly, are the behaviours which lead to the diagnosis of CD indicative of mental disorder; secondly, should these behaviours be regarded as a normal reaction to adverse circumstances; and thirdly, is the labelling of these behaviours as abnormal a result of the complex interplay between the state (social policy), institutions (with the power to exert control) and authority figures (psychiatrists, doctors, police, teachers, parents)? This section will address these questions in the context of the increasing trend for medicalising behaviour (Conrad and Schneider, 1992).

Medicalisation is the application of medical diagnoses and treatments to nondisease states (Barsky and Borus, 1995). The inclusion, and subsequent removal, of various 'disorders' from the DSM illustrates that certain syndromes may reflect the moral and political climate rather than internal dysfunction or disease state (Kutchins and Kirk, 1997). For example, the medicalisation of homosexuality in the second edition of the DSM published in 1968 is an example of "the juxtaposition of moral and medical opinion" (Ingleby, 1982). Aside from moral considerations, another possible reason for medicalising behaviour relates to the economy and the funding of

healthcare services, which is a particularly salient issue in the US, which operates a private healthcare system (Kutchins and Kirk, 1997). Richters and Cicchetti (1993) have suggested that:

> The reimbursibility issue is particularly problematic because federal and private funding sources for mental health treatment and services often require that a condition qualify as a mental disorder within the DSM system to qualify for payment. This requirement, in turn, creates an unnatural and counterproductive tension between the mental health, consumer advocate, and scientific communities – a tension that is nowhere more palpable than in the case of CD (p.23)

These authors suggested that the classification of CD as a mental disorder has not provoked debate in the literature because researchers are mindful of the importance of researching the causes, course and consequence of antisocial behaviour, regardless of its clinical status.

However, whilst this issue may not be of primary importance to epidemiologists, the status of CD as a mental disorder has major implications for the organisation and funding of services. In the UK, it has been recognised that there is need to extend help for young people with conduct problems outwith the healthcare sector (Mental Health Foundation, 1999), and therefore the way in which CD is understood might be crucial so that other professions accept responsibility for tackling conduct problems in young people. An entry which formerly appeared on the Greater Glasgow Primary Care NHS Trust website stated that "[t]he service will not accept in the first instance adolescents with conduct disturbance in the absence of symptoms suggestive of mental illness." The wording of this clause suggests that CD was not recognised as a mental disorder within this Health Board, and that individuals with CD would not be entitled to access mental healthcare services in the absence of a second comorbid condition. This not only illustrates the need to develop services that are more easily accessible to young people (West et al., 2003), but also demonstrates that despite its status within classificatory systems such as

ICD-10 or DSM-IV, CD is not automatically regarded as within the remit of psychiatry.

As part of the research for the 'Bright Futures' report on young people's mental health, The Mental Health Foundation (1999) commissioned a series of papers on the social context of young people's lives, and included a number of comments from young people themselves on the experience of mental health problems. The involvement of service users in consultations about health service reforms signals "a fundamental challenge to the old order of beneficent paternalism that has characterised professional work since the birth of the NHS" (Thomas and Bracken, 2004, p.361). Bracken and Thomas (2001) have argued that there is a need for a postmodern shift (or "postpsychiatry"), which "seeks to democratise mental health by linking progressive service development to a debate about contexts, values, and partnerships" (p.727). The current study reflects this need by problematising the current system of classifying CD using young people's lived accounts of behaving badly.

1.6. Conclusion and Research Questions

Through a critical evaluation of the diagnostic criteria and findings from epidemiological research, this review has outlined the problems associated with classifying CD as a mental disorder. The issue of whether the collection of antisocial behaviours defined as CD constitute a mental disorder, or whether these behaviours are better understood in other ways, for example, in the context of interactionist perspectives on delinquency, is central to this study. The aim of the thesis is to investigate competing (psychiatric and sociological) views on antisocial behaviour through an examination of the accounts of young people who have met criteria for CD. A tripartite analysis will be conducted in order to probe the different levels of meaning which can be derived by adopting different ontological positions about the nature of accounts. This approach to analysis is described in more detail in Chapter 3 but broadly seeks to explore the layers of meaning and identity work

achieved by young people in their accounts. Alternative perspectives on behaving badly will be investigated by exploring the meanings which young people ascribe to their behaviour. The following research questions were devised to guide the analysis:

1. How do young people define and explain antisocial behaviour?

2. What features of individuals' biographies, family background and peer relationships might add to the understanding of their involvement in, and beliefs about, antisocial behaviour?

3. Is there a gender and class patterning of young people's accounts?

4. How do these accounts, biographies and explanations vary across individuals with and without CD?

Chapter 2: Methods

2.1. Introduction

This chapter will describe the philosophical underpinnings of the study, and the methodological approach. This chapter begins with a description of different epistemological and ontological positions, and the advantages and disadvantages of each for addressing the research questions set out in Chapter 1. The first section will describe different ontological approaches to understanding reality, and the implications of these positions for the type of knowledge produced. The second part of the chapter outlines the methods employed in the current study, covering the study design; sampling; ethical considerations; practical aspects of the interview encounter; and transcription.

2.2. Philosophical underpinnings

2.2.1. Positivist Tradition

Following the philosophical tradition of 'foundationalism,' scientific research has operated on the premise that there exist objective truths, which are separate from individuals' beliefs about the world, and form a benchmark against which to judge these views as rational or otherwise (Hughes and Sharrock, 1997). Positivists have attempted to unearth this 'reality' through controlled experiments (Schwartz and Jacobs, 1979), in order to explain causation. Comte (1907) argued that human actions can be understood using the principles of positivism. This position reflects Enlightenment principles and the view that there exists a fixed, universal reality. According to this view, "knowledge is understood as buried metal and the interviewer is a miner who unearths the valuable metal" (Kvale, 1996, p.3). However, this position has been criticised on the grounds that humans do not act like molecules, and therefore controlled experiments cannot predict and explain behaviour, which is governed by free will (May, 1997).

2.2.2. Postpositivist Research

The postpositivist position reflects the view that research findings in the human sciences can only approximate 'truth' since research involving humans rules out the possibility of controlling for all of the factors which may be relevant to the phenomenon under study (Lincoln and Guba, 2000; Robson, 2002; Silverman, 2000). Therefore, in contrast to 'closed' systems, which characterise research in the natural sciences, research in the social sciences investigates 'open' systems wherein human consciousness is regarded as unobservable (Robson, 2002; Taylor, 1979). The discipline of psychiatry reflects this ontological position as reflected in the use of epidemiological and quantitative research findings for validating classifications and identifying abnormal behaviour. However, the use of quantitative research techniques has been criticised on the grounds that there exists a tautological link between the methods used to test hypotheses, and the conclusions drawn, since the researchers have selected the measures used to record behaviour and attitudes (Guba and Lincoln, 1998). This suggests that the "cumulative generalizations" (Silverman, 2000) arrived at in quantitative research may not reflect the meanings of those being studied.

2.2.2.1. Critical Realist Position

Bhaskar's (1989) critical realist perspective described how certain features of the environment, even if not directly experienced, affect human agency:

> Social structures may be just as objective, and transfactually efficacious within their geo-historical domain, as natural laws. Moreover both alike typically impose limits and constraints upon the kinds of action (including speech action) possible to human beings, without (normally) rigidly determining what we do within those limits or constraints (p.176)

In common with positivism, Bhaskar argued that the world has an existence independent of human agents' experience of it. However, although he suggested that social structure shapes experience, he also claimed that these influences were not entirely deterministic. For this reason, he described theories in social science

disciplines as explanatory rather than predictive. Bhaskar's critical realist perspective is open to the criticism that he unites two positions (positivist and interpretivist) in order to avoid the criticisms associated with each, although his theory has been regarded as an acceptable and pragmatic approach to research in the social sciences (Robson, 2002).

2.2.2.2. Critical Realism and Identity

Sarup's (1996) views on identity appear to mirror the general principles of Bhaskar's critical realist approach. He acknowledged the effects of certain 'dynamic' elements of the social world on human experience, which he argued work in tandem with subjective meanings to shape identity:

> ...the identity of the human subject is, in some ways, an effect of (what I shall call) dynamics such as class, ethnicity, 'race,' religion and nation, but the subject is not entirely determined by them. Our identities are not completely determined by socialising institutions, the ideological state apparatuses. Through 'free will' – the processes of choice in interpretation, selection – we can, to some extent, limit or adapt the external determinations. (p.48)

Hall (2000) described the concept of identity in similar terms, emphasising the fluidity of identities across different situations, and the importance of social and historical structures:

> ...identities are never unified and, in late modern times, increasingly fragmented and fractured; never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions... Precisely because identities are constructed within, not outside, discourse, we need to understand them as produced in specific historical and institutional sites... (p.17)

Hall's definition therefore emphasises agency in the construction of identity, suggesting that it is shaped by individuals within the boundaries of socio-historical factors.

2.2.3. Interpretivism

Researchers working within the interpretivist tradition of social research have emphasised the need to interpret behaviour from the point of view of the individual. This position therefore addresses some of the criticisms of postpositivist research in prioritising meaning as understood and described by individuals in the course of social interaction. For example, Weber (1964) claimed that understanding actors' meanings was a prerequisite to understanding the causes of behaviour. He believed that this could be achieved by the researcher through 'verstehen,' which involved observing and interpreting action through the eyes of the social actor. The difference between research in the natural sciences and Weber's methodology was its quest for "the theoretically conceived 'pure type' of subjective meaning" (1964, p.128).

Symbolic interactionism represents another branch of the interpretivist tradition, which in common with Weber's approach, seeks to explain the causes of behaviour from the perspective of actors, where behaviour was believed to be shaped and modified through social interaction. Mead (1934) conceived symbolic interactionism as essentially role-playing, in which the concept of self was developed through relations with others:

> [t]he 'I' is the response of the organism to the attitudes of the others; the 'me' is the organized set of attitudes of others which one himself assumes. (p.156)

Becker (1963) applied the theory of symbolic interactionism in his work on deviance, as described in Chapter 1, claiming that behaviour is not inherently deviant, but becomes so as "a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an 'offender'" (p.9). One criticism of the symbolic interactionist perspective has been its failure to address the source of meanings (Williams and May, 1996), as distinct from the causes of behaviour. Applying this general criticism to Becker's work might lead to the suggestion that he failed to address the reasons behind the process of labelling others.

The objective of both symbolic interactionism and Weber's approach was to explicate the causes of behaviour using techniques which prioritised the meanings assigned to behaviour by social actors. The principles associated with these interpretive research strategies can be attributed to the philosophical tradition of phenomenology (Robson, 2002). Central to this tradition is the view that there is no objective reality beyond the meanings and classifications assigned by humans to understand various 'phenomena' in their environment. Hence, meaning can be said to be rooted in the classificatory systems, or 'typifications,' used by individuals to make the world intelligible to them (Schutz, 1972). Phenomenologists argue that this understanding is reached through shared knowledge and is subject to change through the process of social interaction. However, this relativist ontology has been criticised on the grounds that there is no objective benchmark against which to evaluate interpretivist theories and research (Hughes and Sharrock, 1997).

2.2.4. Constructivism

Constructivism shares some features of interpretivism, particularly the pursuit of meaning through the understandings of social actors, and the ontological position of phenomenology that there is no fixed, universal reality (Charmaz, 2000). Adhering to the view that "objective knowledge and truth is the result of perspective" (Schwandt, 1998, p.236), constructivists emphasise the relativity of 'truth,' which is believed to be reflected in language and constructed in interaction:

> Respondents' answers and comments are not viewed as reality reports delivered from a fixed repository. Instead, they are considered for the ways that they construct aspects of reality in collaboration with the interviewer. (Miller and Glassner, 1997, p.127)

Hence, within the constructivist paradigm, accounts must be understood in the context of the social interaction in which they arise, as re-constructed by the researcher.

This emphasis on the production of 'situated' knowledge is open to the criticism that research findings cannot be easily validated through empirical testing and challenges

constructivists to "show that meanings really do provide intelligibility, not just a psychological feeling of intelligibility" (Rosenberg, 1995, p.119). Since the reconstruction of the findings relies on the perspective of the researcher, who is also co-creator of the source data, some argue that the research outcomes lack reliability and validity. For example, Pratt (1978) claimed that for "any radical claim that our view of the world is created by our concepts... [it is] impossible to achieve a position from which the truth of any claim made within a conceptual framework may be 'externally' assessed" (p. 58). To address such concerns, Lincoln and Guba (1999) have argued that the concepts of reliability and validity, as understood by positivists, are irrelevant to qualitative research, arguing instead for the importance of the "trustworthiness" and generalisability of findings.

2.2.4.1. Nature of Accounts

West (1990) asserted that "one of the major problems for the sociologist lies in evaluating both the status and validity of their versions of reality" (p.1229). He argued that triangulation represents a way of evaluating the status and validity of accounts. By comparing parents' accounts of coping with an epileptic child with observations of clinical consultations involving the families, West concluded that parents' negative accounts of the medical profession were substantiated, therefore serving to reinforce the validity of their "gloomy" accounts. Cornwell (1984) differentiated between 'public' and 'private' accounts, suggesting that the aim of the former is to depict behaviour and attitudes in a way which maximises social approval. Cornwell argued that participants express views from the perspective of the "generalised other" in public accounts. Conversely, she described private accounts as experiential, and therefore more likely to contain less socially acceptable explanations of behaviour. She conducted a series of interviews on health and lifestyle among people living in East London, and found that participants were more likely to offer public accounts in early interviews and in their answers to general questions, whilst private accounts tended to emerge in later interviews in relation to experiential questions. These studies illustrate that the types of accounts produced in interviews vary, and that part of the process of analysing accounts involves

ascertaining the status and validity of participants' reports about their behaviour, which in turn may be affected by views on socially acceptable behaviour, or by the level of rapport achieved in the interview.

In describing identity as "multiply constructed," Hall (2000) pointed to the role of the individual in shaping and controlling the image they project in social interaction. Goffman (1959) put forward a more extreme argument; namely, that all social interaction represents a form of "impression management," and suggested that individuals actively manipulate accounts in order to achieve a particular goal, for example, projecting moral worth or goodness. Using the analogy of dramatic performance, Goffman argued that:

> ...*qua* performers, individuals are concerned not with the moral issue of realizing these [moral] standards, but with the amoral issue of engineering a convincing impression that these standards are being realized. (p. 243, original emphasis)

According to this view, accounts do not reflect reality, but rather demonstrate the techniques used by individuals (or performers) to elicit moral approval from others. In the context of the current study, Goffman's ideas would suggest that accounts may be viewed as attempts to convey moral goodness, but should not be considered as a means of understanding actual behaviour.

Radley and Billig (1996) described the process of accounting in more detail:

> The tacit grounds of the exchange become the basis of the speaker's concern to justify his or her position or to articulate a role that is congruent with that believed to be held by so-called normal or healthy others. That is to say, issues of accountability are situated, rhetorical concerns. However, in accounting for oneself, speakers must do more than talk about themselves. Accountability only arises in the first place because there are general concerns of value and morality. (p.228).

Despite their specific reference to accounts of health and illness, the components of accounting identified by Radley and Billig – the justification and normalisation of experiences – could similarly be applied to accounts of antisocial behaviour. In addition to accommodating the contextual features of the exchange and the situatedness of the dialogue, Radley and Billig's description of accounting highlights the inherent importance of values and morality in the process of accounting. Within their framework, accounts cannot be regarded as objective windows on reality but as arguments. They proposed that focusing on the "activity of accounting" reveals the ways in which individuals use accounts to construct a favourable social identity:

> ...the study of accounting involves examining how people are using beliefs and what they are doing when giving their beliefs in particular situations. In this respect, the study of health and illness beliefs is a study of activity, not of a presumed object lying behind the activity of accounting. (p. 224)

Radley and Billig provided a number of examples of the 'activity of accounting,' and illustrated the variety of roles and perspectives which can be taken up in a single dialogue. In the context of discussing health and illness, Radley and Billig (1996) suggested that "people are also making claims about themselves as worthy individuals, 'as more or less fit' participants in the activities of the social world" (p. 221). Their analysis of the process of accounting can therefore accommodate the contradictions, moral work, and contextual features of the social encounter which they regarded as important in understanding individuals' perspectives on the social world.

Similarly, in accounting for actions which may be deemed unacceptable by others, Scott and Lyman (1968) argued that individuals will naturally "strive for the advantageous identity" (p.59). In their seminal paper on accounts published in the American Sociological Review in 1968, they stated that "the study of deviance and the study of accounts are intrinsically related, and a clarification of accounts will constitute a clarification of deviant phenomena" (p.62). They defined an account as:

...a statement made by a social actor to explain unanticipated or untoward behavior – whether that behavior is his own or that of others, and whether the proximate cause for the statement arises from the actor himself or from someone else. (p.46)

Scott and Lyman (1968) discussed the concept of identity in relation to accounts of deviance, referring to the notion of "identity-switching" as a method whereby individuals assume various roles in accounting for their actions from a "multiplicity of identities" (p.58). They claimed that individuals will ultimately "strive for the advantageous identity" (p.59) in accounting for behaviour which they believe is regarded as unacceptable.

These theories on the process of accounting reflect a constructivist ontology, and suggest that individuals actively construct their identities in the course of social interaction with others.

2.2.5. Summary
The four main approaches to social research reviewed above reflect different ontological positions, which produce different types of knowledge. Firstly, positivist research aims to predict and explain human behaviour using the objectivist principles associated with the natural sciences. The goal of positivist research is therefore to unearth truths which reflect an external reality. In contrast, research in the postpositivst tradition reflects a realist ontology, and aims to explain behaviour within a socio-historical context but acknowledges human subjectivity and consciousness. The interpretivist approach prioritises meaning as negotiated in social interaction and reflected in language. Therefore, according to an interpretive perspective, accounts are indicative of participants' own subjectivities, and meaning is regarded as relative, as understood through shared language and social interaction. Finally, the constructivist position, in common with interpretivism, regards meaning as relative and bound by the social context of the exchange. Constructivists view accounts as stories with a purpose, which are used to convey an argument or construct a social identity.

As discussed in Chapter 3, a tripartite analysis will be used in the current study to demonstrate the type of knowledge produced when accounts are viewed from a realist, interpretivist and constructivist perspective.

2.3. Choosing the Research Method

Various commentators have discussed the relationship between research methods and the philosophical principles underlying research paradigms (e.g. Lincoln and Guba, 2000). Most qualitative researchers would probably agree with Lincoln and Guba's (2000) statement that "[m]ethodology is inevitably interwoven with and emerges from the nature of particular disciplines (such as sociology and psychology) and particular perspectives..." (p.164). However, not all would necessarily agree with Schwandt's (2000) more radical stance that choosing a method should be secondary to addressing wider epistemiological and ontological considerations. For example, Mason (2002) has indicated that philosophical position may not always be the most important consideration when choosing a method. In relation to the constructivist paradigm, both Bryman (2001) and Guba and Lincoln (1998) would probably challenge her statement that "[s]ome researchers may feel unable to answer... ontological questions fully at the beginning of their research" (p. 15/16). In their opinion, constructivism itself represents an ontological position. Consistent with this view, 'choices' relating to the design of the current study were driven by the goal of exploring 'multiple realities,' which necessitated a flexible design (Robson, 2002). A qualitative project was therefore developed which prioritised individuals' accounts, and allowed their definitions and explanations to freely emerge. In-depth semi-structured interviews were carried out, which provided scope for individuals to spontaneously elaborate on a range of themes, but which also ensured that core material was generated in each interview. The tension between generating equivalent data so that comparisons could be made in keeping with the aim of the research, and creating an open and fluid discussion in which participants had scope to pursue interesting themes, created very long interviews in many cases. Seeking breadth and depth in the discussion of each interview topic was in hindsight

very ambitious but also produced rich accounts, which moved between descriptions of experience to more general explanations of antisocial behaviour.

Interviews were felt to be more appropriate than focus groups in light of the nature of the research. Adopting a focus group methodology would have been a tool for examining 'multivocality,' and the way in which individuals' views emerged in the context of a group (Holstein and Gubrium, 1995), but it was recognised that individuals may have felt less comfortable discussing some aspects of their personal experiences in the presence of others. Focus groups could have been designed to involve groups of friends, and would have provided a means of exploring how peer interaction affected individuals' negotiations of meanings since peer influence has been identified as important in both the interviews carried out and in the wider literature on CD. However, there is also a possibility that individuals would have been concerned that discussions of their behaviour would have compromised their status in the peer group, thus changing the nature of the accounts. Wight (1994) used an ethnographic approach to study boys' accounts of their sexual behaviour, and found that the nature of accounts varied across the interview and focus group settings:

> The contrast between accounts given in individual interviews and those given in group discussions was most striking in the school where the individual interviews preceded the group discussions. Several young men who recounted their sexual histories to me as if fairly sensitive to their partners' feelings later discussed sex with their class mates in a grossly obscene, objectifying manner. This was probably an attempt to embarrass me (in retaliation after their own experience), and a reaffirmation of provisionally suspended group norms. (p.729)

Hence, respondents may have been more likely to furnish their accounts with bravado had they been interviewed in the presence of their peers. Although it would have been interesting to investigate the research questions using a multi-method design, this was felt to be outwith the scope of the study. In addition, confidentiality may have been compromised in a group situation (Mason, 1999) and may have

affected the depth and quality of the data generated. Since the emphasis was on exploring meaning and contextualising experiences by reference to biography, individual interviews appeared to be a more appropriate method than focus groups (Morgan, 2002).

In addition, participant observation was felt to be an unworkable approach since participants were selected from an existing cohort on the basis of information provided in a self-administered psychiatric interview. These individuals did not form natural friendship groups and therefore could not be studied collectively in their 'natural setting.' Furthermore, fewer individuals could have been observed than interviewed within the time-frame of the project, which may have reduced the spread of views, and limited the scope for comparing perspectives. While the emphasis of a participant observation study is often on behaviour, and the researcher's interpretation of it (Lincoln and Guba, 1999), this project was designed to explore participants' subjective understandings of 'antisocial behaviour,' in line with the constructivist approach. This focus on inter-subjectivity (Kvale, 1996) could have been achieved using an ethnographic approach which incorporated in-depth interviews, but this was also outwith the scope of the study.

One advantage of using a participant observation methodology would have been the direct insight gained from witnessing the interaction of participants 'in the field,' rather than their retrospective accounts of their experiences. However, the interview encounter and the position of respondents vis-a-vis the interviewer formed an integral part of the analysis in the current study, in line with the constructivist perspective and its emphasis on talk as situated. Furthermore, aspects of the social interaction were arguably more amenable to analysis in the interview setting than would have been the case in a natural setting where relationships and social encounters would have been less well understood by the researcher. Also, the presence of an 'outsider' researcher may have influenced group dynamics and therefore created an artificial window on the research setting (Shipman, 1997). There was some evidence in the interviews carried out that the researcher was

indeed perceived as an 'outsider,' as revealed in Emily's expectation of the interviewer's ignorance about a weapon she is describing:

...cause I took a wee boy in my car the other night that'd been hit across the face wi' em, a two by two, do you know what that is, no?

No.

It's like a piece o' wood that goes along the way and a piece of wood that goes up the way like that.

Oh right, yeah.   [Emily]

Such recognition of the researcher's status as an outsider may have led to a reluctance by participants to carry out certain acts as they normally would. Moreover, participant observation may have presented particular ethical dilemmas if the researcher had witnessed illegal behaviours, or if some of the behaviours threatened the life or safety of another individual (Patrick, 1972).

Therefore, despite the potential of other methodological approaches to generate data relevant to addressing the aims of the research, interviews were believed to be the most appropriate method for exploring individuals' reflections about their involvement in antisocial behaviour. This was in part due to the depth of understanding which could quickly be achieved in carrying out interviews, and also as a result of the potential for generating core data, thus increasing the scope for comparing accounts (Flick, 2002).

2.4. Study Design

2.4.1. Pilot Project (1): Exploring Young People's Accounts

The first pilot project was carried out in 2001 and aimed to explore ways of talking about 'antisocial behaviour' in terms meaningful to young people, and to gauge the extent to which participants appeared comfortable when talking about their lives and

views in relation to antisocial behaviour. Five individuals, aged between fourteen and eighteen, were recruited on spec at a youth club. Permission was sought from the director of the centre and on the nights of the visit, information sheets were handed out to individuals attending the club, who were then given the opportunity to ask questions before deciding whether to participate. This was conceived of as an orienting exercise to give the researcher some experience of interviewing young people and to stimulate ideas about ways in which to frame questions and promote discussion in this area. Thus, the interview schedule was only very loosely defined at this stage with the conversation broadly centred around the topics of biography, leisure, peer groups, school, antisocial behaviour and future ambitions.

Since this pilot project was specifically devised to explore methodology, these interviews were not transcribed or analysed, however, one striking observation related to gender differences in ways of talking about antisocial behaviour, which shaped the direction of the research questions and line of questioning in subsequent interviews. For example, while the males in this pilot project were more likely to discuss gang membership and incidents between rival gangs, the girls described watching these activities, in apparent admiration and appeared to be providing encouragement from the sidelines.

2.4.2. Pilot Project (2): Psychiatric Views on Conduct Disorder

A separate pilot project was carried out in which four psychiatrists were interviewed in order to explore how CD is defined and understood in clinical practice. These individuals were colleagues of one of the supervisors, Dr Michael van Beinum, who selected them on the basis of their differing perspectives on clinical practice in child and adolescent psychiatry. This pragmatic approach to selecting interviewees meant that the range of views on CD was maximised across a small number of interviews, which could be easily slotted into the timetable of research. A structured interview schedule was devised which explored psychiatrists' perspectives on CD, and in particular, views on diagnostic labelling and the diagnostic criteria for CD, the

aetiology and treatment of conduct problems, and projections about future prevalence.

2.4.3. Pilot Project (3): Recruitment and Interviewing Procedures

A second pilot project with young people was carried out specifically to test recruitment procedures and pilot the semi-structured interview schedule, which was organised thematically in order to explore personal biography, lifestyle, school experiences, antisocial behaviour, and future aspirations. These areas were covered in light of emerging ideas about the data generated in the pilot projects and in order to contextualise young people's accounts of antisocial behaviour. The rationale for carrying out this more targeted pilot study was to assess the acceptability and applicability of questions, and to refine the interview schedule. To this end, two of the interviews were fully transcribed by the researcher and circulated to the supervisors of the project who provided feedback on the interview content and style.

This project involved seven young people, aged 19 and 20, who were drawn from the same cohort as the participants in the main study, and took place immediately prior to the fieldwork for the main study. Since the number of cases of individuals with CD was relatively small, these individuals were selected from the group who did not meet criteria for any psychiatric disorder in order to conserve the pool of individuals who could be selected for inclusion in the main study. The very low rate of return of reply slips in the pilot project, in which only two individuals out of the ten contacted to participate responded using this method, prompted a change of tactic in the main study. Individuals were instead invited to contact the researcher by telephone or e-mail and those who did not were then phoned by the researcher and asked if they would like to participate in the study. This strategy proved to be more successful, and personal contact with the researcher at this stage seemed advantageous, since questions about the study could be answered before individuals decided whether to participate. These pilot participants offered positive feedback on the content and format of the interview, and some seemed to very much enjoy the

interview and the opportunity to discuss issues which they confessed to not having given much thought to before the interview.

2.4.4. Sampling Frame

Participants were selected from an existing cohort of individuals who have taken part in a number of phases of an ongoing epidemiological study (11-16, 16+; West, Sweeting, Der et al., 2003) under the direction of Professor Patrick West. Individuals who were contacted had agreed to participate in further research studies during the most recent stage of the study (16+), which began in July 2002. Forty individuals from the original cohort were contacted in four stages in order to achieve the target number of 32 interviews.

Warren (2002) reasoned that "[b]ecause the object of qualitative interviewing is to discern meaningful patterns within thick description, researchers may try to minimize or maximize differences among respondents – say, according to race or class – in order to highlight or contrast patterns" (p.87). Maximum variation in accounts (Flick, 2002; Maykut and Morehouse, 1994) was achieved using a purposive sampling strategy, taking advantage of the data collected during previous sweeps of the longitudinal study (11-16, 16+; West, Sweeting, Der et al., 2003). In the two most recent phases of this study, participants completed a self-administered computerised psychiatric interview (Voice-DISC, Shaffer, Fisher, Lucas et al., 2000). The Voice-DISC is an interactive version of the 4th version of the Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children (National Institute of Mental Health, 1997). Preliminary evidence suggests that the Voice-DISC is at least as reliable as the interviewer version (Lucas, 2003). The psychiatric classifications derived from the Voice-DISC allowed individuals who met criteria for CD to be targeted for inclusion in the current study. Therefore, the sampling frame included individuals who met criteria for CD at age 15 and/ or 18; individuals who met criteria for CD and a second (comorbid) condition; and finally, individuals who did not meet criteria for any psychiatric disorder. As well as maximising the difference between participants in relation to CD status, sex and class was also built into the sampling frame in order

to explore possible gender differences and the influence of social background. The target number of interviews was 32, comprising four males and four females in each group as detailed in Table 2.1.

	CD (Age 15)	CD (Ages 15 & 18)	Comorbid CD (Age 18)	No psychiatric diagnosis (Ages 15 & 18)
No. of males	4	4	4	4
No. of females	4	4	4	4

Table 2.1: The Sampling Frame

Bryman (2001) complained that "the lack of transparency that is sometimes a feature of qualitative research...is particularly apparent in relation to sampling" (p.323), which concurs with Mason's (2002) observation that sampling is seldom discussed in qualitative methods texts. This contrasts sharply with the way in which sampling is discussed in relation to quantitative research (e.g. Coolican, 1994). In fact, the sampling frame outlined above is arguably more typical of that devised at the outset of a quantitative study rather than a qualitative study. However, this sampling strategy was employed to address the research questions, which necessitated a comparison of the accounts of individuals with and without CD; of males and females; and of individuals from different social class backgrounds. Indeed, in researching accounts of health and illness, Radley and Billig (1996) discussed the importance of interviewing 'healthy' individuals, since "[t]he healthy have much to say about their illness experience, while the sick are often at pains to show their 'normality' " (p.225). Therefore, it was regarded as important to seek a range of views, including those of participants who did not meet criteria for CD. The rigidity of the sampling frame ruled out the possibility of theoretical sampling (Glaser, 1978) within the time-frame of the study. In addition, since the researcher was not aware of the CD status of interviewees during fieldwork to avoid bias, operationalising a theoretical sampling strategy would have been difficult to achieve in practical terms. Thus, a purposive sampling strategy was adopted, and the supervisors of the study

selected the sample so that the classifications would be unknown to the researcher until after the analysis stage.

2.4.5. Sample Characteristics

Out of the 40 individuals contacted to take part in the study, 32 were interviewed, three refused, two were initially contacted and seemed willing to participate in the interview but did not respond to further contact by the researcher, one could not be contacted, and one was in prison. The following tables detail the characteristics of the sample achieved (Table 2.2; see also Appendix C) and the profile of the group of individuals contacted to participate in the study (Table 2.3). Two individuals who met criteria for CD at age 18 were included in the target sample although the addition of this category to the original sampling frame was not known to the researcher until the interviews were completed. The inclusion of this category reflected difficulties encountered by the project supervisors in identifying sufficient numbers of individuals who fulfilled all of the criteria set out in the original sampling frame. This was partly due to the relatively small number of participants who met criteria for CD, and to the timing of the current study, which overlapped with data collection for the 16+.

	CD Age 15	CD Age 15&18	CD Age 18	No CD	All
Male	9*	6	2	4	21
Female	6**	1*	-	4	11
All	15	7	2	8	32

Table 2.2: Sample Profile (*1 comorbid case; **2 comorbid cases)

	CD Age 15	CD Age 15&18	CD Age 18	No CD	All
Male	14*	6	2	4	26
Female	9**	1*	-	4	14
All	23	7	2	8	40

Table 2.3: Profile of Interviewees Contacted (*1 comorbid case; **2 comorbid cases)

Therefore, whilst all the individuals selected from the categories of CD/ Age 15 and 18; CD/ Age 18; and no CD agreed to take part, a total of eight individuals refused to take part from the category of CD/ Age 15. Although a third of the individuals classified as having CD at age 15 refused to take part, this group ultimately comprised the biggest group of those interviewed. In addition, all four of the individuals who met criteria for a second comorbid condition (anxiety or depression) agreed to participate.

The following table shows a breakdown of the sample by social class:

		CD/ 15	CD/15&18	CD/18	No CD	All
Middle class	Male	5	5	1	1	12
	Female	4*	1*	-	2	7
	All	9	6	1	3	19
Working class	Male	3*	1	1	3	8
	Female	2*	-	-	2	4
	All	5	1	1	5	12

Table 2.4: Breakdown of sample by class (*1 comorbid case; 1 SC unclassified)

The measure of social class was derived from parental occupation at age 15, with the middle class group comprising social class levels I, II and III non-manual, and the working class group encompassing social class bands III manual, IV and V. The main bias in the sample related to the greater proportion of middle class participants, particularly among the group of participants who met criteria for CD at age 15. This was partly due to a higher proportion of refusals from those in the working class group, but also reflected the 16+ sample composition, in light of the under-representation of both working class participants and individuals with CD at age 18 (Sweeting, Der and West, 2001).

2.4.6. Correspondence Between Voice-DISC Classifications and Verbal Accounts

Only one participant who met criteria for CD stated that he had no history of involvement in antisocial behaviour. It is possible that this participant was more comfortable with the idea of disclosing information about his behaviour in the computerised interview than in the face-to-face interview setting (Shaffer et al., 1996, 2000). However, despite this one exception, there was remarkable correspondence between participants' Voice-DISC classifications and their verbal accounts. This is illustrated in the following quotes from the interviews with three of the four participants who met criteria for CD and either comorbid depression or anxiety:

...I wis like I, really suicidal at that time.   [Simon]

...because I know I've got a bad temper but em, I know when I'm in a bad mood and stuff and I cry because sometimes I don't know how 'ae control it and I go away and I greet and I greet and I can't like get rid of it. But like em it's just frustration and stuff, like I don't know how 'ae control it...   [Jillian]

But depression, it can be, it's real, it can be strange because you don't have the same standards. Your brain's in a twangle, you know, it's, you're not thinking the way you'd normally think.   [Moira]

This demonstrates that the Voice-DISC classifications and interview accounts were closely correspondent, and furthermore, suggests that the Voice-DISC classifications may be viewed as a form of triangulation, serving to 'validate' the verbal accounts (Lincoln and Guba, 1999; West, 1990).

2.4.7. Impairment

For the purposes of this analysis, severe impairment was defined as any impairment in two or more areas of functioning or severe impairment in one area of functioning

(West, Sweeting, Der et al., 2003). Only two (out of a possible 9) participants met criteria for severe impairment at age 18 whilst half of those who met criteria for CD at age 15 also met criteria for severe impairment (see Appendix C). The social class of the 12 participants who met criteria for severe impairment at age 15 mirrored the overall distribution for those with CD. Therefore, level of impairment did not appear to be related to social class. In addition, the gender distribution of those classified as severely impaired was reflective of the proportion of males and females in the sample (9 males and 4 females). Jillian was the only participant to meet criteria for severe impairment at ages 15 and 18, which may reflect the presence of a comorbid condition. Of the other three participants with comorbid conditions, two met criteria for severe impairment at age 15.

2.4.8. The Interview Schedule

The interview schedule was developed around the themes of personal biography, lifestyle, school experiences, antisocial behaviour, and future aspirations (see Appendix D). The areas of biography and lifestyle were included in order to provide a context in which to interpret accounts of behaving badly. Interview questions mapped onto the research questions (Mason, 2002), therefore reflecting a 'thematic' relevance to the research topics, but were also devised to promote the 'dynamic' elements of the conversation as an encounter which aimed to encourage rapport between the interviewer and interviewees, and to ensure a comfortable (if not natural) setting for the discussion (Kvale, 1996). Discussion about involvement in antisocial behaviour followed the biographical section to help establish rapport before questions were posed which could have been perceived as threatening or inappropriate (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994).

Interviewees were asked about the nature of their experiences with regard to "getting into trouble," before being asked specifically about a number of CD behaviours; namely, staying out late, truancy, destruction of property, theft, arson and assault. These behaviours were selected out of the list of DSM-IV symptoms of CD in order to reflect different levels of severity and frequency of behaviours as found in 11-16

and 16+ and in the Scottish Crime Survey carried out in 2000 (Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, 2002). This section, which was included to elicit general explanations of antisocial behaviour, also prompted some individuals to discuss further aspects of their own experiences in relation to getting into trouble. In some cases, these questions on specific behaviours also prompted participants to describe aspects of their own behaviour which they had not mentioned earlier in the interview. These apparent omissions may have been due to memory problems, or they may represent areas which participants chose not to discuss initially for a variety of reasons. One possibility is that individuals may have been more likely to discuss a behaviour after it was raised by the researcher since it appeared more socially acceptable. However, in many cases it appeared that individuals had not recounted certain experiences earlier in the interview because they did not conceptualise these behaviours as 'antisocial' or outwith the norm. Therefore, these 'omissions' shed light on participants' definitions of antisocial behaviour and their ideas about what it means to get into trouble.

Additionally, in recognition of the aim of maximising the potential of the interview as a method for exploring and understanding meaning, eliciting views about specific behaviours was regarded as important to increase the depth of coverage of central topics. In the absence of this additional section on typical CD behaviours, some of this important information would have been untapped. In turn, comparing participants' general explanations and experiential accounts was a way of exploring views on 'normal' and 'abnormal' behaviour, as these related to self and others. Pilot work revealed that it was quite difficult to explore these concepts directly. Therefore, the semi-structured interview was, in retrospect, a very valuable tool for researching this topic, and through the inclusion of these indirect questions, seemed to provide a non-threatening forum for discussion.

One of the most important aspects of these interviews was knowing when to probe interesting responses (Robson, 2002), a skill which was honed during pilot work and in the initial stages of fieldwork. Whilst there was a temptation in early pilot work

to allow individuals to tell their stories relatively spontaneously, with minimal interruptions from the researcher (Flick, 2002), a conscious effort was made in subsequent interviews to focus the conversation around the principal areas of interest. The importance of this became apparent in the second pilot project involving individuals without CD since there was sometimes very little or no material on personal experiences of behaving badly. Adding the section on typical CD behaviours partly addressed this, as did the use of follow-up questions to elicit views on normal and abnormal behaviour.

In part related to growth in the confidence and improving interviewing skills of the researcher, and due to the emergence of interesting ideas about the data, different types of probes and follow-up questions were used more frequently as interviewing progressed. In addition to the standard 'detail-oriented,' 'elaboration,' and 'clarification' probes described by Maykut and Morehouse (1994), some more challenging questions were posed in order to achieve a deeper understanding of respondents' meanings, explanations and theories in relation to antisocial behaviour. For example, a discussion of individuals who Glen believed had more academic potential than him but who failed to achieve at school prompted the following exchange:

There were so many people I hung about wi' that were so brainy, then as soon as they started hanging about wi' the wrong crowd they just absolutely messed up. Like there was a guy I went down, my gran was em, eh, putting, she was ripping up all the grass from her garden and putting in stones so I went down 'ae [names garden centre] for some stones and the guy that was shovelling them intae the bags for me was somebody I'd went 'ae school wi' and he had just so much more potential than me, then all o' a sudden, he just started getting pally wi' one guy and then he was hanging about wi' all his mates and they're just, they're just a bunch o' losers, they're just, dogging school all the time and like that time it was like second, third year so it was just smoking hash but by the time you get 'ae fourth year and fifth year they're doing all kinds o' stuff, so they just go the wrong way and slip away.

So see just to play devil's advocate, could that have, in theory, happened to you?

How d'you mean?

Like you know how you were saying like they started off really brainy and you were, you might have hung around with them and now you see them and they've, you know, they've whatever, they've got into drugs, could the same have happened to you, do you think, in theory?

Em, aye, definitely, aye. If I didn't, aye, well...

I'm just trying to get at, you can see what I'm...?

Not really, cause I've got, the way I see it, I've got nice parents who have taught me well, eh and I'm not stupid, like I've some, I'm just, like I'll go out and just have a good time but I'm not an idiot. I think a lot o' other o' these people, for whatever reason, just, they were idiots, they just wanted to mess around and it could o' happened to me but I just, I didn't want it 'ae, I see, d'you know what, I seen all these other people I went to school wi' and I seen the way other people talked about them and I just didn't want 'ae be like that so, I mean everyone knows what they want 'ae be like. I mean I want 'ae be a decent guy, go 'ae uni and whatever but other people just want 'ae be nutters. They just want people 'ae be afraid o' them and they want 'ae be drug dealers and have loads o' money and, it's just individualness I think and just what you want.   [Glen]

Therefore, through the use of follow-up questions, a greater understanding of Glen's conceptual framework was achieved, although, from a social constructivist standpoint, his response could also be interpreted as an attempt to present himself in a more favourable light.

Warren (2002) reminded researchers of the "various perspectives that can be taken up by a single respondent within a single interview. Perspective is especially significant in qualitative interviewing, where meaning making is center stage in the interpretive process" (p.84). It was this range of perspectives that was often important to explore, and, in particular, seemingly contradictory notions of self and other, where individuals' perspectives appeared to shift from the 'badly behaved' self to the 'pathological' other. While some might argue that some questions may have been leading, all responses were treated as situated knowledge, and therefore

the context – including the questions posed by the researcher – were considered in the approach to analysis, in line with the constructivist approach.

2.5. Ethics

Ethical approval for the current study was obtained from Glasgow University Ethics Committee on the 19th December 2002. In view of the nature of the interview topics, and the potential for disclosures about participation in illegal activities, it was important for the project literature (information sheet and consent form) to strike a balance between ensuring confidentiality and obtaining fully informed consent. Various commentators have described situations in which researchers have been forced to testify in court (e.g. Berg, 1998; Kvale, 1996), and the threat of such legal obligation on the part of the researcher potentially compromises guarantees of confidentiality. However, as this was deemed a highly unlikely situation in the current study, participants were not informed of this extreme scenario in order to avoid raising anxieties about the research. In practice, confidentiality was extended to everything said in the interview with the exception of information regarding any activity which threatened or harmed another individual's life or health, for example, child abuse. As well as being outlined in the information sheet (see Appendix E), information regarding these exceptions to confidentiality was repeated at the start of the interview in case it had been missed by participants when they received the initial letter inviting them to take part in the study (see Appendix F). Participants were informed that they were selected on the basis of their answers to some of the questions posed in prior phases of the longitudinal study. Only one participant enquired about this, implying that he did not feel that he had any direct experiences which he thought would be of relevance to the research. In response, it was explained to him that a range of people with different experiences were being interviewed in order to compare views on the interview topics.

Homan (1991) stated that "[t]he essence of the principle of informed consent is that the human subjects of research should be allowed to agree or refuse to participate in

light of comprehensive information concerning the nature and purpose of the research" (p.69). Informed consent was officially obtained by asking individuals to sign a consent form with four clauses, indicating that they agreed to take part in the project as described in the information sheet; that they understood that all information provided was confidential and that they could refuse to answer questions and/ or terminate the interview at any time; that they authorised the use of anonymised quotes from the interview in subsequent work; and finally, that they permitted the recording of the interview session (see Appendix G).

The degree to which 'informed consent' was obtained appeared to vary across research participants (Homan, 1991). Whilst most individuals seemed to understand the purpose of the research, apparently due to previous participation in the 11-16 and 16+ studies, or to their experiences as a student in further or higher education, there were some participants who seemed more confused about the nature of the research but who nevertheless signed the consent form and participated in the interview (Warren, 2002). For example, Aaron, a participant in the main study, seemed to find it difficult to absorb the information about the study at the beginning of the interview, and it is possible that this uncertainty may have stemmed from the difference in the format of the qualitative interview as compared to the structured interview carried out in other phases of the study. This presented an ethical dilemma for the researcher as such intuitions were difficult to act upon in practical terms at the outset, due to the risk of patronising participants or creating undue worry or concern. This problem is further amplified by the nature of qualitative interviewing, which cannot be 'shown' in advance to participants in the way in which a questionnaire can be viewed before individuals consent to completing it. Aaron appeared to find some of the interview questions quite difficult to relate to, repeatedly commenting that he knew what he wanted to say but found it difficult to find the words to explain what he was meaning:

Right, and what do you mean it was probably better that they split up?

Well you know, they didnae want 'ae be wi' each other anymair but, you know, I couldnae stoap that, but in a way I could probably say you know it was, I don't know what I'm trying 'ae say. (Laughs). I know what I'm trying 'ae say but how 'ae, put, word it (laughs). Eh... [pause], I don't know what I'm trying 'ae say (laughs). [Aaron]

In such cases, the interview questions were tailored to suit individuals' experiences and to encourage an "epistemiologically tuned-in" approach which attempted to reduce the power dynamics between interviewer and interviewee, and allow the often suppressed discourses of young people to emerge (Smyth and Hattam, 2001).

At the opposite end of the continuum were a small number of participants who discussed sensitive and intimate aspects of their life in more detail than was required or expected, as demonstrated in the following extracts:

... I'd one myself, eh I had, I had an abortion last June. [Paula]

You know the way you've got so small self-esteem that you don't really care and for stuff like I mean em, first time, like when you start having sex with people, I mean I have, like I, I've only had sex with like three people but the first one was when I was 15 with someone that I wouldn't have... [Louise]

... me and her were going together for two and a half years, we were actually engaged, which is weird, em but I ended up cheating on her which wasn't the first time, I'd done it eh like at the start of the relation-, eh the relationship as well, I went on holiday and eh, I never actually slept wi' anyone else, eh, she was the, like the first at that time and I never slept wi' anyone at all, we just, you know you just... [Peter]

Johnson (2002) compared the research interview to conversations between friends, and in contrasting the purposes of each, considered the ethical position of the researcher. As discussion of private matters was considered to be a choice made by participants, it was felt that any attempt to change the topic of conversation would be inappropriate. Furthermore, in many cases, these discussions contextualised

accounts, and were drawn upon by individuals in their explanatory frameworks for their, or others,' behaviour. One concern was that individuals experienced "postinterview echoes" as a result of revealing details about more personal aspects of their lives (Warren, 2002). However, most individuals appeared to enjoy talking to the researcher about their experiences. In addition, although the interview was not conducted in the manner of a counselling session (Kvale, 1996), some interviewees seemed to find the opportunity to discuss personal issues cathartic (Schwartz and Jacobs, 1979), as shown in this extract from field notes on the interview with Peter:

> ... he commented at the end of the interview that he had really enjoyed just being able to talk to someone and having someone listen to him. (Field note entry, f18)

For this reason, individuals' experiences were acknowledged and their feelings respected as would normally be expected in a 'natural' conversation without any attempt by the researcher to steer the conversation away from more intimate aspects of interviewees' lives.

Two individuals described very difficult circumstances and their stories revealed some ongoing worries and concerns which suggested they may benefit from further support. In one case, a follow-up letter was sent containing some information on seeking help with anger which was provided by one of the supervisors, Dr Michael van Beinum. This followed a discussion about a difficult family situation, which had left the participant feeling very angry, a reaction which she believed spilled over into everyday situations. She stated that her intention was to find out about anger management classes, which prompted the researcher to offer to send some information on identifying sources of help. In the other case, the researcher suggested contacting a GP on behalf of a participant who appeared to be suffering from depression, but this was politely refused. Instead, alternative sources of help were pointed out to this participant, who was given a contact sheet with details of different agencies and help lines (see Appendix H). It appeared that the opportunity

to discuss their lives had been of value to both of these participants, and that they had chosen to talk about these issues, rather than felt obligated to mention them.

Individuals were advised of the interview topics in advance of the interview and were alerted to the main focus of the research, which was conveyed as an interest "in why some young people seem to get into trouble more than others." Individuals were not, however, informed of their CD status and the strategy for selecting the sample. Lincoln and Guba (2000) suggested that postpositivist research is characterised by a "tilt toward deception" (p. 170) with respect to the aims of the research, as compared to the "tilt toward revelation" (p.171) inherent to constructivist studies. Despite possibly appearing deceptive to participants, the reason for withholding information regarding diagnostic categories was twofold: firstly, the classifications were based on Voice-DISC data rather than a full psychiatric assessment; and secondly, to avoid leading participants to believe that there is only one way in which to view behaviour. Since the focus of the study was to explore alternative perspectives on antisocial behaviour, it was felt that giving this information to participants would compromise the research aim. In addition, disclosing this information may have led participants to produce more favourable accounts of their behaviour.

2.6. Conducting the Interviews

The recruitment procedure for the main study was the same as that used in the pilot, except that an added stage of 'door knocking' was introduced in the attempt to track participants who could not be contacted by phone. For the most part, this was due to telephone numbers being changed and in such cases, the researcher was accompanied by an MRC fieldworker to visit participants' homes. This was considered important due to the small numbers of individuals who met criteria for CD in the original study. Out of four attempts to recruit individuals in this manner, two were successful. Interviews were conducted either in the MRC Unit or at a venue convenient for participants, such as a community centre or library near their

home. This procedure addressed concerns about safety, as outlined in the MRC Risk Assessment form, and ensured that the researcher was not alone in a building when conducting the interviews. Care was taken to select venues with private rooms and minimal noise, in order to provide a relaxing environment for the interview, which was free from interruptions, in order to maximise confidentiality. In practice, there were occasional interruptions from staff in the centres who had not been informed about the interview, or some noise from others in the building. Only in one instance was such a disturbance slightly problematic since one participant seemed quite aggravated by the sound of hammering outside the room where the interview was being conducted. However, he had some trouble in answering the interview questions (as described on page 60), and this therefore may have reflected his more general frustration.

Each session began with an overview of the format of the interview, during which reference was made to every clause on the consent form. Individuals were then asked for their permission to record the interview, which was granted in each case. Before the interview commenced, individuals were offered refreshments, and were reminded to ask questions at any point in the interview, although only a few did. The first few interviews were recorded using a minidisk but concerns expressed by another researcher in the MRC Unit about the quality of the recording when transferring to tape (for transcribing purposes), and the reliability of the equipment, led to the use of a conventional tape recorder, which was very cumbersome in comparison. Despite concerns about the intrusive appearance of this machine, interviewees appeared to be quite curious about it and the researcher's reasons for choosing to use it instead of a minidisk! Therefore, the machine actually provided an instant talking point (Warren, 2002), and although a few individuals seemed quite self-conscious about the prospect of being taped at first, participants quickly settled down and the conversation progressed normally, as found by other researchers using this method (Bryman, 2001). At the same time, some participants appeared to remain conscious of being taped throughout the interview, as shown in the extracts below:

...one o' them, he tried 'ae done that a few times [gesture emulating slitting wrists], slit his wrists for the recording...   [Peter]

From when I was really small [hand gesture indicating height], oh, I shouldn't do that [referring to the fact that the action is not being caught on the tape]...   [Justine]

It could be argued that the presence of the tape recorder may have affected the type (and quality) of the data generated due to the topics covered in the interview, and the illegal nature of some of the behaviours described by participants. However, individuals seemed to understand that confidentiality was extended to everything discussed, with the exception of ongoing behaviours which threatened an individual's life or health. This, together with the researcher's clearly stated intention to anonymise the material, seemed to lead participants to be quite forthcoming about their experiences. This does not rule out the possibility that some individuals withheld some information relating to more serious behaviours, which they believed was not covered by the confidentiality clause; however, this a caveat of all social research in this area, and can be accommodated within the constructivist perspective with its emphasis on situated accounts, and shared inter-subjectivities (Kvale, 1996). It is unlikely that this problem could be addressed unless the sample included convicted criminals who might be less likely to fear the consequences of discussing certain behaviours. Unfortunately, this was outwith the scope of the current study.

At the end of the interview, individuals were asked if they had any further comments or questions which they would like to raise before the tape was switched off (Kvale, 1996). Following this, individuals were thanked and 'debriefed' about some of the observations from the research so far, and the intentions of the researcher with regard to the dissemination of findings. For example, individuals were often interested in how their accounts compared with those of other participants and so the researcher highlighted some common themes in the data, placing emphasis on the wide range of views and experiences described by the relatively small group of

interviewees. In addition, aspects of accounts which the researcher found particularly interesting were highlighted (for example, in cases where a 'new' topic had emerged in an interview), and in a few cases, this led to further elaboration from the participant. In one case, permission was sought from a participant to switch the tape back on at the end of the interview when he expanded on some ideas he had discussed in the interview. In other cases, comments on the interview experience were recorded in field notes. On one occasion, the conversation at the end of the interview turned to the participant's experience of racism, and since it was considered insensitive to seek permission to turn the tape back on, details of his comments were recorded in the field notes. However, there was no evidence to suggest that individuals discussed topics after the interview which they felt unwilling to discuss 'on the record.' Participants were also advised of the researcher's intention to submit a report to policy-makers, based on interviewees' recommendations about tackling antisocial behaviour. In general, the topics covered in the debriefing were very much shaped by questions asked in early interviews, since only a few individuals had specific questions to ask at the end of the session. Such questions more often related to plans about future phases of the study, rather than focusing on aspects of the interview itself.

Participants were paid £20 for participating in the study in line with the protocol for the previous phase of the study (16+), and their travel expenses were fully reimbursed. Some interviewees then had a short discussion about a variety of other 'everyday' subjects before leaving. These were recorded in the field notes if they were considered relevant to the research questions. Interviews lasted between 50 minutes and 2¼ hours, with an average duration of 1½ hours.

Field notes were recorded immediately after each interview, which focused on the "essentials of the interviewee's answers" (Flick, 2002, p.168), as well as the rapport, and any other orienting information which was felt to be relevant to the subsequent analysis. Whilst field notes were compiled in the style of case studies, a research diary was used to log general observations and recurrent themes in the interviews,

particularly during the transcribing stage. In addition, similarities and differences in participants' accounts which came to light during transcription were logged in the research diary.

2.7. Multiple Meanings and Reflexivity

Having placed a lot of emphasis throughout this chapter on the way in which accounts are constructed in social interaction vis a vis the researcher, my role, as a young, middle class female researcher, was considered as inextricably linked to the nature of the accounts obtained in the interview dialogue. Commenting on his role as a 'bouncer' in an ethnographic study conducted in the North of England, Winlow (2001) explained:

> I was lucky enough to have the opportunity to conduct this piece of research in my early twenties, an all-too-brief time of life when my age and physical appearance did not contrast with those of the subjects researched. (p.12)

Like Winlow, I felt that the proximity of my age in relation to the individuals I interviewed was advantageous due to shared cultural experiences, particularly in relation to education and lifestyle. A number of participants seemed to assume that I could identify with their comments about school on the basis of my own experience as a pupil:

> Em I suppose you know yourself in school there's the kind o', there's a wee clique o' people that's kinna very high up and every-, very respectable and em it's usually all the kinna very glamorous girls and like the football player boyfriends and everything like that.   [Calum]

> Cause they just, cause they're both different and they both hate each other, then you've got us in the middle who just don't care, like the goths have this hate for the neds and the neds have like, that, you must know about that from just like school.   [Gordon]

School was, it was good, I mean I think you'd probably know yourself, I don't know if you do, eh, like you're spoon-fed in school, you know, you, you're told what to do and you have to do it and I think when you come to uni, it's, it's about changing.   [Ahmed]

This common ground appeared to be useful in creating a shared understanding, and may have reduced the power dynamics between researcher and researched, thus making individuals feel more comfortable in the interview setting. One participant commented that I looked quite young as she enquired about my educational background and route into working in the MRC; she seemed quite surprised that I had completed a degree! However, I was acutely aware that this could result in the blurring of the boundary between friend and researcher, and I therefore consciously balanced the natural impulse to be friendly with the professionalism expected in good research practice.

According to feminist standpoint epistemology, my gender could have been a distinct advantage in the interview situation due to the possibility of gaining insights into women's experiences, which feminists believe have historically been understood from a male perspective (e.g. Stanley and Wise, 1990). This is particularly important in the area of crime and deviance, since it has been pointed out that most theories have been based exclusively on male delinquency (Smart, 1977). Feminist researchers perceive women as oppressed and primarily seek to get their voice heard to redress the balance of power in male dominated domains (Oakley, 1981). Certainly, it is acknowledged that female participants may have felt more comfortable talking about personal details of their life with another female (Finch, 1999), such as in the example of Paula discussing her experiences of abortion (see page 61). However, this study was not developed as an 'active' research project as typically carried out by feminist researchers. This would normally involve establishing a rapport with participants over a number of sessions to break down the power barrier between researcher and researched in order to empower participants and allow them to shape the research agenda. Time constraints prevented this in the current study and power dynamics were evident in some interviews, as demonstrated in the following extract:

It's like any interview, anything. Just like, you're interviewing me, I'm telling you exactly, and you're kinna sitting and you're, you try and say something so that I'll say more. [Naomi]

In view of practical constraints and due to the interest in possible gender differences in accounts of antisocial behaviour, the research was not conducted in line with a feminist epistemology. Therefore, while my gender was not regarded as integral to, or a strength, of the study design, it was considered as a factor which may have influenced the interaction in common with other contextual elements of the interview.

The effect of my class on the interview exchanges was more easy to assess from the perspective of middle class interviewees who appeared to feel able to make classist comments in respect of our shared social class backgrounds:

...everyone knew I was a decent guy and like, I wasn't in, I wasn't, uh, intae things like all these other guys were, like the teachers, if I got into a fight, the teachers would come up to me the next day and ask me about it and, 'Oh, well done for hitting that guy,' and everything.

Really?

Aye, just cause it was all, like, for the amount o' fights I was in at high school I never got suspended at all or got, got in any...

So why would that have been?

Cause it was always the idiots that I was fighting wi'. Like the real scum o' the school, and I was a decent guy, I was, they don't want 'ae, like in schools it's, they don't want to eh, pfff, if they can avoid it, they'll do anything not to give a good pupil intae trouble. But see if you're just giving the teachers grief all the time and getting suspended and no' turning up, they'll do anything they can 'ae fling you out, it's like whenever I got into fights wi' all these guys, half the time they'd get suspended and I'd get absolutely nothing. I'd get a pat on the back once the door was closed and that was it, so I think that annoyed them a lot o' the time as well. But if you get good marks at school, well, in my school anyway, you can

do just about anything. Within reason, like you couldn't go, but if something happened to you, you'd be looked upon leniently. Rather than, d'you know what I mean, the hammer brought down. Cause a lot o' the times the teachers, the teachers would ask me about the fight and, 'Oh how hard did you hit him? Did it feel good when you hit him?' and stuff like that, and eh, I had one teacher pulled me intae a room one day and he was like, 'Oh, I heard you were bullying that poor boy [Jamie], that's terrible. He's a nice boy, he comes fae a bad family, you shouldn't be touching him,' and he was just ripping the absolute piss. He was just taking the mickey out the guy and he was like that, 'Oh, if you get a chance again, hit him again.' He was like, 'Hit him for me as well.' And that's one o' the teachers.   [Glen]

This was not comfortable territory for me but clearly Glen's story and his assumption of 'class collusion' was important in the interpretation of his comments in relation to behaving badly. There was no evidence in the interview transcripts to suggest that individuals from lower social classes felt uncomfortable in discussing aspects of their life due to perceived differences in social background.

In general, I found the interviews very stimulating and enjoyable, and I also felt that most participants considered their participation in the study to be a positive experience. Their active engagement with the topics has undoubtedly helped to make the project a lively and thought-provoking venture. My experiences are summed up in Warren's vivid account of qualitative interviewing:

In the social interaction of the qualitative interview, the perspectives of the interviewer and the respondent dance together for the moment but also extend outward in social space and backward and forward in time. Both are gendered, aged, and otherwise embodied, one person (perhaps) thinking about her topic, questions, rapport, consent forms, and the tape recorder, not to mention feeling nervous. The other is (perhaps) preoccupied with her relationships outside the interview, pressing tasks left undone, seeking information, getting help, or being loyal. These are the working selves and others at the center of qualitative interviewing. (2002, p.99)

2.8. Transcription

Interviews were transcribed by either the researcher or a professional transcriber since time constraints meant the it was not possible for the researcher to carry out all of the transcribing. An example of a transcript prepared by the researcher was submitted to a local small business employing a team of professional transcribers in order to standardise the format of transcriptions. These individuals had all signed a confidentiality agreement. Ethical issues relating to the remote possibility of one of the participants being known to one of the transcribers was discussed with the research supervisors and colleagues in the MRC Unit, and it was decided that some tapes would be transcribed by the researcher in order to protect the confidentiality of participants. Therefore, interviews with participants who provided intimate details about their lives, or who provided explicit identifying information in the course of the interview dialogue were transcribed personally by the researcher. Ideally, the researcher would have transcribed all of the interviews but this was felt to be impossible within the time-frame of the project and therefore most of the project budget was spent on the production of the first drafts of transcripts. All of the transcripts produced by external transcribers were checked thoroughly in order to reach a good level of consistency, and to anonymise information such as names and places. The standard of transcriptions completed externally varied considerably, apparently depending on the individual transcriber, and the types of errors in transcription described by Poland (2002) in relation to sentence structure, labelling direct quotations, missing information and incorrect words and phrases, were frustratingly familiar.

In describing transcripts as "interpretative constructions," Kvale (1996, p.165) emphasised the level of subjectivity involved in moving from the oral discourse of the interview encounter to the written representation. In constructing these representations, it was not considered necessary to include the level of detail which might be required by conversation analysts (Seale, 1999; Silverman, 2001). However, many features of the interview as a social interaction were preserved in

the transcript, including laughter, pauses, discontinued sentences, imitations and sighs. These details were believed to be important since they conveyed the mood of the interview, and the way in which different questions were perceived. In addition, language was recorded verbatim to reflect local dialect, although it was recognised that quotations may require 'tidying up' for inclusion in future conference presentations where members of the audience may not be familiar with local dialect (Poland, 2002).

2.9. Selection of Quotes

The function of the quotes in the findings chapters is generally to illustrate themes of the research. To complement the thematic analysis, the quotes included in Chapter 4 are representative of others' comments. However, in Chapters 5 and 6, which present the findings of the narrative analysis, the quotes reflect individuals' histories and biographies in relation to their accounts of antisocial behaviour. These quotes are therefore more specific, but also reflect the general themes being discussed.

2.10. Anonymity

All names and identifying information have been changed in order to protect the anonymity of the interviewees.

Chapter 3: Approach to Data Analysis

3.1. Introduction

Having consulted a number of books and articles on approaches to qualitative data analysis, it became obvious early in this study that there was no single approach which could accommodate the richness and complexity of the data generated. Coffey and Atkinson (1996) have suggested "that it is important for qualitative researchers to explore their data from a variety of perspectives" (p.4), and recommend the use of different approaches for understanding qualitative data. Therefore, rather than relying on a single approach, the findings chapters which follow draw on three different approaches to the analysis of qualitative data, reflecting a realist, interpretivist and social constructivist ontology. The findings reported in Chapter 4 on explanations of antisocial behaviour draw on a thematic analysis, reflecting a realist ontology wherein participants' accounts are treated as indicative of their opinions and experiences based upon their subjective realities. In Chapter 5, the focus is on contextualising accounts using an interpretivist approach to narrative analysis. In this chapter, participants' explanations of behaving badly are considered in relation to their biography and personal experiences. The final approach to analysis applied a constructivist approach to narrative analysis, and focused on the social construction of knowledge and the identity work being achieved in the interview setting, as reported in Chapter 6. To some extent, this approach also drew on Kvale's phenomenological approach to the analysis of 'InterViews,' which involves an examination of how knowledge is jointly created in the interview encounter. The aim of using these three approaches to analysis was to highlight the complexity and richness of the data, and to illustrate the types of knowledge produced using different approaches to analysis. Therefore, the findings chapters may be viewed as examples of different techniques of qualitative data analysis and, in turn, illustrate the process of analysing data at different levels of meaning (Schmidt, 2004).

The stages of analysis were different for each of these approaches but, overall, the method of analysis followed a hierarchy, in which the first stage of analysis involved coding the data for subject and concept codes. These codes were then compiled in matrices to understand patterns in the data. This thematic analysis forms the basis of the analysis described in Chapter 4. The second stage of the analysis involved a more in-depth narrative analysis of each transcript in order to understand the context and meaning of participants' accounts (as reported in Chapter 5). This process involved reading each transcript in its entirety and drawing on participants' experiences and biographies to contextualise their explanations of behaving badly. Finally, the third stage of analysis involved examining the 'process of' accounting, drawing on Scott and Lyman's (1968) work to provide a framework for understanding the types of identity work being achieved in the interviews. In this chapter, accounts of antisocial behaviour were interpreted as justifications and excuses to examine the extent to which participants appeared to be constructing a positive social identity in the interview encounter. Hence, the three stages of the analysis reflect a progression from a primarily descriptive analysis to a more in-depth interpretive analysis. This approach to analysis broadly reflects the three-stage process of analysing qualitative data outlined by Wolcott (1994), who pointed out that the relative importance of the three levels of description, analysis and interpretation varies across different qualitative research paradigms. Thus, while the thematic analysis is primarily descriptive in nature, the narrative analysis involves a deeper level of interpretation aimed at contextualising accounts, whilst the analysis of accounts from a constructivist perspective explores the 'hidden layers' of meaning and the process of identity construction. Since the two approaches to narrative analysis focus exclusively on personal accounts of behaving badly, these analytical approaches are applied to the accounts of the 28 participants who described involvement in antisocial behaviour. The four participants who said they had never been involved in trouble are therefore excluded from these analyses although their views are represented in Chapter 4. The following sections outline the rationale for the different approaches and the methods of analysis, which is

followed by an illustration of the way in which the analysis was conducted from each perspective.

3.2. Thematic Analysis

A thematic analysis was undertaken to explore young people's and psychiatrists' explanations of antisocial behaviour (Chapter 4). The approach to data analysis reported in Chapter 4 involved identifying the subject themes arising in the interviews, and coding the transcripts thematically. To this end, interview transcripts were imported as rich text files into QSR NVivo, version 2.0 and were coded "line by line" (Charmaz, 2000) by drawing on a bank of subject codes which was devised to facilitate on-screen coding. Passages of text were coded under the main subject themes of biography, lifestyle, school, antisocial behaviour, responsibility, interventions and future aspirations, with codes and subcodes arranged hierarchically in order to represent their interconnectedness. The initial coding frame was derived from 'mind maps' of the topics covered in four interviews involving participants with very different accounts. These interviews were selected in order to capture the diversity of topics covered and were compiled by hand as a means of easily comparing the interview content across cases. This frame was expanded as new material emerged from other interviews which did not fit into any of the existing codes. Subject codes and subcodes were arranged hierarchically and tagged at 'tree nodes' in the software package. These codes comprised both 'constructed' codes, which were derived from existing research into antisocial behaviour, and 'in vivo' codes, which closely approximated the way in which interviewees described the constructs they represented (Flick, 2002). Thus, research findings played a "sensitizing role" in formulating both the interview guide and the coding frame (Blaikie, 2000), in comparison to a pure grounded theory approach which would preclude the use of existing research and theories in the formulation of interview material (Glaser and Strauss, 1968). The final coding frame consisted of 97 codes and was presented to both supervisors in the form of a powerpoint presentation.

This facilitated a discussion of the themes to emerge from the data, and led to the generation of some initial theories about the data.

In order to address each of the research questions, relevant data were selected from the transcripts and arranged in a tabular format in a process of "meaning condensation" (Kvale, 1996). These matrices were compiled by hand and colour coded to identify commonalities and differences in accounts. At this stage, initial theories about trends in the data were starting to emerge in a form that would be difficult to capture through a system of computerised coding. Therefore, whilst coding the transcripts in NVivo was an important first step in the preliminary descriptive analysis, it was felt that further on-screen coding would be time-consuming and unlikely to capture the complexity of the data and the hypotheses emerging. Therefore, the system of computerised coding was used as a method of organising and retrieving data pertaining to each theme in order to facilitate the process of compiling and comparing participants' responses, but much of the analysis of themes was conducted on paper in order to identify patterns in the data. This approach contrasts with the other two approaches to analysis which involved examining each transcript in its entirety.

Some of the principles of deviant case analysis were used to guide the process of identifying patterns in the data. However, the analysis differed in many respects to a grounded theory analysis, as originally described by Glaser and Strauss (1968). Whilst a grounded theory analysis would require the data generation and analysis stages to run simultaneously in order to formulate and test emerging hypotheses (Glaser and Strauss, 1968; Strauss and Corbin, 1990), the interviews for the current projects were completed before the analysis began in earnest. This was primarily due to practical constraints in light of the time lag between completing the interviews and receiving the transcripts from the transcriber, but also because of the idea to adopt three approaches to analysis. In addition, it was felt that the depth of coverage of topics in the current study might mean that in some interviews, participants might not reach the same level of explanation as in others, but may have

expressed similar ideas if the interview had been longer or they had expanded their ideas. Therefore, deviant case analysis was only applied in cases where participants' comments ran counter to the general trend, rather than in relation to participants who failed to mention a factor which was common across other accounts.

Participants' observations and conceptualisations regarding constructs such as social class and gender were coded at 'free' nodes since these did not fit into the hierarchical structure of the subject codes. This system of coding produced a further 17 categories coded at 'free' nodes. Participants were also categorised by gender, class, and psychiatric classification, in order to facilitate comparison across cases, and to provide a basis for investigating the relationship between psychiatric perspectives on CD and young people's views, in keeping with the aim of the research.

While Chapter 4 focuses on the range of explanations provided for antisocial behaviour, rather than young people's accounts of their own behaviour, contextualising accounts by reference to biography and experience is the topic of Chapter 5. Therefore, the thematic analysis did not consider the context of the interview encounter, instead treating accounts as a window on participants' subjective realities, in keeping with the 'externalist' position described by Silverman (2001). Thus, the thematic analysis was primarily descriptive in nature and aimed to document the breadth of lay understandings by drawing on shared meanings and categories of explanations.

3.3. Using Narrative Analysis to Contextualise Accounts According to Experience

Bryman (2004) noted that there are a wide range of meanings attached to the term "narrative analysis." In considering the range of approaches, he described narrative analysis as:

...a sensitivity to: the connections in people's accounts of past, present and future events and states of affairs; people's sense of their place within those events and states of affairs; the stories they generate about them; and the significance of context for the unfolding of events and people's sense of their role within them. (p.412)

Riessman (2002) advised that:

Precisely because they are essential meaning-making structures, narratives must be preserved, not fractured, by investigators, who must respect respondents' ways of constructing meaning and analyze how it is accomplished. (p.220)

Therefore, the narrative analysis conducted in Chapter 5 contextualises accounts by reference to experience, therefore looking beyond the content (as prioritised in the thematic analysis) to focus on the relationship between accounts and experience. Most importantly, the narrative analysis treats accounts as a unit of meaning, prioritising individuals' own understandings rather than viewing accounts an objective report on behaviour reflecting external 'truth' (Riessman, 2002).

Contextualising accounts by reference to experience has a long tradition in social research, and particularly in narrative analysis, whereby accounts are often elicited using chronological markers and epiphanal events to frame individuals' subjective experiences and prompt them to theorise on their lives (Flick, 2002), although others have suggested that it may also be used to investigate short episodes as well as life histories (Mishler, 1986). This approach is commonly used to investigate illness experiences (Bury, 2001), but has also been applied in criminological research (Goodey, 2000). The scope to adopt a biographical narrative approach was limited in the current study due to the difficulty in tracking the trajectory of antisocial behaviour among the young people interviewed. In contrast to criminal behaviour, which has been officially labelled through a process which might be regarded as an epiphanal event, many participants in this study had not experienced any official sanctions for their behaviour, therefore limiting the scope to describe their behaviour chronologically. Furthermore, some individuals failed to acknowledge that their

behaviour might be deemed antisocial, thus adding to the difficulty of contextualising their accounts by reference to epiphanies. Therefore, whilst the analysis adopted some principles of narrative analysis as discussed below, the accounts were not elicited in the style of a narrative.

Rosenthal and Fischer-Rosenthal (2004) have pointed out that passages can be analysed at two different time points, either from the participant's perspective at the time of the event being discussed or in the present, by treating the account as a reflection on past events, which is in turn influenced by current experiences. This was an important feature of the analysis in the current study since much of the examples of antisocial behaviour cited in the interviews had occurred in the past, thus it could be argued that participants were interpreting past events through the lens of current experience. The narrative analysis therefore aimed to analyse participants' accounts of their past actions in relation both to their biography and current circumstances, and secondly, to examine the relationship between general explanations of antisocial behaviour and personal accounts. This process involved analysing the transcript in its entirety and noting relationships between features of the accounts, such as similarities and differences between general accounts of antisocial behaviour and personal biography. According to Riessman (2002), narrative analysis "involves attention to subtlety: nuances of speech, organization of a response, local contexts of production, social discourses that shape what is said, and what cannot be spoken" (p.262). Therefore, the analysis aims to capture this subtlety by attending to features of language (pauses, intonation, laughter), and features of story-telling (inconsistencies and ambiguities) in order to relate accounts of antisocial behaviour to biography and experience. An example of this analytical technique is provided later in this chapter. Again, it is unlikely that this level of analysis could be achieved through a system of computerised coding, since the content of the narrative analysis was unique to the individual participant and their personal experiences. However, entering notes on the individual transcripts was an effective means of tracking these features of accounts and of making comparisons across participants. It should be noted that some researchers consider thematic

analysis to be a component of narrative analysis (e.g. Riessman, 2004), however, for the purposes of the current study, and to clearly demarcate the approaches used, the term 'thematic analysis' applies solely to the approach to analysis presented in Chapter 4.

3.4. The Construction of Identity in the Interview Encounter

Riessman (2002) described "the interpretive perspective that undergirds narrative" (p.263) but also depicted narratives as "situated in particular interactions" (p.256). Therefore, Riessman's work on narratives appears to draw on both a constructivist and interpretivist ontology. Rather than combine these ontological approaches in the manner of Riessman, the current study separates them in order to distinguish between contextual features of the dialogue (biography and experience) and the view that accounts reflect arguments, and are used by participants to construct a social identity. Rosenthal and Fischer-Rosenthal (2004) described an important feature of narrative analysis as the investigation of the 'manner' of presentation of biographical experiences through an examination of the reasons that people choose to present their stories in a particular way in the interview. They described this as searching for the "hidden layers" in the narrative. Thus, the social constructivist approach to narrative analysis used in the current study adopts their position in examining the "hidden layers" of accounts and the identity work being carried out.

Henwood and Pidgeon (1992) reasoned that there are:

> ...many reasons to be cautious of taking respondents' accounts wholly at face value; for example, people may not always be fully aware of reasons for their actions, and accounts may be offered to perform a variety of non-obvious and context-specific functions (e.g. allocating blame to others, warranting particular claims to truth) which go beyond the mere provision of information. (p.107)

This view concurs with the notion of accounts as strategic devices, used "to achieve certain effects in the social interaction" (Radley and Billig, 1996, p.59). In keeping

with the constructivist perspective, the third approach to analysis considers accounts of behaving badly as strategic devices for constructing identity in the interview situation. Specific techniques investigated included the use of justifications and excuses (Scott and Lyman, 1968) and the portrayal of moral goodness, perhaps in the attempt to reduce the potential for criticism or condemnation. In their investigation of convicted offenders' explanations of crimes, Willott, Griffin and Torrance (2001) described "interviewees' talk as strategic, focused on constructing a representation of themselves that was socially acceptable and drawing on discursive patterns already culturally present" (p.449). Similarly, in relation to young people's accounts of drug use, Pattman and Kehily (2004) expressed the belief that:

> ... interviewers do not elicit descriptive accounts from interviewees. Rather, the interviewees construct their identities through what they say about themselves and others...
> (p.67)

Therefore, the third approach to analysis prioritised the strategies which appear to be used by interviewees in the attempt to present a particular identity in the context of the interview. This analysis considers the use of language, as well as the inconsistencies, anecdotes and possible omissions in accounts and the purpose of such rhetorical devices in the construction of identity. Thus, for the purposes of this part of the analysis, accounts are viewed as social constructions, with a particular focus on the identity work being carried out, and the types of linguistic devices used to achieve this. The use of such strategies by participants discussing behaviour which they believe others may regard as "untoward" (Scott and Lyman, 1968) has been demonstrated in other studies, as illustrated above in relation to accounts of criminal behaviour and drug use.

3.5. Demonstrating the Analytical Approaches

In order to further illustrate the difference between the three approaches to analysis, the following extract from an interview carried out in the main study will be analysed from each perspective. Firstly, the account will be viewed as a lay

explanation for behaviour in line with a social realist ontology. Secondly, the interpretivist approach to narrative analysis will be demonstrated by drawing on biographical and experiential features to contextualise the account. Finally, the account will be conceptualised as a social construction through an analysis of the process of accounting (Radley and Billig, 1996), by examining the use of linguistic devices to construct identity, and the interpretation of the account as a justification or excuse for behaviour (Scott and Lyman, 1968).

The following extended quotation is taken from the interview with Louise, in which she recounted her experiences of bullying:

I would say, well see I, like the reason I didn't like school was like, originates from primary school cause I was really, really shy when I was young and I got bullied for eight years...

Did you?

...through primary school and first year. And then, that's why, know how I'm talking about these crowds, maybe people from, like my sister didn't hang about wi' the same kind of crowds as I did. Like my mum kinna worried about the crowd I was with, it was more people what you would call maybe, well not so much neddy but like trouble-makers, they were louder and everything. But it's because after first year and everything I'd hung about wi' these girls who were supposed, they were from like my area, they were, she was just, och they were just like horrible, they were just nasty, jealous of everything and just wanted like power, just like if you were shy they'd put you down and like it was, like not so much physical, but it was more mental abuse for 7 or 8 years and I was absolutely, absolutely miserable. And but, in a way, now in hindsight, like I was absolutely miserable, I can't imagine going through anything like that again, but I'm glad because it's made me realise that I would never do that to anyone and how much it would hurt, like how much words can hurt. And like, after like first year and everything that's how I kind of... (small pause), these people, even though they were different from me, like kind of accepted me more and they were like, 'Stick up for your-, like stick up for yourself.' But what really got me is when I finally did stand up to this, like the particular girl, and because I'm, like I'm bigger than her, it wasn't a, as I say it wasn't a physical thing, I wasn't so much physically scared of her, it's just like she would tell lies about me and she told, like in primary school for example, like she told, like I think, like it's just know how stupid wee petty things, like a boy fancied me

who she fancied, she told people I was anorexic, bulimic, and that my dad raped me. Like that is the kind of mentality these girls had that I had for 8 years.

That's horrible. [Louise]

3.5.1. Thematic Analysis

From a social realist perspective, it is presumed that Louise's comments reflected her actual experiences of bullying. Thus, the inference from this passage is that Louise sought out friendships with individuals who had a history of antisocial behaviour ("trouble-makers") following a period of bullying in primary school. Louise recounted how her adverse experiences within the group of friends from her ('good') area led her to seek out friends who accepted her and gave her confidence to confront these bullies. However, the cost of this boost to her self-esteem was her association with a group of "trouble-makers," which caused her mother concern. Louise's story therefore supports epidemiological findings which postulate a link between adverse life events, peer pressure and delinquency (Fergusson and Horwood, 1999). This account could therefore be viewed as anecdotal support for these findings, and a means of understanding the processes underlying the association.

For the purposes of the descriptive analysis, this section was coded as 'negative experiences of school' (tree node), 'relationship with peers' (tree node), 'biography – friends' (tree node), and 'class' (free node).

3.5.2. Interpretive Approach to Narrative Analysis

The excerpt analysed above will now be contextualised using other passages from the interview with Louise in order to demonstrate the interpretive approach to narrative analysis. The quotation presented below is Louise's response to a general question about motives for truancy, and highlights how her own personal experience was reflected in her general explanations of antisocial behaviour:

Em again, it'd be, well one, because I didn't like the classes, that's why I did it, I hated the classes, I didn't like the teachers. Maybe I didn't want 'ae see some people who were in the classes. Definitely if you're getting bullied you would dog school. And certain, but you would get reprimanded for that, you would get totally, 'Oh you, you're bad. You dog school.' Instead of, 'Why are you dogging school? Is it because you're having trouble in this class?' I think teachers need 'ae realise that. Em, that that's is one, the probably biggest reason. And I didn't do that so much in high school because I wasn't getting bullied so much in high school. Em, but I think probably the reason is because they can't be, like, it's like, 'Oh I can't be bothered going and doing this class. Let's be cool and go and dog it and have a laugh and relax.' Or just because they didn't like the teacher or anything. Or else just because they've got no interest. They've got absolutely no interest in staying on at school, so they wouldn't see why they should have to do a, a class where they don't enjoy, where they could be having fun doing something else. Or just to be, just to be openly defiant and say, 'I don't want to. F your school.' And they want 'ae get, maybe for attention as well because they want someone 'ae say, 'Why are you not dog-, why are you not coming to school?' I think it, well that's a big thing as well, attention, to get attention.   [Louise]

Louise immediately described her own motives for truanting from school in response to a general question, citing bullying as the primary motive. Despite suggesting a range of other possible reasons, she suggested that experiencing bullying was "probably the biggest reason" for truancy. This was in opposition to other participants, who tended to relate truancy to peer influence, the desire to have fun or a disinterest in education. Therefore, Louise's 'general' account appears to have been influenced by her own experiences and subjectivity, which suggests that to understand her views on antisocial behaviour, her account must be contextualised by reference to her own experiences. This theme will be explored in later chapters, particularly in relation to the view expressed by many participants that antisocial behaviour represents normative behaviour.

Louise's friendships in the past appear to have informed her general beliefs about antisocial behaviour, but she did signal in the interview that she had to make an effort to view antisocial behaviour from her former 'insider' perspective now that she had left school and developed new friendships:

What words do you associate with young people getting into trouble?

> Like I would, even though I did kinna hang about with them, I've got a snobbery against
> them. Like now, I'm like oh wee neds, they're just trouble-makers. And I'll need 'ae think
> well why are they doing that, they're doing it for a reason. [Louise]

Therefore, Louise suggested that she considers young people who engage in antisocial behaviour differently in light of her "snobbery against them." She described how she had to prompt herself to consider the reasons that young people get into trouble, rather than condemn them for doing so. This highlights the relationship between accounts of the past and current perspectives and experiences, which will be discussed in later findings chapters.

3.5.3. Analysis of the Process of Accounting: Constructing Identity in the Interview

According to Radley and Billig's (1996) perspective on accounts, which is founded on a constructivist ontology, the truth value of Louise's comments about bullying is irrelevant. Instead, the central focus in analysing her account is the way in which it represents her views on social reality. Hence, Louise's account suggests that she conceptualised society as organised around the principle of class, and that behaviour is linked to social class. In distancing herself from the group of friends she associated with at secondary school, describing them as "these people" and "different from me," Louise positions herself outside the circle of "trouble-makers." Her beliefs about the relationship between class status and behaviour are reflected in her apparent disbelief at the actions of "these girls who were supposed... were from like my area... were just like horrible." Furthermore, her moral judgement about the behaviour of the girls from her area, as reflected in her use of the word "supposed," is not evident in her discussion of the behaviour of the "trouble-makers," suggesting that she had different expectations about these girls' behaviour based on their social class status.

Louise's account could also be viewed as a justification or excuse for her own behaviour in line with Scott and Lyman's (1968) framework. Her portrayal of the mental abuse she suffered at the hands of the girls from her area whom she described as "nasty, jealous... [and] wanted power" presents the notion that she was forced to join the group of "trouble-makers." This, in turn, may be viewed as an excuse for her involvement in antisocial behaviour. In addition, her description of the emotional trauma she experienced strongly depicts her as a victim and therefore may be viewed as a further justification for her behaviour.

Therefore, regardless of the 'truth' status of Louise's account, a constructivist approach to analysing the interview highlights: firstly, that her description of her experiences of bullying reflects her conceptual understanding of class structure and its relation to behaviour, and secondly, how her account may be viewed as a tool for constructing a positive identity in the interview situation.

It is also possible that the three different versions of accounts may conflict. For example, it is possible that Louise's identity construction might lead her 'retell' her story and alter the 'facts.' For example, it is possible that she may have exaggerated her experiences of bullying in order to present herself in a positive light. However, adopting three different perspectives increases the likelihood that ambiguities, inconsistencies, and conflicting details in accounts can be understood and contextualised.

3.6. Chapter Summary

This chapter has outlined the three approaches to analysis employed in this study. The decision to employ alternative approaches to qualitative data analysis was taken in view of the breadth and depth of the material generated, since it was felt that none of the approaches could adequately convey the complexity and "hidden layers" of the data. The findings chapters which follow reflect the structure of this chapter, with Chapter 4 presenting the results of the thematic analysis, Chapter 5 adopting an

interpretive approach to narrative analysis, and Chapter 6 employing a constructivist approach to narrative analysis.

Chapter 4: Defining and Explaining Antisocial Behaviour

4.1. Introduction

This chapter will explore definitions and explanations of antisocial behaviour from the perspective of young people and psychiatrists. The aims of this chapter are: firstly, to present an overview of young people's definitions of antisocial behaviour and their understanding of the factors underlying bad behaviour; and secondly, to set the academic debate about the classification of CD in a clinical context by exploring the views of four psychiatrists. This chapter will also compare the views of young people (who might be regarded as potential "users" of mental health services) and psychiatrists to illustrate the diversity of perspectives on antisocial behaviour, and the implications for defining CD.

4.2. Psychiatrists' Perspectives on CD

In order to understand the meaning of behaving badly from a practitioner's perspective, four semi-structured interviews were carried out to explore clinicians' views about diagnostic labelling and the criteria for CD; the aetiology and treatment of conduct problems; intervention; and future projections about prevalence (see Appendix I). Due to the small number of interviews carried out, the opinions presented here cannot be regarded as representative of psychiatrists in general, although the psychiatrists interviewed were all colleagues of one of the project supervisors and were selected to provide a wide diversity of views.

4.2.1. Views on the Status and Classification of CD

Across all of the interviews, there was a sense that CD was outwith the remit of psychiatry. However, this may be because three of the psychiatrists were working for the same Health Board, which stipulated that uncomplicated cases of CD should not be referred to psychiatric services:

...we made a choice some years ago, for reasons that I can elaborate if it's pertinent to you, what you want to know, actually that we wouldn't see young people presenting with solely conduct problems, CD.

Uh-huh, I saw that on the website.

And the reason for that is that we came to feel that there was, and this was some years ago, and we addressed this in conjunction with the Health Board, at a time when the Health Board had a role statutorily to commission the provision from the NHS providers of the Health Board to tell us we want you to cater for these young people and treat them in this way. We were at that stage saying to the Health Board, we believe there is no clear evidence, no clear research-based evidence, that shows that mental health specialist provision, so adolescents with CD, is anymore likely to offer success, whatever factor you define success by, for this community, or by Education or by Social Work. Given that we are under-resourced to actually cater for young people where there is a strong evidence-base that we **can** actually treat their anorexia or their depression or the schizophrenia then we would not plan to cater for this group of young people.   [Psychiatrist 3]

The notion that CD is difficult to treat was expressed by all of the psychiatrists interviewed. However, opinion was more divided on the issue of whether CD represents a mental disorder and on the value of including it as a category in psychiatric nosology. One psychiatrist described CD as "a socio-legal label," adding that "we shouldn't elevate it to the status of being seen as a health disorder" [Psychiatrist 3], a view echoed by another psychiatrist:

...so there's CD plus, in the jargon that would be comorbidity, but I hate these medical languages for things that are so plainly not medical. Um, you know utterly, or by definition, when a psychiatrist says CD, what they're saying is it's neither medical nor psychiatric, that's really what they mean – CD just means they're naughty kids 'cause they're not being looked after or... so that's what it means. But psychiatrists have forgotten that they've invented that term and so it looks like they're saying "oh it is psychiatric." But actually when a psychiatrist says to another psychiatrist, "CD," what they mean is, don't, you know, even bother to try because it's not, not for us.   [Psychiatrist 1]

Later in the interview, this psychiatrist suggested that there is a "circularity in the definition" of CD:

> And I think if you said to people, "your child has CD," they'd say, "what does that mean?" And you'd say, "well it means he's not behaving himself." You know, (sigh), "I told you that about an hour ago, why are you telling me?" And so you, it's circularity in the definition. Em, so it doesn't, if it helps, it helps for a vacuous reason, it's pseudo-help, it's mystique, it's saying I know what to do about it when actually what you have to say is, I know how to help you to do something about it. [Psychiatrist 1]

However, this psychiatrist also offered an explanation for the inclusion of CD as a category in the ICD and DSM:

> ...in America, just to draw attention to this, you do need to have an over-inclusive medical looking system because otherwise the insurance company don't pay for your treatment. There, you may well want to call it ADHD, CD, Oppositional Defiant Disorder, because that has to be pinned onto you, your child, in the first quarter of an hour, or the insurance company won't pay, there has to be a medically looking label to get help. We're a welfare state and so we don't need labels. [Psychiatrist 1]

Two of the psychiatrists therefore supported the view that simple CD should not be considered a mental disorder by highlighting the lack of treatment, the circularity of the definition, and possible financial motives for medicalising behaviour.

The other two psychiatrists suggested that there was some foundation for classifying CD as a mental disorder:

> ...I think I'm definitely more on the mental disorder category when we're talking about children and I think that's because I'm an optimist – I mean I, I do in the next 20 years, think that we will actually discover some useful treatments... [Psychiatrist 4]

This psychiatrist also suggested that she would diagnose CD on the basis of "things that were really outwith normal behaviour so things like, severely aggressive behaviour or fire-setting or, for example, sexually aggressive behaviour."

According to one psychiatrist, the advantages of classifying CD as a mental disorder lay in being able to "short-hand one's thinking":

> ...I have very mixed feelings about the CD diagnosis anyhow. I mean I think it's not in any sense a diagnosis in the way that, I don't know, dystrophy or something is a diagnosis. It's a description really, em, but eh, for all that it's quite a useful description to be able to sort of short-hand one's thinking...　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[Psychiatrist 2]

The view that CD behaviours can be "healthy" in the sense of being a normal response to suffering and distress was also expressed by three of the psychiatrists:

> When you think about, you know, the notion that the child with CD is doing a very healthy thing, protesting about their circumstance, em, it seems to me that the responsibility then is to engage with that protest in accord as if it were a protest.　　　　　　[Psychiatrist 2]

Thus, whilst these psychiatrists disagreed on whether CD represents a mental disorder, there was agreement that the classification can be useful in identifying distress, although there was also a sense that psychiatry may not be the most appropriate service to meet the needs of these young people. The issue of the stigma of seeing a psychiatrist was identified as a problem, and one psychiatrist also suggested that the diagnostic criteria may not be sensitive for identifying problem behaviour, since three symptoms represents a low diagnostic threshold.

4.2.2. Perspectives on the Aetiology of Conduct Problems

Explanations relating to social class featured prominently in psychiatrists' discussions about the aetiology of CD. One psychiatrist stated that social class background is important in the clinical evaluation of conduct problems in view of differing behavioural norms across the classes:

> If you live in a communal housing scheme then it's more likely to be the kid is going to be, eh the majority, socialized CD because that's what kids do on a housing scheme, it's normal to be smashing up windows with a bottle, you wouldn't be surprised if they... (trails off).

> On the other hand, if they lived in a nice middle class family and they start smashing up
> bottles on their own then you think, hang on a sec, that's not so.   [Psychiatrist 1]

However, one of the other psychiatrists suggested that parenting style may mediate the relationship between deprivation and CD due to the ways in which the strains associated with poverty impact parenting:

> Well I guess if you're, if you're experiencing deprivation as a child, your family's likely to
> live in an area where there are more likely to be difficult issues of your peer relations. So in
> other words, you're likely to be living in an area where the street is likely to be difficult for
> you, but then I think there's also the issue that, I think there's no doubt that the best parents
> in the world, when they're experiencing poverty, their relationship comes under strain and
> you know you, I think you're much more likely to have less than optimal parenting if you're
> living in a situation of deprivation.   [Psychiatrist 4]

It was also suggested that refusing to accept referrals of CD "flies in the face of the government's social exclusion policy" [Psychiatrist 3]. Thus, there was a general consensus among the psychiatrists interviewed that CD is linked to social class and deprivation.

Other opinions expressed about the aetiology of CD mirrored epidemiological findings in this area, and reflected a broad spectrum of factors, including physiological and developmental factors; social factors, particularly family background and peer affiliation; and environmental factors, including area and housing conditions. The following excerpt offers a comprehensive summary of these themes:

> Well a range of different factors, factors that relate to the individual young person
> themselves and so, there'll be factors related to the home environment – family and living
> environment – and then factors relating to the wider culture. So factors relating to the young
> person would relate to issues, for example, the young person possibly being of a
> temperamental style, depending on if they've been a more difficult child to bring up, so
> maybe children who are poorer adapting, children who are sullen in their mood, children
> who respond poorly to change, children who are quite compulsive and they're maybe

children who have other biological constitutional features like predisposition to ADHD, and very impulsive mood, the biological, they might be children who have poor sleep patterns, who may be difficult to comfort, hard to put down at night and restless and so quite challenging to parent. Em , but not necessarily children who, just because of those biological factors or predispositions, would have been bound to become conduct disordered. I think there's absolutely no doubt that with good enough parenting, any parents can easily manage these children's difficulties without there being an increased predisposition for them then, over time, developing CD. So then issues to do with the parenting style come into play... I think the most critical influence is the quality or style of parenting so harsh rejecting and inconsistent critical parenting, parenting that uses physical punishments, emotional threats, extreme responses so that parents respond to some small defiance or oppositionality in an extremely threatening or rejecting but critically, abusive manner and in children learning that the response to getting it wrong would either be, is rejecting punishment in the absence of concern or love and so that doesn't predispose them to building up appropriate sharing, guilt and healthy concern, doesn't provoke them into trying to do better next time... In a wider environment, there are peer group influences which can both maintain the oppositionality and defiant approach against society in general, that can then add fuel to the young people. Some young people then will have their disordered conduct, quote, unquote, normalised because of a peer group who shares their similar values and views... And then, within the wider community, more often that these young people are actually, sadly, are increasingly socially excluded and so it's maybe not surprising that if you're, if you can't aspire to the material wealth because they're not well educated, there aren't any jobs, they can't get good quality jobs... [Psychiatrist 3]

The developmental problems associated with CD were emphasised by one clinician who focused on the connection between parental drug abuse and antisocial conduct in offspring:

I think we're being very simplistic about children with parents who use drugs, and, we've got you know lots of children being born in Glasgow to drug addicted mothers. They're probably developmentally vulnerable, partly because of inheritance and partly because of, intra-uterine experience – they are children who maybe need extra good parenting and yet we're trying to support them with parents who aren't really managing their own lives. [Psychiatrist 2]

This psychiatrist also suggested that other developmental factors were implicated in some cases of CD:

And what would you make of the sort of stance that CD behaviour is simply a healthy reaction to social circumstance?

Well you see I think that's a a very reasonable thing to say and I think for a lot of children that's probably true but I think social circumstance includes being a person with specific language impairment who nobody understands, you know. So I think there's an intrinsic pattern in the child and I think there's also an issue about impulsivity and the capacity for normative behaviour in the function of the executive, of the frontal lobe and things like that which do make a difference.   [Psychiatrist 2]

Whilst Psychiatrist 2 discussed the theme of neurological impairment at a few points in the interview, the other psychiatrists emphasised the importance of social and environmental factors in the development of CD. Psychiatrist 4 pointed out that she regarded CD as a different type of condition on account of her understanding that CD is not linked to genetics:

I think CD is absolutely fascinating. It's actually something I've been reading about recently because I've been looking at things that have, I've been looking at genetics, I suppose, behavioural genetics, and one of the things that I think's really interesting is that CD doesn't seems to have a big, a strong genetic loading, which is really, really makes you scratch your head cause just about everything else that we deal with does. Em, so, I mean I, from clinical work, it seems to me that the family is important, clearly, and if you've got, particularly a father I think – I'm getting that from my research reading again – but certainly if you've got a father who's got criminal behaviour, then you're more likely to have a young person with CD so there's something about the family environment but I think... peer relationships are very very important, and schooling. I think those kind of three areas are the big things.   [Psychiatrist 4]

Thus, three of the psychiatrists interviewed depicted CD as a social problem, with only one referring to intrinsic characteristics as an important aetiological factor.

A final theme that was raised in two of the interviews related to psychiatrists' 'lay' observations of a social trend of increasing defiance among young people and less respect for adult authority:

> I've seen ten-year-olds on the streets who don't know the rules of when to stop becoming completely hyper, you know playing football on the main street oblivious to, but that's not something you do, you don't, in front of other adults who are standing at the bus stop, pick up a big bag of rubbish that's there and just plonk it in the middle of the road. You know adolescent gangs wouldn't do that I don't think but ten-year-olds who've just, you know, who are really high with their own... [trails off] so I can see the results of kids being given too much loving really. And the media of course telling them you can have everything and the world's your oyster, ask your mum, dad and they'll buy you anything. So I'm just speaking as a lay person now really and I'm sure the, that the facts will bear that out, for kids, em... What I have seen clinically is situations of just straight-forward defiance...
>
> [Psychiatrist 1]

Therefore, the psychiatrists interviewed cited an array of factors which they regarded as underlying conduct disturbances in young people.

One of the frustrations expressed across all of the interviews related to the lack of multi-agency collaboration to address the needs of individuals with CD. Two of the psychiatrists pointed to the potential of multi-systemic therapy for responding to the needs of young people with CD:

> I think there's an issue about looking into whether or not some of the early evidence that's coming out of North America with fancy names like multi-systemic therapy may be the way forward. And I think a Scottish approach to it, or a UK approach to it, might be to actually join up and tie in with various agencies in a committed response so that if the young person is found to have CD, then using some form of systematised assessment profile, we look at the young person's functioning in the home, the young person's functioning in the community, and that would include you know committing offences, whether or not there's alcohol or drug misuse, we'd look at the health and functioning of the family, we'd look at the mental health well-being of the parents, look at the young person's ongoing education, and then actually we tailor a treatment plan that tackles all of these.   [Psychiatrist 3]

Thus, there was a sense that psychiatry may have a role to play in tackling the problems associated with CD but only as part of a joint response involving a number of agencies.

4.2.3. Summary

In summary, this small group of clinicians all regarded CD as largely outwith the remit of psychiatry. Despite differing on the extent to which they regarded the collection of behaviours which define CD as a mental disorder, they all depicted these behaviours as an important form of self-expression among young people who are suffering distress. However, CD was only viewed as a protest by young people about their difficult circumstances in a minority of cases. Mostly, CD was regarded as normative behaviour, particularly among young people from lower social class backgrounds. CD was primarily conceptualised as a social problem by these psychiatrists, although they described a complex range of individual, family and social factors associated with greater risk of CD. They also suggested that the successful treatment of CD is dependent on the development of a multi-agency approach since specialist child psychiatry clinics did not have the resources to fully support the complex needs of young people with CD. It appears from the interviews that psychiatrists conceptualised 'disorder' as linked to biological factors. In other words, if the problematic behaviour could be understood as entirely socially oriented, it was not seen as a valid psychiatric disorder.

4.3. Young People's Conceptualisation of Antisocial Behaviour

This section focuses on young people's general views about antisocial behaviour, as opposed to a description of their own motives, which will be the topic of the next chapter. Section 4.3.1 deals with young people's definitions of antisocial behaviour, whilst section 4.3.2 presents the range of explanations provided for behaving badly. This section is organised around the themes of structural factors, social influences, and individual characteristics, although it is acknowledged that these classes of responses were not always clearly demarcated in participants' accounts, which often

emphasised the combined effect of a number of these factors. The view that antisocial behaviour represents disordered versus normative behaviour will be explored in young people's accounts in line with the debate on psychiatric and sociological theories on antisocial behaviour introduced in Chapter 1. Following a description of "behaviour-specific" explanations in section 4.3.3, the chapter concludes by exploring the patterning of accounts by gender, social class and CD status.

4.3.1. Definitions

Participants' definitions of antisocial behaviour covered a wide range of behaviours: fighting; vandalism; destroying property; theft; violence; hanging around in gangs; underage drinking; shouting and swearing in public; drug abuse; bullying; hurting or harming others; bigotry; sectarianism; law-breaking; rule-breaking; offending others; ignorance; and disrespect. Whilst the majority of participants defined antisocial behaviour as rule-breaking and rebelliousness, often in relation to hanging around the streets and drinking alcohol, there was evidence that the type of definition provided was patterned by individuals' own behavioural history. In particular, those with little or no experience of behaving badly tended to describe antisocial behaviour as motiveless acts, without a purpose or aim. For example, Jane described antisocial behaviour as that carried out "for no apparent reason":

> ... people being abusive to anybody else. Most, mostly that or some kind o' vandalism (laughing) or something, like breaking stuff in a pub or something or just shouting at somebody for no reason and starting a big fight and things like that.   [Jane, No CD]

Similarly, Keiron described antisocial behaviour as:

> ... just being a nuisance. Just kind of eh annoying other people just for no apparent reason. Just trying to get into fights for the sake of getting into a fight kind of thing. Writing stuff on walls, just deliberately stirring up trouble.   [Keiron, No CD]

In contrast, individuals who described involvement in antisocial behaviour were more attentive to the consequences of behaviour and often defined behaviour as antisocial when it resulted in harm to others:

... what would you say antisocial behaviour is?

Em, I think it's, becomes antisocial behaviour when it harms other people, either through fighting or destroying other people's property. Or causing such a racket that people's children can't sleep, fair enough seven o'clock at night, you know, there's nothing wrong with people walking down the street talking or, but what when it's late, and people are shouting and screaming, I'd say that, cause that's not right. And when people are drunk walking down the street and they're shouting at each other or having a fight in the street, it's not, it's no' right. But em I'd say when other people get hurt then it's wrong. As long as you're not hurting anybody else, I don't see the problem. [Paula, CD]

Some participants who described involvement in more serious forms of antisocial behaviour challenged the notion that behaviour commonly regarded as antisocial should be condemned. For example, Nick objected to the notion that young people who hang around the streets and drink alcohol should be regarded as antisocial:

And a lot o' it, say like young kids and a' that running about, and people say they're vandalising and a' that but I don't think that's a problem, know how like wee kids running aboot in the streets and they've had a bottle of wine or whatever, they're just running about and they're no' really daeing anything in particular, they're just running about, I don't call that antisocial, I just think, well what else are they gonnae do type o' thing. They've got absolutely nothing else to do, it costs like, say it costs a tenner 'ae go 'ae the pictures, it costs a tenner 'ae go 'ae the pictures, most people cannae go 'ae the pictures and what else are you gonnae do, sit in your house all day? You've been 'ae school a' week and you've been oot a couple o' times, maybe playing football during the week, and it comes Friday and Saturday, you want 'ae do something and obviously a lot o' people, kids have no' got a lot o' money so what do they dae? They buy a three pound bottle o' cider at the weekend and get, they go mad and then people are wondering, what about all these kids and broken families, what, what, what, whatever, it's no' all the time they're, a lot o' people just want 'ae have a bit o' fun and that's the only way people can have fun the now, and cause they've been drinking

and a' that and think they're hard, then it leads tae them fighting and things get happening, type o' thing. [Nick, CD]

By arguing that these behaviours in young people are a consequence of them having nothing else to do, Nick implied that this behaviour is not malicious, and therefore should not be regarded as antisocial. George challenged the labelling of some behaviour as antisocial on similar grounds:

> Eh probably like hanging about, eh *that's what the polis would call us*, call it anyway, but antisocial I'd say like annoying people, like at their houses or if they're out on the street and you're annoying them, like playing football, like keep hitting it in their garden or off their car or something like that, if you're... It's like annoying somebody but if you're just having a laugh and you're not annoying anybody I wouldn't see it as antisocial. [George, CD]

George's account suggests that he acknowledged that his behaviour would be regarded by others as antisocial ("that's what the polis would call us"), but that he felt that this was an unreasonable judgement. In turn, George based his assessment on the consequences of the behaviour, and whether it annoyed other people. This theme was echoed in Emily's account when she described the boundary between harmless behaviour and taking it "too far":

> Somebody that just, somebody that takes it too far and wrecks people's property, that's what I think to be honest wi' you. I hate people like that, d'you know what I mean, so I do, but I don't think hanging out, hanging about and everything's no' antisocial, d'you know what I mean? But somebody that wrecks people's property I would say. [Emily, CD]

Therefore, Emily also suggested that behaviour should only be deemed antisocial when it directly affects other people. Greg took this argument one stage further, and explained that there are rules to abide by when behaving badly, and that only breaking these rules constitutes antisocial behaviour:

> I don't, I don't know but like, antisocial behaviour, there's hunners o' things you could say aboot it, but it all comes down 'ae one thing I think. It's the way you act, innit, and the

manner in which you act and where you are, cause there's times and places for things in't there? I mean it's like if a guy was walking down the street wi' his girlfriend and you wanted tae fight wi' him, then you wouldnae go and batter him when his girlfriend's there because that's not allowed. But there's like kids noo that don't, there's nae rules anymore either, that's the thing, there's nae rules, anything goes with, with anything.   [Greg, CD]

Despite describing participation in a range of behaviours, including theft, burglary, fighting, carrying a weapon and vandalism, Simon concluded that he was "no' really one for getting intae trouble":

> ... it's only really been that [reference to carrying a knife] and the assaults and two breach o' the peace or something and every time I've had a letter back saying, 'We're no' going 'ae take it any further,' so I'm no' really one for getting intae trouble I don't think but...
>
> [Simon]

Simon revealed later in the interview that his brother was in jail for a very serious crime and discussed the experiences of a few friends who had been imprisoned at various points throughout the interview. Therefore, for individuals in Simon's family and community, imprisonment perhaps represented a norm, thus explaining why he did not regard his behaviour as serious, and why he was adamant that he would never go to jail:

> Cause after that time, like when that, they lifted me for that, I was like scared, I was only twelve and it was the first time I'd ever been like lifted, and I think it just frightened me enough like to say I'll never be caught wi' one o' them again man. Likes o' carrying one o' them nowadays, you get three 'ae five year straightaway man. I wouldnae, phew, I don't think I could handle going 'ae the jail anyway, I'd probably try suicide at the, I couldnae, I'd do everything in my power 'ae avoid going 'ae it man. Especially now cause like if a, three or four year sentence, I'm 21 next year so it's gonnae mean, mean me going 'ae like a big jail (laughs), it's something I can't imagine man. It'll never happen anyway, I doubt it will man. I've always says like, 'I'll never go 'ae jail,' and like so far so good anyway.
>
> [Simon, CD]

It may also be the case that Simon equated getting into trouble with official labelling of behaviour through the penal system, in line with the experiences of those around him.

In contrast, Katy's lack of personal experience of behaving badly was reflected in her definition of antisocial behaviour:

...and what would you say antisocial behaviour is?

Antisocial behaviour, probably, (long pause), I don't know, maybe going out and getting so drunk that you're just making a complete fool of yourself. Em (laughs), I can't really think of anything, and hanging around in gangs, just kind of excluding yourself from kind of socialising within big places and things like that, yeah. [Katy, No CD]

It can be seen that Katy answered this question from a different standpoint in comparison to other participants, highlighting that definitions were relative to participants' own experiences and background.

Therefore, while hanging around the streets, drinking alcohol, swearing and ignorance were considered antisocial behaviour among individuals with little personal experience of behaving badly, a pattern of more severe behaviours were often included in the definitions of those with more experience. These individuals also tended to base their definitions on intentionality, and generally considered behaviour to be antisocial when it was malicious or harmed others. Thus, the range of definitions of antisocial behaviour provided by young people in the current study serve to highlight that different meanings were attached to behaviour across individuals with different levels of experience, and that these meanings were grounded in individuals' own behavioural history.

4.3.1.1. Stereotypes

The majority of participants used the term "ned" to describe young people who get into trouble. Although this is an acronym of the technical term 'non-educated

delinquent,' it is commonly used to refer to young people who hang around the streets, are affiliated with gangs, drink alcohol (often tonic wine or cider) and dress in tracksuits, caps and trainers:

...how would you describe what you mean by a ned?

A ned. Well, trackie bottoms wi' the socks tucked outside them, eh, baseball cap, 45 degree angle, eh, and just, just someone that thinks they're bigger than they are and acts really wide and thinks they're a wee tough guy and they're quite clearly not.   [Geoffrey, CD]

A Scottish member of parliament called for the term "ned" to be abolished due its negative connotations (Scottish Socialist Party website, 12/06/03). Such negative connotations were strongly evident in participants' accounts, and were reflected in the other terms which were used by participants to refer to "neds," including "idiots," "maddies," "dafties," "nutters," and "cretins." For example, Nick suggested that dressing like a "ned" marked people out as trouble-makers:

...I mean I seriously do think if you walk aboot the town you could just walk about and point out people and then if you looked intae it, they would be the trouble-makers.

Why's that? What about them?

I don't know, I just think it goes back, it's pure image and what I perceive is being a trouble-maker would... be somebody wi' the pure cap on away back here [pointing to the back of his head], wi' like their, a sorta arctic jacket on the middle o' summer if you know what I mean, stupid things like that, but it is sorta like image and like I immediately think o' it, I think to myself why. But is it no' because of every time in the papers, you've always got the image o' the same wee guy, a' the time, don't know, it's no' the same wee guy but it's always the guy wi' the cap and jacket on looking like an idiot.   [Nick, CD]

Describing the "idiots" in his year group at school, Nick linked their behaviour to their difficult home backgrounds:

...every year you get the ones that are... they're like bullies type o' thing. Their main aim is to come into school and annoy as many people as they can because they've got pure... a rough life at home and they get no support so they come into school and annoy everybody, no' annoy everybody just, they'll pick on the weakest person or the people they think are smaller or weaker than them because they can type o' thing. It's no' because, they probably don't really want 'ae dae it that much but they feel as if they have tae, they have to show theirself that they're bigger because no doubt they're getting a doing at home or something like that or it's not very nice at home. [Nick, CD]

Therefore, Nick suggested that the behaviour of the individuals he described as "idiots" was determined by an attempt to prove themselves, which in turn was triggered by a lack of support at home. This illustrates that these stereotypes were not simply used to describe individuals and their behaviour, but that they reflected assumptions about the causes of antisocial behaviour in young people.

Some participants' descriptions of "neds" revealed their embedded beliefs about the relationship between social class and antisocial behaviour:

Eh talking about trouble, there's so many wee idiots walking about [names area] it's just not real and I wouldn't want to know what it's like in an actual place with proper neds and like, do you know what I mean, cause the wee neds in [names area] are just as bad, my mate's been mugged and all sorts and this is like a posh suburb of Glasgow. [Gordon, CD]

In contrasting the group of "wee idiots" who cause trouble in the middle class suburbs of Glasgow with "proper neds," Gordon implied that the behaviour of the former group is less threatening than that of individuals inhabiting worse areas of the city. His use of the term "proper neds" illustrates the finding discussed later in the thesis that "real" antisocial behaviour was generally associated with the lower classes whilst antisocial behaviour in the upper classes was depicted as less violent and more likely to be used as a method to enhance status and construct a masculine identity.

These extracts suggest that participants' general explanations of antisocial behaviour incorporated social stereotypes about young people who engage in antisocial behaviour. Only two participants explicitly claimed that they used to be a ned although some people described dressing in tracksuits and being members of gangs when they were younger. Only six participants failed to mention "neds" (or any of the related terms) in their general explanations of antisocial behaviour although their descriptions of young people who get into trouble matched those of the other participants who did use these terms, suggesting that participants discussed a common stereotype.

4.3.1.2. Summary

Analysing young people's definitions of antisocial behaviour has shown that participants attached different meanings to behaviour, and that these meanings were patterned according to experience. While individuals with less experience of behaving badly tended to define antisocial behaviour by reference to milder behaviours, those with more experience generally cited more serious behaviours, and sometimes challenged the grounds for classifying behaviour as antisocial at all. However, as most participants also described a common stereotype when asked to describe young people who get into trouble, there was also some indication that participants based their explanations at least partly on a core group of individuals they referred to as "neds."

4.3.2. General Explanations of Antisocial Behaviour

4.3.2.1. Setting the Context: The Nature-Nurture Debate

One participant alluded directly to the nature-nurture debate, and suggested a number of factors which might underlie young people's involvement in trouble:

> And I mean in general, you know, just thinking more generally, why do you think em people would get themselves into trouble?

> Em maybe this nature or nurture (laughs)?

Oh well that's interesting (laughing).

Eh... I think to a certain extent it is *nature*, em but also to a certain extent the *area where you live* can accentuate maybe someone who's already a little bit kinna off the rails, I think if you're a little bit like that and if you live in a bad area it just kind of heightens it slightly. But em...

So what is it about a bad area that you would say would heighten...?

Probably em if you were saying antisocial behaviour, somewhere where there's a lot of that then people seeing it all the time, eh *maybe their friends* are like that as well and they've kinna got to do the same stuff to stay in the crowd or something like that. Em but I'll, but that's kinna so naive that way thinking it's just that that causes it, also people who aren't associated wi' crowds like that kinna go off and do stuff on their own, on their kinna own initiative, not, not needing kinna egged on by anybody.

And why do you think that is?

Em probably just *people are born like that* I think. But it's a kinna freaky thought (laughs), people are kinna born with a, with a desire to kinna cause mayhem.   [Calum, No CD]

In his sophisticated analysis, Calum suggested that environmental factors, social influences, and innate characteristics all contribute to young people's tendency to engage in antisocial behaviour. However, he also differentiated between those who are influenced by others and those who act alone, suggesting that the latter group is biologically predisposed to behave badly. In this way, his lay account ties in with the ICD subtype of unsocialized CD, which relates to those individuals who act alone. His analysis also maps onto Moffitt's (1993) description of Life-Course-Persistent CD, which is associated with early onset and neuropsychological impairment.

Like Calum, Louise's account provided some support for the nature hypothesis although she argued that individuals' actions can generally be explained by their experiences, even in the most extreme cases:

> ...I don't believe that you're just born and you're gonnae grow up to be an evil, evil person. I mean even Hitler probably had his reasons, like for being as evil as he was, maybe he was always unbalanced, but something made him go over the edge or, people do have..., if you look deep into something you can always see there is reasons for it, it's not just cause they were born like that, I don't think. I don't know if there's any scientific reason but... (trails off)
> [Louise, CD]

Louise used the emotive example of Hitler to highlight her belief that antisocial behaviour represents a response to adversity, in addition to innate characteristics. Her assertion that antisocial behaviour can be explained by life events and experiences was evident throughout the interview, for example when she described bad behaviour as "a self-fulfilling prophecy":

> It's like, know how, it's like a self-fulfilling prophecy. It's like, well, if they think that, then I'll, I'll just be like that. Fine. Definitely, I think that is why a lot of people do it as well, if they're told they're bad they're just gonnae say, 'Right they think I'm bad, I'm gonnae be bad.'
> [Louise, CD]

Louise's belief that labelling an individual as 'bad' can lead to antisocial behaviour affirms her support for the nurture hypothesis and suggests that she judges actions, rather than people, as bad. Louise's account therefore reflects the principles of labelling theory discussed earlier, which holds that individuals labelled as deviant by those in positions of authority tend to live up to this expectation (Becker, 1963).

Most participants' explanations supported the nurture hypothesis, and specifically the notion that factors associated with upbringing and social environment accounted for engagement in antisocial behaviour. David's general explanation provided strong support for the nurture hypothesis, as evidenced through his statement that he would behave badly if his circumstances mirrored those of the individuals he knew who were constantly involved in trouble:

114

...I think it's just because they've got nothing to do, you know what I mean, and they just hang aboot the streets and cause bother. I mean if, I'd probably be doing the same if I wasnae at uni and if I'd, if I had had a life like that, you know what I mean, just like, because the ones I knew at school that are like getting into trouble noo, they were always like, coming in late, they didnae care aboot school, they had trouble at home and stuff like that, so I'd probably be the same if I was in their shoes, I, I don't know, they just cannae see anything that they can... anything worthwhile so they just go oot and cause trouble.

[David, CD]

David therefore implied that lack of opportunity leads to young people becoming involved in antisocial behaviour, but also that any young person could, in theory, become involved in antisocial behaviour. His view is therefore consistent with the nurture stance since he attributes behaving badly to lack of stimulation and to trouble in the home environment.

These excerpts show that while some participants believed that a small proportion of young people are biologically predisposed to behaving badly, the majority argued that socialisation processes account for the tendency to engage in antisocial behaviour. These alternate viewpoints have implications for classifying young people who engage in a range of antisocial behaviours as disordered rather than disorderly, as discussed in the literature review in relation to psychiatric and sociological perspectives on antisocial behaviour. In particular, the view that behaving badly represents normative, purposive and adaptive behaviour refutes the notion that such behaviour may be indicative of mental disorder. However, the suggestion that antisocial behaviour is caused by an innate characteristic or genetic predisposition implies dysfunction and therefore provides support for the classification of CD as a mental disorder, in line with psychiatric perspectives.

4.3.2.2. Social Influences

4.3.2.2.1. Gangs and Peer Groups

With the exception of one interviewee, peer pressure was cited as a motive for behaving badly by all participants, and was thus the most common general

explanation offered. Explanations either centred around the theme of friends as a bad influence on behaviour, or on the notion of behaving badly as a means of enhancing status in the peer group. For example, Robbie interpreted the behaviour of young people in his area as motivated by the desire to follow the crowd:

> If you get in wi' the wrong crowd then that's what you..., they just seem 'ae lead you into it. It depends on your, I just think it's just a' doon 'ae friends, like it just takes one o' them 'ae start it and the rest of them are a' just gonnae... they just follow along. It's always the same wee group, and then you see other guys like getting intae the group then they start going that way as well. [Robbie, No CD]

On the other hand, Brendan proposed that the attempt to impress others was the main motive for behaving badly:

If you had to say what the main reason was why young people get into trouble, what would you say the main reason is?

Em, I'd say probably to impress others, because you don't, you get one, you get, you don't get one guy that'll go out and do something, he'll do it because he's impressing a group or doing it because he's with his friends and he'll think, oh if I do this it'll make me *look big* and they'll all *like me for that*. So I think that's the main thing that eh, changes young people is just, I mean they want 'ae impress their friends, eh that's what makes them want to be violent or whatever.

What about a guy that is going out on his own and doing things, what's the main reason that's he's doing it?

He's probably got nothing else to do and he's doing that so he can *get noticed*, because he's fed up sitting in the background being a nigel, and being a down-and-out and eh, just not getting recognised and he wants to *get recognised* so that's why he goes out and does that.

Who by?

Eh, obviously people that are *popular*, maybe groups o' people so that he can get friends cause he, he's obviously, inside him, he'll be upset, but if he wants to impress them so he can get friends or whatever and he, he, he must think that's the best way 'ae do it. He

doesn't think, oh I'll just go up and talk to them, because obviously that wouldn't work so he thinks that that's the best thing 'ae do, I think. [Brendan, No CD]

This excerpt highlights a number of perceived benefits of getting into trouble, including enhanced status, popularity and recognition (see italicised sections), and also depicts involvement in trouble as socially-oriented. Brendan described social rewards as the factor which "changes young people" and "makes them want to be violent" (underlined). His account therefore portrays antisocial behaviour as purposive, and aimed at gaining acceptance in the peer group. These features of Brendan's account broadly sum up other participants' analysis of the influence of the peer group, although some individuals distinguished between young people who follow others (as depicted in Robbie's account above), and those who lead the group. These "ring-leaders" were portrayed as a minority group whose background led them to become involved in trouble outwith the home.

Justine's account hinted at the benefits of getting involved in trouble to avoid being labelled as "one o' the good ones," which she explained could have serious consequences at the school she attended:

...the good ones were the ones that were getting bullied and stuff like that which isn't really nice, so I don't know, you do like to rebel a wee bit.

Ih-hm, why do you think people picked on the good ones?

Probably because they were the ones that were doing well, they would get positive feedback from teachers, they might be jealous that they're not getting it so, I don't know, just... and obviously cause they're quiet and they're not gonna say anything, they're not gonna stand up for themselves really, well they're the ones that are gonnae get attacked, verbally and physically (laughs). [Justine, CD]

Therefore, Justine portrayed behaving badly as a mode of self-assertion and avoidance of bullying and ridicule. This suggests, in line with other accounts, that antisocial behaviour was regarded as a means of protection from bullying, ridicule or

being regarded as unpopular. According to this viewpoint, antisocial behaviour could be viewed as adaptive and purposeful.

Lucy's analysis of the social rewards of getting involved in trouble was similar to Brendan's account, although she took her analysis one step further and linked the social rewards of antisocial behaviour specifically to the youth subculture in Glasgow:

> ...I think basically people that dae be bad, just want 'ae feel how big they can be and get away wi' how much they can get away wi' and stuff, I really dae, I really dae...

> **Why do you think there's so much, cause I've heard other people saying similar things, why do you think that some people just want to be big and want to get away with certain things?**

> Popularity, peer pressure. It's really, I don't know but I just, I don't know if you, I don't know if you found it at your school or whatever, but I think in Glasgow it's really bad for it.

> **So you think it's specifically in Glasgow?**

> Like, like if you can fight, if you can fight then... you're worshipped basically... I think most o' the lads, I'd say aboot eight times oot o' ten, it's just got 'ae dae wi' that.
>
> [Lucy, CD]

Like Lucy, who portrayed the situation in Glasgow as "really bad," other participants also located their accounts of gangs and fighting within the culture of violence in Glasgow. For example, Tom described the gang violence in his area as "part o' the mentality o' Glasgow," whilst Emily considered territorial brawls "a Glasgow thing."

The quotes above highlight the themes which surfaced in participants' general accounts of the link between peer influence and antisocial behaviour; namely that being perceived as badly behaved was associated with status and respect, and that antisocial behaviour was seen as a marker for membership of a group and perhaps as

an initiation ritual for entry into a popular group. Therefore, behaving badly was often associated with seeking approval and a sense of belonging in the context of the peer group. In this respect, antisocial behaviour was often depicted as normative and adaptive within a youth subculture.

4.3.2.2.2. Family Background and Upbringing

The vast majority of participants associated antisocial behaviour with family background and upbringing, although this explanation tended to be attributed to a minority of young people, who were portrayed as "ring-leaders" (in the context of the peer group) or persistent offenders, and whose behaviour was depicted as more serious. For example, Gordon hypothesised that 70% of individuals get involved in antisocial behaviour because they are "tagging along," as compared to the remaining 30% who instigate trouble as a result of their background:

> I think very much a lot, like 90 percent of the person you are is the, between the ages of one and like ten, when your parents brought you up, and what you were exposed to as a child in those years and how your parents you know what I mean, developed you, I think it's all, I put a lot of emphasis on the parents and on, therefore probably put a lot of blame on the parents as well which is fairly bad but...
>
> * * *
>
> ...there'll be a group of 10 and there'll be three of them who'll be trouble, who'll, who will want, who will actually want to do, but the other ones will just be tagging along and they are the seven who'll get along in their lives, who kind of watch in the background and kind of don't really know what's going, they're just doing it because they've got nothing else to do. There's other ones who are just evil people, they're just, and how, that's probably just *the way they've been brought up*, they, it could be anything, there could be so many reasons for that. There could be like *domestic reasons*, you know what I mean, there could be *abuse in the home* which then they retaliate in other people, and that's why they're like that, that's why they want to go and fight people, d'you know what I mean, people will get, these, a lot of them will get drunk and then go about hitting people and that might be *a reflection of what's going on in their house* or what's going on. [Gordon, CD; para 262, 326]

Therefore, Gordon described the minority of young people who behave badly as trouble-**makers**, attributing their behaviour to their upbringing and to abusive family

relationships. Implicit in his account was the suggestion that these trouble-makers represent a more dangerous group than those who "watch in the background" and participate "because they've got nothing else to do."

Other accounts supported this notion, illustrating a belief amongst those interviewed that family factors and upbringing may underlie sustained involvement in antisocial behaviour and participation in more extreme acts. For example, Tom contrasted the tendency for most boys to get involved in trouble during their teenage years with the circumstances of "big trouble-makers," whose behaviour he attributed to problems at home:

> ...all the big trouble-makers they were all kinna, they were all into drugs and stuff like that and they all had something wrong in the home. .   [Tom, CD]

This distinction drawn by participants between those who engage in socially-oriented behaviours and the "ring-leaders," depicted as those more likely to have a prolonged period of engagement in more serious forms of antisocial behaviour, mirrors the AL/ LCP distinction proposed by Moffitt (1993).

Some participants blamed parents for setting a bad example to their child, with Paula alleging that "[if] they're [parents] punching you or they're constantly shouting at you or they're alcoholics or whatever, obviously you're not gonnae be a model citizen either." Other participants associated behaving badly with the *absence* of a role model in the home:

> I mean if their family's all in jail and they've like only got one parent whose an alcky or whatever, then what chance have they got?
>
> **Why do you think that is?**
>
> Just because they've got nob'dy 'ae look up to. Nob'dy 'ae, nob'dy 'ae help them out, nob'dy 'ae talk to, nob'dy 'ae like, even stuff like pocket money and stuff, nob'dy 'ae get pocket money off o'. Eh, they've no' got an example 'ae look up to. I mean that's their

example, some drunk or whatever, and that's, that's probably how they cause trouble.

[Brendan, No CD]

Collectively, these quotations suggest that participants believed that socialisation processes and upbringing account for some individuals' pathways into antisocial behaviour, although such individuals were regarded as a minority group. For these individuals, behaving badly was regarded as a reaction to adversity or a consequence of not having a role model within the home, and they were also seen as a "persistent" group of trouble-makers, with prolonged engagement in more serious antisocial behaviours. Antisocial behaviour in this group was therefore regarded by participants as problematic.

4.3.2.2.3. Summary

Young people broadly described two groups of individuals: those who are influenced by their friends and whose behaviour is normative and adaptive; and those who engage in antisocial behaviour as a result of their troubled family circumstances, who lead others into getting into trouble. The behaviour in this second group was depicted as problematic.

4.3.2.3. Structural Factors

Two-thirds of the sample explained antisocial behaviour in young people by reference to area, deprivation or social class. For example, Ahmed attributed gang violence and antisocial behaviour in young people to the high level of deprivation in Glasgow:

...I was asking you there, you know, what kind of things you associated in your mind with young people getting into trouble and one of the first things you talked about was how in Glasgow, you know, there's four of the poorest constituencies, why did you talk about that first?

Because I think, em, a lot of problems that are, I mean that relates to, the people with the four, you know, the four poorest constituencies are in Glasgow. Or four out of the five. I don't know the exact, eh, I can't remember but those four have got the worst health

121

problems, they've got basically the worst in just about everything. And that's just not coincidental, there's obviously a link.

* * *

...it's not just a coincidence that the worst lifestyles are linked with the poorest areas, it's not a coincidence really. I mean it's because the best lifestyles are in the best, better areas and you've got to see it in that way as well so it's not just purely coincidental, it's, there's a reason behind it so... There's other varying factors as well, you know, in the way you've been brought up, the way you're educated, everything, is important as well, not just the kind of area you live in because you can get, you could live in the poorest area but turn out to be, you know, the straightest person around, you know, don't do anything wrong, a really good, a good, excuse me, good lifestyle, good, you know, create a good environment for yourself, you know. So, em, there will always be exceptions but I think generally you know, I think it's, you know, *there is a link between lifestyle and the area that you do live in.*

[Ahmed, CD; para. 324-326, 338]

Ahmed's account of the association between antisocial behaviour and structural factors culminated in the assertion that "there is a link between lifestyle and the area that you do live in." Therefore, Ahmed suggested that lifestyle operates as a mediating factor in the relationship between antisocial behaviour and area characteristics. In addition, his comment that individuals residing in bad areas must be proactive in the attempt to "create a good environment" simultaneously implies the belief that avoiding trouble is dependent on the individual proactively shaping their environment and opportunities. Ahmed's ambiguity about the nature of the link between area and antisocial behaviour reflects the complexities and ambiguities in the accounts offered by many participants in their attempt to explain antisocial behaviour. However, despite emphasising the effect of area characteristics, Ahmed's account also strongly emphasises a sense of agency in relation to involvement in trouble.

Others focused on more practical aspects of impoverished neighbourhoods, for example, the cramped housing conditions in inner city areas, with Ricky describing the effect as a "Big Brother type thing":

... what would you say the main reason is that young people get into trouble, if you had to say the main reason?

The main reason? Eh, I guess it's, em, their own situation, where they live sort of thing, eh, and eh, yeah, it's where they live I think, I figure it does come down to that, em, if they lived around, and who they live with, if they're in like those *huge blocks,* there's a lot of *tension,* they're kind of like sort of almost *Big Brother* type thing, em, if you're all in *confined space,* eh, and you don't have a lot of space to like sort of claim as your own as well, then I think you know, people get kind of sort of *uptight and angry* and eh start doing things, I don't know, whatever... [trails off]. But maybe that, sort of where they live.   [Ricky, CD]

In his account, Ricky suggested that cramped housing conditions cause tension amongst residents, which culminates in feelings of anger and ultimately involvement in antisocial behaviour (see italicised text). Thus, Ricky portrayed antisocial behaviour as a reaction to the lack of space and privacy associated with cramped living conditions. Furthermore, through his references to "huge blocks," "a lot of tension," and "all in confined space," Ricky also implied that individuals living in these areas are more likely to become involved in trouble, which taps into notions of a violent subculture in the lower classes (Miller, 1962).

Paula associated antisocial behaviour with a culture of state dependency and financial hardship (see italicised text):

... and it just depends what the area's like, and what kinna backgrounds people fae the area have got as to what they're like, what kinna, what they're gonnae do.

So how does background come into what they're going to do?

Em, if they're fae a *poorer background,* usually, and I'm saying usually because not everyb'dy's like this, usually it means that parents don't have as much, like a good paying job or they're on *social security,* and they're in a *council house,* and usually em it's people, I don't know if this is gonnae sound terrible, that I'm pure prejudice but em, it's people that have usually got themselves intae trouble, like they're a, taking drugs, or they've been in jail, or stuff like that, they're people like that because they *can't get a good paying job,* and they end up on *social security,* not always, cause obviously there's people that need that and,

and I understand that, I'm not saying that everyb'dy's like that, but it's the people that are on *social security* and everything else and it's just that...   [Paula, CD]

Like Ahmed and Ricky, Paula implied that there is a tendency for individuals from a "poorer background" to engage in antisocial behaviour. She also suggested that these individuals are also more likely to be receiving state benefits undeservedly through her reference to "people that need that." Furthermore, her comment about "people that have usually got themselves intae trouble" suggests that people make a conscious decision to behave badly in spite of their living conditions and wealth. Therefore, according to her view, antisocial behaviour is not simply the product of adverse living conditions. Taken together, these comments suggest that some participants were alluding to an "underclass" (Murray, 1989) whom they regarded as responsible for the vast majority of antisocial acts. However, there was variation in the extent to which participants attributed behaviour to adverse circumstances versus lifestyle choices. In associating antisocial behaviour with both social class and agency, these accounts reflect Bhaskar's social realist perspective which holds that "[s]ocial structures...typically impose limits and constraints...without (normally) rigidly determining what we do" (1989, p.176).

4.3.2.4. Personal Characteristics

4.3.2.4.1. Immaturity

Only a minority of participants mentioned personal characteristics in their general explanations for antisocial behaviour. A few individuals depicted those who engage in antisocial behaviour as immature:

What kind of words do you associate with young people who are getting into trouble? Just what comes into your mind.

Idiots, irresponsible, oh, what d'you, how d'you, how d'you call it? Eh... carefree or they don't give a fuck to put it more, that's the way I'm trying 'ae say, they don't care. Em, and just stupid as well, selfish. Cause a lot o' the time everyone that gets intae trouble just doesn't realise what it's doing 'ae other people. Em... immature a lot o' the time as well.

124

> Em, unfortunately when most people mature it doesn't stop but a lot o' them it's just immaturity.
>
> [Glen, CD]

Glen's response drew on a number of factors in addition to immaturity, including selfishness, stupidity, ignorance and irresponsible attitudes. While Glen suggested that some individuals continue to engage in antisocial behaviour after 'maturing,' Jane reasoned that individuals who engage in trouble into their late teens have failed to "grow up" after leaving school, and continue to identify with a "ned" subculture as they get older:

> ... most people that are neds to me don't ever seem to grow up, they always seem to act the same from when they left school, from when they were at school to they left school to they're a bit older.
>
> [Jane, No CD]

Therefore, associated with the theme of immaturity was the notion that explanations differed according to the age of the perpetrator, with children being portrayed as less introspective and insightful, and therefore more ignorant about the consequences of their actions, in contrast to adults whose actions were regarded as more deliberate and premeditated. In addition, participants tended to discuss children's actions with less condemnation. For example, Tom described how young people "can make money as well by mugging people, but anyone's that's older and like is say 20 or whatever, and still does that, they're just scum." Similarly, whilst Robbie labelled shop-lifting in adults as "pretty bad," he reasoned that children do not share the adult meaning of what it means to steal since they do not fully grasp the consequences of their actions:

> ... like if it was like a, somebody my age to go oot and steal sweeties, then they're gonnae think that that's pretty bad, but like if it's like just a wee kid, I don't think it's seen as being anything too bad really.
>
> **So why is it different like if it's someone your age?**

Cause they should, well being a kid, you should know better being an adult, basically. You know that it's no' right, whereas a kid doesnae really see it as being, they see it as just being a sweetie, they don't really see it as having any like meaning steal-, like they don't really see it as stealing, they don't think, I'm stealing fae somebody, whereas if you're an adult, you think aboot it like, I'll just pay for it, d'you know what I mean. It's like usual, maybe it's just your conscience, like you think about things more when you get older, whereas when you're young you just, you don't really think the same, you don't really think about consequences or whatever.   [Robbie, No CD]

This demonstrates young people's tendency to attribute different meanings to behaviour depending on age and intent, and shows how behaviour was only judged as problematic when carried out by adults who understand the consequences of their actions.

4.3.2.4.2. Psychopathology

Ideas and phrases relating to psychopathology were discussed by approximately two-thirds of the sample. Except in a few cases, psychopathology was associated with more serious behaviours including arson, unprovoked assault, murder and child abuse. For example, Naomi described arsonists as "not right in the head" while Calum suggested that arsonists and murderers have a "loose connection in the brain":

> I think maybe something very traumatic could maybe trigger that [arson] or something, I don't know, but I think again that's something that's the same kinna, pathologically the same kind of thing wrong with them maybe as like murderers or something. I think maybe there's something, a kinna loose connection in the brain (laughing) or something.   [Calum, No CD]

In portraying such behaviour as either the result of a brain dysfunction or triggered by trauma, Calum's analysis supports the notion that antisocial behaviour is outwith the control of the perpetrator. These accounts therefore reflect the view that some CD behaviours are indicative of internal dysfunction, and thus should be classified as a mental disorder.

4.3.2.4.3. "Evil" Nature

Six participants described a proportion of individuals who engage in certain types of antisocial behaviours as 'evil.' Again, the term tended to be applied to more extreme behaviours, such as arson. For example, Dean stated that:

> ...setting light to a populated group of flats or something, eh... I really don't know, the thinking behind that. It's just kinda evil type thing rather than anything else.   [Dean, CD]

Greg contrasted individuals who "act evil" from those who are "evil-minded," attributing the latter to parental neglect:

> That's what I'm saying, there's evil-minded people and there's people that can act evil, but actually are good, honest people, you know what I mean?

> **Ih-hm. What makes an evil-minded person evil? Like why are they evil?**

> Most, usually it's, well the way I see it, usually it's because their lifestyle, the way they've been, since, I mean it could be their maw and da' that have just no' looked after them at all when they've been weans, and noo that they've got their own life and they're back, they're going, right, well I'm gonnae show them. And a' they're daeing, is doing stupid things and getting caught for them and going 'ae jail, just because o' the fact of their mum and dad have neglected them or, what else? Or drugs and a', soon as they turn intae drugs, it's, they're a' stealing, anything, they'll do anything 'ae get money for their drugs so it's just, it's just a running thing a' the time.   [Greg, CD]

These comments demonstrate that participants described "evil" behaviour as a learned, rather than innate characteristic. Both Greg and Gordon attributed being "evil-minded" to parental abuse and neglect "which then they retaliate in other people" (Gordon). Therefore, the explanations linked to being evil differed from those associated with psychopathology although both raise questions about accountability since behaviour triggered by adversity or resulting from a mental disorder may be viewed as outwith an individual's control.

4.3.2.5. Summary

Thus, social explanations, particularly those relating to the influence of peers and family background, were the most commonly cited reasons for young people behaving badly, although within this category of explanation two distinct groups were identified. 'Ring-leaders' were portrayed as those from troubled backgrounds with neglectful and abusive families, who cause trouble and have sustained involvement into adulthood. These individuals were depicted as the most problematic group. In contrast, the behaviour of the group of adolescents whose involvement in trouble is limited to adolescence was regarded as normative and socially oriented. In this group, antisocial behaviour was seen as a means of gaining kudos in the peer group. The second most common explanation related to structural factors and the impact of area characteristics, cramped living conditions and financial hardship on young people's tendency to engage in antisocial behaviour. Whilst most explanations provided support for the 'nurture' hypothesis and the influence of socialisation processes, a small number of participants related behaving badly to intrinsic characteristics and psychopathology. However, overall, very little support was provided for the 'nature' hypothesis in participants' general explanations of antisocial behaviour. In addition, only more serious acts were regarded as indicative of disorder.

4.3.3. Behaviour-Specific Explanations

As described in the Chapter 2, participants were asked their views on specific behaviours taken from the list of 'symptoms' associated with CD. These behaviours were selected because they ranged in severity from mild (staying out late) to more serious (assault and mugging) and due to their frequency in the population, which arguably made them easier to discuss. Analysing these responses involved tabulating participants' responses (using the process of meaning condensation described by Kvale, 1996), and then grouping the explanations into categories. The final list of ten categories of explanation which could accommodate all of the data were: peer influence; family and upbringing; power and identity; character traits; immaturity; thrill; personal gain; trauma, adversity and revenge; psychopathology;

and behaviour-specific explanations. Table 4.1 (Appendix J) summarises the patterning of participants' responses in relation to each of the behaviours. It can be seen that a wider range of responses were given in relation to more serious behaviours, with milder behaviours generally being associated with social factors and more serious behaviours with adverse circumstances and psychopathology.

4.3.3.1. Staying out late

Peer pressure was cited as the most likely reason for individuals to stay out late without permission. In particular, participants described the desire in young people to stay out with other friends who were allowed out later so that they would not miss any situations arising within the peer group. Staying out late against parents' wishes was regarded as a means of enhancing status within the peer group, allowing individuals to rebel, and to generally enjoy themselves without interference from parents. Other suggestions concerned the possibility that individuals might be engaging in behaviours not permitted by their parents, or attending venues which they were not allowed to go to. Related to this were a number of factors connected with the theme of power and identity, whereby individuals who stay out late against their parents' wishes were portrayed as seeking more responsibility, independence and control. Conversely, some participants associated staying out late with immaturity; for example, lacking self-discipline, forgetting the time, or lack of consideration of the consequences. Others associated staying out with experimentation, in which individuals were testing the boundaries, and in such cases behaviour was generally regarded as a normal part of growing up. Another reason cited for staying out without permission was family problems. Puberty was considered a factor by one interviewee who associated the onset of puberty with the need to gain independence.

4.3.3.2. Truancy

Explanations for truancy tended to focus on school-related problems, or character traits or attitudes which were associated with a lack of motivation at school. Individuals who found school work difficult, were getting bullied, felt bored at

school, were not coping with the pressure, had problems with the teachers, did not feel they could confide in anyone, or did not realise the importance of education, were described as those most likely to truant from school. Character traits such as low self-esteem and defiance were thought to underlie truancy, as well as the need for attention. The attraction of alternative pursuits was another peripheral explanation, and other less commonly cited explanations related to the influence of peers, family circumstances, and the desire to push boundaries.

4.3.3.3. Vandalism

Vandalism and destruction of property were most commonly explained by reference to the feelings of excitement and the thrill produced from engaging in the act, which may be amplified by the threat of danger associated with getting caught. Other explanations related to the peer group, individuals' character traits and attitudes, adverse circumstances, and a small proportion of participants related vandalism to family factors and upbringing. The desire to impress friends and gain respect were seen as motivating factors by many, whilst a disregard for others and acting without thinking were regarded as typical character traits of vandals. Anger, revenge, envy and the influence of alcohol were described as potential triggers, whilst lack of affection and attention in the family environment was felt to be a reason for the destructiveness associated with vandalism. Two participants suggested that vandalism was linked to psychopathology (expressed by Calum as "a brain thing" and by Jillian as "sick"). Only one participant, who had tried graffiti art, reasoned that graffiti may be a legitimate means of self-expression; others portrayed vandals as menaces with nothing better to do.

4.3.3.4. Theft

Unsurprisingly, personal gain was seen as the most likely explanation for theft, although many individuals also associated stealing with the buzz and thrill which accompanies the element of risk. Thrill-seeking behaviours were felt to compensate for the boredom experienced as a result of having nothing else to do, or might be fuelled by those wishing to have "a wee poke at authority," as described by Dean.

Circumstances which might lead individuals to steal for personal gain included feeding a drug habit, desperation associated with unemployment or homelessness, owing money, or membership of an organised crime network. Other materialistic factors related to the desire to keep up-to-date with fashions; one participant suggested that the belief that companies are making sufficient profits might inspire individuals to steal to redress wealth inequalities. Again, peer pressure, popularity and status were perceived as possible explanations, as was a lack of consideration of consequences and others' perspectives. Other circumstances which were associated with theft included drug abuse, children being taught to steal for their families, and teenage pregnancy.

4.3.3.5. Arson

In the interviews, explanations for arson were the most varied, but it was also the behaviour which participants had least direct experience of, possibly accounting for the wide range of responses. A range of motives were presented as possible explanations for arson, including revenge attacks, anger, trauma, influence of parents and other family members, drugs, envy, owing money, seeking insurance payout, and terrorist attacks. Another common explanation related to the theme of seeking excitement or an adrenaline rush, in some cases to counteract boredom or to satisfy curiosity. Psychopathology was discussed in relation to arson more than in connection with any other behaviour, including assault and mugging. A range of expressions were used to convey this, with arsonists being described as: "mentally unstable" (Brendan); having a "loose connection in the brain" (Calum); having a "brain disorder" (Naomi); "[o]bsessed with fire" (Paula); having "mental problems" (Ahmed); and having "something wrong wi' them" (Glen). Other explanations focused on character traits and attitudes, and a small proportion of participants mentioned peer influence.

4.3.3.6. Assault and Mugging

Individuals were asked their views on assault and mugging in a single question, which in retrospect might have been a methodological error. Although some people

talked about the two scenarios separately, some individuals provided only one answer or presented a series of explanations for both. Reasons for mugging were most often tied to the theme of personal gain, either in relation to feeding a drug habit, or due to desperation or homelessness. Having consumed drugs or alcohol, a hard or violent upbringing, revenge, self-defence, the need to support family, lack of education, area characteristics, and experiencing bullying were all factors which were thought to contribute to the tendency to become involved in assault or mugging. Perpetrators of mugging and assault were described by some participants as cowards who wanted power and would search for an "easy picking" (George). A few individuals linked assault and mugging to getting a buzz, peer influence, or lack of forethought and understanding.

4.3.3.7. Summary

It can be seen from the patterning of responses that milder behaviours such as staying out late and vandalism were more likely to be seen to be associated with social factors, particularly peer influence and the pursuit of fun. Truancy was predominantly explained in terms of academic problems and school avoidance, and theft was regarded as generally motivated by personal gain. However, more serious forms of antisocial behaviour were linked to adversity and psychopathology by most participants. Therefore, whilst less serious behaviours were generally depicted as normative or purposive, more serious behaviours were often regarded as triggered by adverse circumstances or intrinsic characteristics.

4.3.4. Relating Explanations to Gender and Social Class

This section deals with participants' beliefs about the nature of the link between gender, social class and antisocial behaviour.

4.3.4.1. Gender

One third of participants alluded to gender differences in their theories about antisocial behaviour. In general, participants felt that boys tend to engage in more

aggressive behaviours, whilst girls are more likely to argue and hold grudges for longer. Emily suggested that fighting takes a different form in boys and girls, and that arguments among girls tend to be more psychological than physical:

...but girls, oh girls are so much worse, so they are. They're jealous, that's...

Why do you think that is?

I don't know, they're just like, usually if guys fight they can shake hands straight after it, d'you know what I mean, whereas girls, girls'll just carry it on and they're bitchy and they're nasty and they just take things too far, d'you know what I mean? And they keep it going for years, so they do. [Emily, CD]

Paula suggested that boys "really fight" whilst girls are more likely to give up and withdraw from a violent encounter:

But most guys punch and really fight whereas wi' girls it's like pulling hair and slapping and that can only go on for so long before someone, one o' them just says, 'I've had enough o' this,' you know. [Paula, CD]

In depicting antisocial behaviour in girls as less extreme than in boys, participants generally accounted for this difference by reference to maturity level, physiological differences and role expectations. For example, Robbie linked violent behaviour to immaturity, suggesting that girls are less violent because they reach maturity earlier than boys:

...girls obviously mature quicker and all so they realise that these things arenae right quicker or whatever. Girls arenae really as violent, it's a' seems to be, most things is a' doon 'ae violence, like smashing things up, you know that, most girls arenae really intae that sort of thing for whatever reason, I don't know, but it's, just always seems to be boys, just, I don't know if it's just a maturity thing or whatever. [Robbie, No CD]

Similarly, aggression was linked to hormones in other accounts, with Ricky commenting that:

Guys tend to get into more sort of aggressive situations and all the testosterone whatever. yeah, it is testosterone, em, through puberty I guess, sort of something like that. [Ricky, CD]

On the other hand, David alluded to role expectations and gender stereotypes in his discussion of gender differences:

I think boys are expected to get intae trouble and girls are expected to be... girls, you know what I mean, just like..., I don't know it's always mair shocking when I, when you hear about a girl doing it, I don't know why. (Interruption from someone entering room by mistake). What was I saying, what was...?

You were saying it's always more shocking...

Aye em, that's just the, the idea that people have, you know what I mean, that boys are wee rascals and they get intae bother and girls are nice and play wi' their dolls and that, you know what I mean, you don't expect to hear about girls getting intae trouble so it's always a bit more shocking when they do. [David, CD]

David described social stereotypes related to the expectation that boys will get involved in trouble whilst girls "are nice and play wi' their dolls," contrasting the notion that girls' involvement is "shocking" with the element of inevitability associated with antisocial behaviour in boys. Thus, in contrast to other participants, David did not suggest that there are innate differences in the level of violent behaviour in boys and girls, but claimed that girls' behaviour is governed by social etiquette. In turn, he reasoned that the behaviour of girls who break these social rules is disturbing. Therefore, participants generally argued that boys have a biological predisposition to engage in more violent behaviours, whereas girls' behaviour is governed more by social norms and expectations.

Half of the interviewees who discussed gender differences associated antisocial behaviour among boys with projecting an image. For example, Charlie described a greater pressure among males to impress their friends:

That's, when I, the group I hung around with when I was younger, there was always girls there. But... I've no' really got any, didnae really see much stuff wi' girls. No.

Did the girls get into trouble?

Nah, but I don't know any that did, but obviously some do but nah, I don't know of any who did.

What kind of stuff do you think girls do?

Uff I don't know. I know girls that sleep wi' guys, I know young girls that sleep wi' guys just tae impress, other guys and impress their friends. But that's about it, nothing drug wise or anything like that, I knew some that took drugs and stuff like that but none that ever were, ever done anything that bad or anything.

So do you think there's a difference between girls and guys getting into trouble or not?

Em I would say wi' guys there is more peer pressure to impress their friends. No' so much wi' girls.

That's interesting. Why do you think that is?

Don't know. Guys are mair rowdy. (Both laughing) That's why they would probably say. And em, guys are more inclined to try and live up, or to try and impress their mates more. And they go further I think, and guys are just dafter as well probably. (Both laughing). Aye. I'd say that.   [Charlie, CD]

In describing boys as "mair rowdy" and driven by the desire to impress their friends, Charlie attributed different forms of antisocial behaviour to girls and boys. Other participants also linked the tendency to use antisocial behaviour as a way to impress peers specifically to boys:

Guys might go out and cause a bit more trouble but if it's a mixed crowd, things get taken a lot further cause they want 'ae show off and they want 'ae be one up and especially guys, they want 'ae go and fight wi' somebody to show that they're hard.   [Louise, CD]

135

...it's just that guys, I don't know, guys have got the male ego (laughs), and that, I think that boils doon 'ae lots o' things that guys do. You know it's like a guy can't back doon fae a fight cause he would be seen as, you know like a sissy or something, you know, but he'd have tae, if they, if he starts fighting wi' a guy then it has to be carried on 'til the other guy backs off cause he can't possibly back down because, oh my god, you know, that would make him seem less of a man.   [Paula, CD]

...boys trying 'ae be big men (discussing fighting)...   [Steve, CD]

...it's just kinna people know you for being it, so you just need 'ae live up to your name, sort o' thing. But, I think that's got a lot to do wi' it. I don't think it's got a lot, I think most o' the lads, I'd say aboot eight times oot o' ten, it's just got 'ae dae wi' that (discussing fighting).   [Lucy, CD]

All of these excerpts suggest an association between fighting in males and portraying an image, and imply that antisocial behaviour may be related to constructing a male identity. These accounts support the notion that males push boundaries in order to attract admiration from friends, which may be prompted by the "male ego" and the attempt to project a particular image in the context of the peer group (Messerschmidt, 1997).

Only one participant associated engagement in fighting with enhancing status in females, with Suzanne proposing that girls are attempting to change their image and become more like boys:

See a lot o' gangs are usually a lot o' boys, and it's just boys but a lot o' girls are getting involved now as well.

Why is that?

They just want 'ae be like the boys I think, because they don't see why they should just be all goody-goodies, I mean it should be, they could, they're trying 'ae say that they can be just as bad, kinna thing.   [Suzanne, No CD]

This suggests that Suzanne believed that the behaviour of boys was worse than that of girls in the past, but that there was now an equalisation in the tendency to become involved in antisocial behaviour across the sexes. Suzanne's account also supports the notion discussed earlier in this chapter that young people regarded it as advantageous to be seen as "bad," and consciously attempted to shirk the reputation that they are "goody-goodies." Drawing on their research into girl gangs in the U.S., Laidler and Hunt (2001) observed that for the girls they interviewed, "'looking bad' (as opposed to 'being bad') was a protective strategy to the patriarchal environment at home and on the street" (p.676). Suzanne's assertion that "they're trying 'ae say that they can be just as bad" fits with this notion and suggests that she recognised a new trend for girls to construct their identity around antisocial behaviour in a manner traditionally associated with males.

Tom restricted the notion of antisocial behaviour as a front to boys, and suggested that girls are more interested in acting older whilst boys "pretend to be mental":

> But I think the aim of, of young girls is to pretend to be older, but the aim of young boys is like, to pretend to be mental.   [Tom, CD]

In addition to portraying antisocial behaviour as a front, these quotes illustrate the tendency for participants to provide sex-specific explanations. Considered together, these accounts of gender differences suggest that participants interpreted antisocial behaviour in boys as either a way of enhancing status and constructing a male identity, or as triggered by a natural instinct. On the other hand, fighting among girls was depicted as less violent and more psychological. Only one participant alluded to a secular trend for girls to become involved in trouble to rival males' behaviour and to shirk the image of being good.

4.3.4.2. Social Class

Two-thirds of the sample linked behaving badly to social class or area characteristics. Two themes emerged in participants' evaluations of the link

between antisocial behaviour and social class: the effects of increased exposure to crime in low income areas; and the interpretation of the meaning of behaviour according to its social context. This section provides an analysis of participants' views regarding the nature of the link between social class and antisocial behaviour, beginning with a discussion of the ways in which participants defined antisocial behaviour in relation to class.

4.3.4.2.1. Increased Exposure to Antisocial Behaviour in Low Income Areas

Some of the participants who proposed an association between class and antisocial behaviour explained this relationship by reference to the effects of increased exposure to crime in low income areas. Charlie described a serious physical assault as "run o' the mill" in a low income area due the higher rate of crime, which he contended resulted in residents in these neighbourhoods tending to "accept badder things":

And like when I've been talking to people I've noticed that people have different views on what's good behaviour and bad behaviour. And why do you think that is?

Em... I would probably say, it's all down 'ae, backgrounds, sort o' what area you come fae. If you come fae a lower or higher income area. If you're sort o' fae a higher income area you've got, you're not as... open to as many bad things. But if you're in a lower income area you see a lot more and so you can, you accept badder things more cause you, you see them more, it's sort o' every day, I would say.

Hmm. Why does that make, why would you reckon that that would make them accept them more?

Em, no' even accept them more but just, not, not be shocked by it cause it's every day, people who see things like that every day don't, wouldnae be shocked by it, they would just think it's an every day occurrence. For instance, somebody getting stabbed or something like that, people in, people in a higher income area may find that a lot worse than somebody who's, sees it everyday or hears about it everyday, it happened say round the corner or whatever. It just becomes... everyday, run o' the mill stuff.

Ih-hm. And why do you think people in low income areas are seeing more of that compared to people in high income areas?

I don't know. More crime in lower income areas, I don't know, and I don't know what the reason, what the reason for that is. More crime because there's people trying 'ae make money and things like that. [Charlie, CD]

Charlie suggested that individuals in higher income areas are protected from antisocial behaviour, and are therefore more shocked by it. David also alluded to the notion that exposure to antisocial behaviour affects attitudes, describing individuals living in better areas as likely to be shocked by behaviours which individuals living in worse areas are "used tae":

... why do you think that is that people have different views on that [definition of good and bad behaviour]?

Em, I think it's just what they're used tae when they've been, maybe it's like where they've come from. I mean I've seen like fighting and that, and vandalising and causing trouble, you know what I mean, I've always seen it but there's people that've like grown up in a better area maybe who haven't seen it and they think, they're shocked by it but I'm not, you know what I mean, I think it's maybe like just where they come from and that.   [David, CD]

Implicit in these accounts is the notion that antisocial behaviour is a norm for individuals living in more deprived neighbourhoods. This view was representative of others' perspectives and maps onto the differential association hypothesis (first proposed by Sutherland in 1947) which posits that individuals from deprived areas are more exposed to deviant peers and criminal environments, therefore accounting for their higher levels of delinquency.

4.3.4.2.2. Attributing Meaning to Behaviour According to Social Context

A few participants tailored their definition of antisocial behaviour to social class groups. For example, Geoffrey argued that an incidence of theft might be regarded as "good behaviour" in a deprived area, whilst failing to do household chores might constitute bad behaviour in a better area:

...like someone from an area, for example, that... from a less, you know, a more deprived area or whatever, eh, might say, well good behaviour's only stealing one bike a week and bad behaviour's stealing like five. Whereas you know, someone from a better area would say, well good behaviour's washing the dishes every night and bad behaviour's, eh, leaving your dishes on the table and forgetting to put them away or whatever, or wash them.

[Geoffrey, CD]

In this example, Geoffrey suggested that views about antisocial behaviour are relative to personal experiences, cultural factors and area. This reflects the findings reported earlier in this chapter which showed that participants' definitions of antisocial behaviour varied according to their own circumstances and level of experience.

In her explication of class differences in antisocial behaviour, Louise suggested that behaviour has a different meaning among members of the upper and lower social classes:

I think that's worse behaviour than, unless it's going to harm you physically, like if somebody from a lower class doesn't, like if they stab you or kill you or whatever, I think that's more, it's more of a, a physical threat from people like that because you know, like you're not gonnae pay so much attention if they say, 'Oh you're a Paki, or you're this or you're that.' You're gonnae go, 'Fff, whatever.' But if someone who's well educated, well off and in a high stance in the community starts to pick you apart like that [referring to an incident of verbal abuse], when they should maybe know better, then I think that's really, really antisocial and unacceptable behaviour.   [Louise, CD]

Louise implied that verbal taunts from an individual of lower social class status would be regarded as less damaging than equivalent comments from a member of the upper class who "should maybe know better." This demonstrates the process of attributing meaning to behaviour according to its social context. Later in the interview, Louise distinguished between the notion of antisocial behaviour as a "front," which she associated with individuals in the middle classes who might

"show off" a knife but be less inclined to use it, and the mentality of those in the lower classes, whom she depicted as more likely to carry out their threats:

> They, if like someone who thought they were, they were mad from a, like a middle class area or whatever and they were going out, it would be like if, I've met them and they go, 'Oh look I've got a knife on me.' But they [referring to individuals of lower social class status] would have it, they wouldn't show anyone, it would be, it wouldn't be like a big deal, it would be because they've got it because they're gonnae use it, not cause they want 'ae show it off. Rather like they would conceal it so that people wouldn't tip off the police rather than people who would go out for the purpose of showing it off and not actually using it, they would use it rather than show it off.
>
> [Louise, CD]

Therefore, Louise attributed more violent forms of antisocial behaviour to members of the lower social classes.

Thus, antisocial behaviour was generally described as the "norm" in deprived areas, where behaving badly was described as common and accepted. These excerpts also demonstrate the operation of entrenched social stereotypes in participants' theorising about the causes of antisocial behaviour, and illustrate how notions of class were embedded in beliefs about the causes of antisocial behaviour.

4.3.4.3. Patterning of Explanations by CD Status

Although participants' CD status has been identified throughout this chapter to give some indication of individuals' level of experience of behaving badly, the types of explanations offered by those who met criteria for CD and those who did not were very similar. This may reflect the finding that five participants who were classified as 'No CD' nevertheless described some involvement in antisocial behaviour, and since most participants did not have personal experience of more serious antisocial acts. In total, only four participants described no personal experiences of behaving badly (3 No CD; 1 CD). While the explanations provided by these four individuals broadly overlapped with the accounts of the other participants, there was evidence that they framed antisocial behaviour as less purposive, and tended to place most

emphasis on adverse circumstances and family background as explanations for antisocial behaviour. For example, Keiron suggested that a number of factors may underlie antisocial behaviour, but stressed the importance of background:

Right and why do you think they do [get into trouble]?

Eh I couldn't really say. I mean there might be alcohol, the fact that they, maybe their parents drink or smoke or something like that, they feel that they, they've been told not to do it so they have to immediately go out and try and do it kind of thing. Eh, I think it's just the background. Maybe eh, maybe their friends but I wouldn't, I don't know about friends and if you get into a bad group of friends, everyone says you know you've got into a bad group and how do you know that they're not making the bad group kind of thing. So I'm not sure (laughs).   [Keiron, No CD]

His statement that "everyone says you know you've got into a bad group," and his subsequent ambiguity about its validity suggests that he did not believe that peer influence was the principal reason for antisocial behaviour. In addition, his statement that he was "not sure" how to respond to the questions posed demonstrates that he had no strong views on the topic, which contrasted with those who had more experience.

Katy referred to individuals who get into trouble as "being in the lower scale of things":

Em I think the people that kind of got into trouble at school were probably the ones that probably weren't as academic, maybe weren't as interested in being there so they had other kind of interests, if you like, em I could see them maybe not going into higher education, maybe getting apprenticeships, maybe being unemployed, I don't know, being in the lower scale of things. But then again there's people that have gone to school, had a bad background but have completely redeemed themselves and are making tons of money now you know.   [Katy, No CD]

Katy's reference to individuals "in the lower scale of things," together with her comments on education, employment and wealth, illustrate that she linked the

tendency to get into trouble with lower social class background. She expanded on this notion later in the interview when she described those who get into trouble as "rougher":

> **...what words would you use to describe young people who get into trouble, off the top of your head?**
>
> Em kind of rougher, if you like, eh, I don't know, (pause), I'm trying to think of words that come off the top of my head, (small pause), maybe not coming from as good a background or em mixing with the wrong people or, I don't know, that's all that comes off the top of my head at the moment.
>
> **That's exactly what I'm interested in. And what about, you were saying rougher, what do you mean by rougher?**
>
> Like coming from worse backgrounds, maybe not being brought up as well or em, (pause), not getting as good an education, not being supported as much, maybe not having people around them that they get on well with or they, like their family even, having people in their family and their parents, maybe don't get on with their parents, don't want to be at home, kind of just quite unsettled if you like maybe, from unsettled backgrounds maybe more than somebody who's got quite a structured life if you like. [Katy, No CD]

Therefore, Katy linked young people's tendency to engage in antisocial behaviour with poor education, strained family relations and "unsettled backgrounds."

In contrast to Katy and Keiron, who said that they did not know anyone who had been involved in trouble, Naomi based her explanations of antisocial behaviour on her friends at school. She emphasised the combined effect of background and peer group as explanations for behaving badly:

> **After everything we've talked about, what would you say the main reason is that young people get into trouble?**
>
> The main reason they get into trouble? Em, following other people. Cause they're going into groups and they're trying to impress people, things like that. And that's to do, but that's

I suppose, that's to do with everything. Cause if they're gonnae end up like that then, they're gonnae grow up and then they're teaching young people, and then people are gonnae end up like that. Except a step worse than that, and then it's gonnae get worse and worse and worse and worse. [Naomi, No CD]

Thus, Naomi suggested that peer influence starts a cycle of antisocial behaviour which is passed down through the generations, thus becoming a norm for some people.

Participants with no personal experiences of behaving badly tended to explain relatively mild behaviours by reference to background and upbringing. This contrasts with the views of individuals who had personal experience and who generally viewed antisocial behaviour as socially oriented, only explaining engagement in more serious behaviours in terms of adverse circumstances and background. For example, the following excerpts relate to participants' views on the main reason young people get into trouble:

... what would you say the main reason is for young people getting into trouble?

Curiosity. Curiosity and it's just a fact o' life that everybody's gonna do it, d'you know what I mean? Curiosity and looking good in front o' people. [Emily, CD]

... what would you say is the main reason that young people get into trouble?

Em probably sort of peer pressure, the group you hang around with. Like if you're in a kind o' neddy group that hangs around wi' gangs and fights wi' this, that and the next thing, I think it's, for young people, it's definitely sort of peer groups. [Jane, No CD]

... what would you say that the main reason is that young people get into trouble?

Eh I think it's just kinna trying 'ae show aff in front o' their pals, really. [Steve, CD]

These extracts illustrate that participants' level of experience appeared to influence their general explanations. While those with personal experience of behaving badly

tended to portray most forms of antisocial behaviour as purposive and socially oriented, participants with no personal experience linked getting into trouble with background and family problems. However, both groups were equally likely to portray more extreme forms of antisocial behaviour as problematic. This points to the importance of contextualising participants' explanations in relation to their experiences, and suggests that participants were more likely to regard antisocial behaviour as normative and socially oriented when it reflected aspects of their own conduct.

4.4. Comparing Young People's and Psychiatrists' Perspectives on Antisocial Behaviour

The evidence presented above demonstrates that both young people and psychiatrists viewed CD as primarily a social problem, linked to family circumstances, peer group and social class background. Most forms of antisocial behaviour were depicted as normative and socially oriented by young people and psychiatrists, although some behaviours including fire setting, sexual aggression and unprovoked violence were described as problematic by individuals in both groups. Only one psychiatrist suggested that CD behaviours may be indicative of neurological impairment, which tied in with a small proportion of the young people who described some antisocial behaviour as linked to intrinsic characteristics. The range of social and structural factors described by young people and psychiatrists were very similar. Interestingly, the four psychiatrists interviewed depicted pure CD as a social protest which is only clinically significant when coupled with a comorbid condition. This reference to behaviour as a social protest appears to link in with the factors identified by young people as underlying behaviour in a core group of individuals depicted as "ring-leaders." Like young people, there was evidence in the accounts of a couple of the psychiatrists that their views were shaped by personal biases and experiences rather than their professional knowledge and training. On the whole, the views of young people and psychiatrists support the notion that the set of behaviours defined as CD are normative, in line with interactionist perspectives on deviance, and the views

expressed by Taylor, Walton and Young in "The New Criminology" (Taylor, Walton and Young, 1973; Young, 1998).

4.5. Chapter Summary

Young people depicted most antisocial behaviour as normative, purposive and adaptive. Such behaviour was tied to social factors, particularly the influence of peers and social class background. Being upper class, and having a good upbringing were factors associated with the tendency to engage in less serious antisocial acts, often to enhance status in the context of the peer group. For these individuals, antisocial behaviour was regarded as socially oriented. This view therefore ties in with interactionist perspectives on deviance, which posit that behaviour is not inherently deviant, but only becomes so when officially labelled by others (Becker, 1963; Lemert, 1972). Participants' explanations of the range of ways in which peer relationships may impact behaviour (through pressure to conform; the desire to enhance status; or as a result of the need for belonging and protection afforded by the peer group) in turn reflected the complex design of some epidemiological studies which have attempted to tease out the factors which influence the relationship between peer affiliation and antisocial behaviour (e.g. Buysse, 1997).

In contrast, the behaviour of individuals in lower social class strata, with troubled backgrounds, and a more prolonged period of engagement in antisocial behaviour, was regarded as problematic by most young people. For this minority group, family problems were regarded as a main cause of antisocial behaviour, in line with epidemiological research which has found evidence of an association between factors such as family conflict (Juby and Farrington, 2001) and the development of conduct problems. Behaviour in this group was depicted as problematic, supporting the view that some antisocial behaviours are indicative of internal distress, and therefore warrant the status of a mental disorder.

It is interesting that the views of the small group of psychiatrists interviewed in the current study broadly reflect interactionist and social constructivist views on deviance. Only one psychiatrist explicitly stated that CD behaviours may be due to neuropsychological impairment in spite of the research evidence that CD is related to a number of physiological influences including neuropsychological impairment, cognitive functioning, verbal deficits and genetic predisposition (Hill, 2002). In addition, another psychiatrist suggested that the lack of evidence for a genetic basis for CD sets it apart from other disorders, although research findings in this area are far from conclusive (Rutter, 2001). The view expressed by psychiatrists that CD represents normative behaviour was supported by reference to the "circularity in the definition" and the view that CD behaviours reflect a healthy protest by young people about their circumstances. These factors led psychiatrists to argue that cases of uncomplicated CD should be regarded as outwith the remit of psychiatry. Therefore, these findings problematise the status of CD as a mental disorder, and suggest that the diagnostic criteria may be over-inclusive, as discussed further in Chapter 7.

The other main finding in this chapter relates to the tendency of young people and psychiatrists to tailor their explanations according to social class. In general, antisocial behaviour among individuals in the lower social classes was regarded as normal while similar behaviour in the upper classes was seen as abnormal. Some young people also suggested that antisocial behaviour was normative in males, and often used to construct masculinity, but more purposive in females, who were more likely to behave badly to fit in with the group. Such social stereotyping illustrates the problems associated with attempting to formulate universal rules for differentiating between normal and abnormal behaviour. In addition, this stereotyping suggests that psychiatrists' 'lay' views may infiltrate official nosology since the categorical system of classification allows for criteria to be amended on the basis of professional opinion rather than empirical validation (Shaffer, 2001; Spitzer, 2001). The accounts of young people, most of whom may be regarded as potential

service 'users,' also challenge the application of a universalist classificatory system for labelling behaviour, which was largely regarded as normative, as CD.

This chapter has outlined the findings of the thematic analysis of young people's and psychiatrists' views on behaving badly, where participants' responses were coded and grouped, before being analysed as a collective voice on the subject of behaving badly. Since one of the main findings to emerge from this analysis related to the patterning of participants' explanations according to their level of personal experience of behaving badly, the next chapter discusses the results of the narrative analysis, which involved exploring participants' personal accounts in the context of their biography and experiences.

Chapter 5: Using Narrative Analysis to Explore Personal Accounts of Behaving Badly

5.1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to contextualise personal accounts of behaving badly by reference to participants' biographies and experiences. Thus, the findings presented here are the results of the interpretive approach to narrative analysis, which views accounts as "a unit of discourse" (Riessman, 2002), and attempts to preserve the coherence of participants' stories. This analysis is based on participants' explanations of their behaviour in the context of their accounts of their peer group, family background, and adverse life events, since these factors are prominent themes in the literature on CD and in sociological theories on delinquency as described in Chapter 1. In addition, this analysis will examine similarities and differences between personal accounts and general explanations, and will investigate the patterning of accounts by gender and social class.

The extracts included in this chapter illustrate the different sorts of explanations of behaving badly, and demonstrate the influence of a number of factors in the construction of accounts, for example: history and biography; the desire to produce a coherent story; the need to demonstrate moral goodness; personal biases; and recall. Some of the core themes in participants' accounts overlap with the 'risk factors' associated with CD in the epidemiological literature, but this chapter will focus on the way in which accounts are patterned and constructed in order to examine how participants ascribe meaning to their behaviour.

5.2. Personal Accounts of Behaving Badly

In total, 28 participants described some involvement in antisocial behaviour while almost half of the sample discussed regular engagement in various forms of antisocial behaviour, or had participated in more serious behaviours. The

behaviours discussed by participants in this group included unprovoked assault, weapon use, gang activity and fighting, large-scale theft, fraud and drug dealing. Although accounts were complex and at times ambiguous, participants generally depicted their behaviour as normative and purposive. In addition, individuals tended to situate their behaviour within the context of their peer group, although explanations often stressed the social rewards associated with behaving badly, rather than pressure to conform. In general, there was a great deal of overlap between personal and general accounts, whereby participants tended to depict their behaviour as normative, purposive and socially oriented. Only two participants hinted that their behaviour was linked to internal distress, despite this being offered as a relatively common explanation for more serious antisocial acts in the discussion of others' behaviours. In addition, only a small proportion of participants associated their behaviour with adversity and even when they did, they were often ambiguous about the influence of such circumstances on their behaviour. This appeared to be related to the emphasis on agency in personal accounts and the notion of behaviour as within participants' control. These themes will now be explored in more detail, in the context of participants' biographies and experiences.

5.2.1. Contextualising Accounts by Reference to Biography and Experience

5.2.1.1. Situating Behaviour within the Peer Group

Many participants situated their behaviour within the peer group, and emphasised the social rewards associated with behaving badly. Moreover, antisocial behaviour was often portrayed as normative, as well as purposive, even in relation to relatively serious acts. For example, Charlie provided an account of the financial and social rewards of drug dealing:

> And at the time, at the time I guess you could say I thought it was, I thought it was good as well. And eh I thought it was, oh this is brilliant, I'm doing such and such, or such and such or whatever. But you learn that that's sort o' no' the way it is.

What way, in what way did you think it was good?

I thought it was good because eh, it made me, well for what age, the age that what I was, I had a lot o' money basically for being that age. And eh, and it made me appear 'ae other people 'ae be, how could you put it, it made me appear 'ae be, like I guess you could say a big man or whatever in front o' other people but, aye that's, I guess that's what you could say. It made me appear, I don't know dodgy, dodgy even. [Charlie, CD]

Therefore, Charlie described drug dealing as good due to the reputation of being "a big man" and being perceived as "dodgy," but reasoned that "you learn that that's sort o' no' the way it is." In suggesting that he has learned, Charlie appears to be demonstrating his moral goodness. Charlie's account provides anecdotal support for Merton's (1968) anomie theory since he portrayed drug dealing as an opportunity to make more money than would normally be possible for young people who are still at school. Furthermore, since Charlie also measured the rewards of his behaviour in terms of the status it afforded him, his account also ties in with Cohen's (1955) description of "status frustration" in males.

For Justine, behaving badly allowed her to avoid the negative consequences of being seen as "one o' the good ones":

Like why did you decide to stay off school and go to the fields and drink and ... ?

(Laughs). Just cause it wasn't the norm, *it wasn't what you were supposed to do*, you wanted to be a bit exciting and have lots of stories to tell and you didn't want 'ae be one o' the good ones.

Uh-huh, why was that?

Well, the good ones were the ones that were getting bullied and stuff like that which isn't really nice, so I don't know, *you do like to rebel a wee bit.* [Justine, CD]

Justine suggested that she should have done more to protect others from bullying, and implied that she played a part in intimidating the "good ones":

I'm not saying that I was a bully but you do see, and if you're in a group and yeah, people are nasty 'ae someone, you don't, you're not gonna stand out and say, 'Oh no, wait a minute!' Cause you, you're young, you don't really know what's right and what's wrong and what you should do and what you shouldn't do, so you tend to just take a wee step back and just let it happen. Whereas now looking back you should _maybe_ o' done something about it.   [Justine, CD]

Therefore, Justine's account suggests that behaving badly was highly purposive within her school environment, and that her association with a 'bad' peer group afforded her protection from bullying. The italicised text suggests that behaving badly was rewarding for Justine, although she concedes that "maybe" she should have intervened when she saw others getting bullied. Justine's account of the protection afforded by colluding in bullying others reflects the finding that individuals with highly supportive delinquent peers are more likely to engage in antisocial behaviour than those in conflictual groups (Buysse, 1997).

Paula similarly expressed guilt about vandalising cars when she was younger:

Cause I remember we used to, this is going to sound terrible (laughs), we used to go about em see on all the Mercedes, and pulling the thing out the front o' them, you know how the bit that sticks out the front (laughing)...

Oh yeah, the wee...

Out the front o' the car, the wee metal piece, we used to pull them out the car and collect them and pull all the badges off the car and have them all pinned up on our wall like a, like a trophy.

* * *

And put them all up on this wa'... we thought it was hysterical. We didn't realise, oh that's someb'dy's car and now they've got a big bit o' paint that's not, d'you know, they've got the hole where the thing used to be, we just thought it was a laugh. And then we'd get, know how (laughing), the big boulders people put in their, in their garden (laughing) - even now I'm laughing, it's really not funny but I'm just laughing 'ae, eh about it at the time - eh we used to throw them at cars and they'd have big dent in like the front o' the car. It was terrible.

152

<center>* * *</center>

So what made you realise, you were saying that...?

I think I just got older. I think, I was only 13, 14 when I was doing it and I was still a child and then I think I just got a bit older and realised that's terrible, you know, we shouldn't be doing that. You know what I mean, I just realised it was wrong and I was gonnae say I didn't do it for that long (laughing). It was only aboot two months or something and I was like, naw I can't do that anymore.   [Paula, CD; para. 769-773; 781; 831-833]

Despite recounting her behaviour with some fondness, as conveyed by her laughter at various points throughout her account, Paula expressed guilt about colluding in this act of vandalism. Her description of displaying the stolen parts of vehicles "like a trophy" suggests that this behaviour conferred status and denoted membership of a group. However, her comment that she "was still a child" also implies that she associated childhood with freedom from responsibility. She pointed out that as she got older she made the decision to stop joining in this behaviour because she regarded it as wrong. Paula's laughter, together with her emphasis on her choice to withdraw from this activity, demonstrates the ambiguity of her account, and suggests that she found it difficult to reconcile her current views about her behaviour with her feelings at the time. Paula's account maps onto Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) social control theory, which posits that personality characteristics and the need for excitement govern the tendency to get involved in trouble, but that these benefits are short-term since they fail to provide a sense of purpose.

Other accounts of the influence of the peer group were more complex. For example, Louise alluded to class differences between her and her peers, and attributed her engagement in antisocial behaviour to her involvement with a group of friends "from worse areas":

... I started to go out with these people who kinna did accept me, but they drank at a young age, they came from worse areas, they hung about the streets, and I did do that ...
                                                                                    [Louise, CD]

<center>153</center>

Louise drew a distinction between herself and her peers at school early in the interview:

> ... like my other friends from school are like completely different em, kinna crowd. They, like they all left, I was the only one out of my friends from school who stayed on to do a 5th and 6th year. They all left after 4th year...   [Louise, CD]

Comparing her friends to "the really bad people in society," Louise contrasted her circumstances to her friends' lives, and concluded that her family background and mentality were main reasons that she had achieved academic success:

> ... know how the way you look at the, the really bad people in society and think how did people get there? Like two of my friends are really like that whereas like know how maybe cause I had the family background and support and just the mentality from when I was a young age that I could do what I wanted, that, that's the reason why, I know that's the reason why I've gone 'ae uni and they've not.   [Louise, CD]

Therefore, Louise depicted her engagement in antisocial behaviour as normative within her peer group, and suggested that her supportive family gave her the confidence to achieve her ambitions. This account demonstrates Louise's belief that her family background shaped the level of influence of her peers, as borne out in epidemiological research (e.g., Henry, Tolan and Gorman-Smith, 2001).

Dean's biography was similar to Louise's in that he attributed his past antisocial behaviour to his association with "the wrong crowd." However, he also outlined the ways in which he regarded himself as different from these friends:

> ... they were like, 'How can you no' come out anymore?' and this and that and one of them actually was begging, and like at one point he was actually begging for me to start inviting him out with my friends fae the other school cause he said oh he wanted to get away fae it all and eh, so I did a couple o' times but he (sniggering) kinda just shone through as being one o' them, the folk fae my school type thing and eh he tried to fight wi' one o' my friends or something like that and so it basically didn't work out. And eh, so that was that...

Right. And see when you said 'one of them,' like [participant laughs] you used that phrase, I was just interested in what you meant by that.

Eh, a, it's a very stereotypical and maybe, don't know, eh, **high and mighty** view of it, but wi' my friends the now, we see kind of, don't classify it as or not really talk about this but kinda **us and them**, us being just decent people and them being, you know, as I used the word earlier on, that used to, eh the word we usually use is cretins and these people, we just kinda try to stay out the road type thing and stuff, but they can, they, folk who just cause trouble for no reason and stuff like that. Just to put it in the basic terms.   [Dean, CD]

In acknowledging his "high and mighty" view of his former friends whom he labelled as "cretins," and through his choice of language, for example his reference to "these people," Dean distanced himself from the group's attitudes and values and inferred that there were class differences between him and his friends (see bold type). However, he commented that, despite having delayed drinking alcohol when his friends first tried it, he finally yielded to the pressure "to gain general acceptance" from his peers:

As I say everyb'dy else had done it and I was kinda holding it off. It's more OK, right I'm kinda more in the norm now than anything else, more just the general, like to gain general acceptance rather than actually thinking oh, cool, look at me cause I drink, more than that.

[Dean, CD]

Changing friendship groups appeared to be a pivotal point in Dean's life, and he described how the renewed confidence gained from feeling comfortable in his new group helped him to achieve his academic potential:

And eh, fourth year was not so good cause I kinda got in wi' the wrong crowd. No, my friends even, got in the wrong crowd and, and as I say that's when I found it boring, going up to the parks and drinking and stuff like that but eh, then say fifth year, start of fifth year I was all kinda, I wouldn't say I was depressed but I was kinda this is quite a, like every week is the same cycle and I was like pfff, and that's why I started going about wi' folk fae the other school more, and more and more and more. Then to the end o' fifth year I'd totally made the transition over to the new group of friends. Then, and sixth year I kinda, that was my best year because eh. I don't know. I just kinda, everything clicked and I done well at

school, like my subjects and stuff, and I was like the school football captain and the school captain in general and just whatever and just seemed to, I don't know, have more confidence about me to do these things and stuff so that was basically, I think that was given to me from going oot wi' the new group of friends as it were. [Dean, CD]

Therefore, Dean placed a lot of emphasis on the influence of his school friends throughout the interview but strongly condemned the actions of his former peer group, distancing himself through his language. However, his insight as an 'insider' appeared to shape his perspectives on antisocial behaviour and led him to reject common interpretations of behaviour, in favour of a situated account which prioritised individual factors. For example, in attempting to account for the circumstances of the four individuals in his old friendship group, two of whom "went one way, and two o' them the other," Dean stated:

...I'd like to say it's cause o' their family but every one o' them came fae a really decent family. A good, I mean, I talk to their parents and stuff like that and vice versa, they talk to my parents and these are the friends that when I see my dad, asks me how so and so's doing, these are the four that he's talking about. Eh, so I don't, I don't, I really couldn't say, because if you look at their personalities, they're all different personalities. Like one was easily led, one was quite strong-willed but yet they both fall on different sides or whatever, or even on the same side, say. Eh, I'd say they've all got decent families, they've all, smart boys, it's no' as if they lacked, eh, the brains to do well in school. So I think it's just down to the individual, eh, maybe it's just being in the wrong place at the wrong time sometimes. Maybe it's just, I mean you could put down to, I don't know if this happened, but you could put down to, eh, maybe you didn't go out the night that they tried such and such drug for the first time and so you've missed out, you've not tried it and they've went away o'er that way and you're kinda just left behind not that you're jealous because all your mates have went away on such and such route but I think in the long term it's better that I, I don't know, to be honest wi' you. I don't think you can really say that there's an average or general answer for that. [Dean, CD]

At the start of this passage, Dean suggested that it would be convenient to blame his friends' circumstances on their family background ("I'd like to say..."), but immediately refuted this explanation on the basis of his knowledge about their

families. Discounting their family situation, educational ability and personalities as possible influences, Dean reasoned that individual factors and fate were the main explanations for his friends' current situation, but was reluctant to generalise across cases. He also implied that he sometimes felt outside of the group because of missed opportunities which determined subsequent friendships and events, but also recognised the long term advantages of not participating in certain activities. Therefore, Dean's experiences among his friends led him to produce a complex and layered account of antisocial behaviour, although he suggested that behaving badly was normative for him in the context of his peer group. This suggests that Dean's behaviour was governed by the need to fit in with the activities of his 'deviant' peer group (Sutherland, 1947).

Emily described her behaviour as motivated by the desire to impress her friends, but despite portraying her behaviour as serious, she also suggested that antisocial behaviour is only problematic when carried out by "underprivileged" people. Emily strongly condemned individuals who assault others in her general explanation of antisocial behaviour, but described engaging in similar behaviour herself:

What about mugging and assault and things like that?

I hate, hate that, honestly. I know, well I wasnae violent when I was younger but I got intae a lot o' fights and that and eh I just, *I hate anything like that... I hate people that hurt people*, so I do.

* * *

What would you say like when you were fighting with people, what would you say was the worst you ever did to anyone, in a fight say?

Probably just like cuts and bruises or, d'you know what I mean, I don't know, cause the majority o' times if I was fighting I was drunk so I've put bottles, I've cut people open, put like those bottles over their head but like I hated fighting and I only did it to look good, and I can always remember, I always, before we ever fought or anything, I always got a feeling o' sick in my stomach and my stomach would be doing, know how like about a million somersaults a minute and everything, d'you know what I mean? And I would feel pure sick,

but I knew that I had to do it or else I'd have looked like an idiot, d'you know what I mean, in front o' everybody, so I had to do it, or else...   [Emily, CD; para.795-797, 807-809]

Therefore, whilst she condemned fighting in others, Emily described her involvement in an unprovoked assault, claiming that she felt compelled to fight to enhance her status among her friends. She later expressed regret about the effect of her behaviour on her family, but explained that her loyalty was with her friends:

So how did you feel like when your mum would be crying and saying she was thinking about putting you in a home or things like that?

(Small pause). Don't, it upsetted me and everything, but like, my mum and dad werenae really my priority, my pals were always my priority, d'you know what I mean, like looking back now, it pure heartbreaks me 'ae think the things I used tae put my mum and dad through, cause I constantly had them in tears. I constantly had the school on the phone or the police at the door...   [Emily, CD]

Despite revealing the extent of her involvement in trouble and her mother's despair at her behaviour, Emily claimed that it was only "underprivileged" people or those whose parents had been involved in trouble who require help from a Social Worker:

Do you think you should have [seen a Social Worker]?

No. I know it sounds really really silly but see although I was constantly in trouble, I was, I was, it's hard to explain, I was fae a good home so I didnae need 'ae see one. I know like this just sounds really really silly so, it's as if they only go 'ae like people that are underprivileged or whatever, d'you know what I mean? Or like, em, their mums and dads have been in trouble or whatever...   [Emily, CD]

Thus, Emily depicted involvement in trouble as problematic among people who are underprivileged or whose parents are in trouble, whilst framing her own involvement as socially oriented, and aimed at impressing her friends.

Lucy also provided a complex account of the influence of her peers in shaping her behaviour. She situated her involvement in trouble within the context of her peer group, but explicitly discounted the possibility that her behaviour was caused by her difficult family circumstances. The following extended quote outlines Lucy's analysis of the effects of her mother's remarriage on her brother's behaviour, but shows how she believed her behaviour was not adversely affected by family trauma:

...what kind of words come into your mind, what do you associate with like young people getting into trouble?

I think a lot o' it's peer pressure, really, I think a lot o' it's peer pressure. Em, I know like half the stuff I've done, I wouldnae o' done if it, if it wasnae for my pals. I think if me and my group o' friends maybe did take drugs, then I might. I cannae say that I wouldnae. Like because we don't, we really don't, we're totally against it, but I think maybe if we did, then it might be alright tae do it. I think that's got a lot to do wi' it, really, really. Like my brother, he was a junkie, and I'm no' saying that it was his friends or anything but he was always in trouble, he was always, the polis were at his door, he was selling drugs, he was daeing this, he was daeing that, oh everything under the sun you could imagine. Stealing hoovers from a neighbour's garage, he's, everything you can imagine, he done, and I think when he was younger, a lot o' it was tae dae wi' pals, and I think a lot o' it's got 'ae dae wi' family as well because my brother, that's who I look on as, that's how, maybe how I don't take drugs because obviously he was a junkie and he died through it and a' that, that's maybe how I don't, that's how I don't like it.

Oh right. Oh I'm sorry.

But the way I look at it - my dad and, but my dad's my dad, and he's my wee sister's dad, but my mum was married before and she had my big brother Stuart. So what happened was I mean obviously my mum met my dad, and they moved [names area] up tae [names area], and Stuart obviously had to go 'ae a new school and things like that, but he was still in primary school and everything was fine. But he got a friend, and my mum always puts on this, I don't know if it's maybe because I'm taking it from my mum, but he got this pal and this pal was adopted and this pal says to my, my brother, 'Why, why d'you listen to him? He's no' your dad.' And my ma' said the trouble started fae him hanging aboot wi' him, and I'm no' saying, but I think that's got a lot to do wi' it, and it just escalated and escalated fae there and then, I believe that Stuart was peer pressuring somebody else as well, maybe he

was a bad influence on other people as well, but I dae believe that it's about the family and peer pressure. Definitely. Definitely. But then, och I don't know, it's weird because, och I don't know. Well obviously he was a junkie and he died through it, d'you, maybe, I'd like, I'd say it's got to do wi' the family, but like my mum was an alcoholic and she tried 'ae commit suicide and a' this but, see when I tell you this it sounds really bad, but see 'ae me it wasnae really that bad. Like my mum's at AA now and I went to an AA meeting with her, she was off the drink for a year and they sit up, and they tell their story. And she was telling her story and I felt like shouting, 'Gonnae you shut up ma' cause you're painting oot this dead bad picture,' and it really wasnae that bad, like the, like you'd think like, like a lot o' people who maybe I tell it to think, oh you should be pure fucked up or whatever, but no, really, no. Me and my wee sister done really well at school and I don't know, I don't know, there's, like on that occasion, and wi' my dad no' being there and it was always me and Lesley that had tae put up wi' it and stuff like that and, och I don't, och I don't know, but a lot o' the think, maybe I think it's got be that, and then in other cases, like if you look at me and my sister, then naw, I don't think it's got tae dae wi' that.   [Lucy, CD]

Aspects of Lucy's account were very emotive, but she presented a strong sense of optimism and responsibility, consistently depicting her involvement in antisocial behaviour as associated with her peer group. In fact, Lucy inferred that she did not take drugs because of her brother's fate, but illustrated the power and sway of her friends in conceding that if they tried drugs then she might.

Therefore, these excerpts demonstrate the range of ways in which participants described their behaviour as socially oriented and attributed their actions to their association with a 'deviant' peer group. Some participants depicted their involvement in trouble as a consequence of their affiliation with a 'bad' group, sometimes in circumstances where the peer group was described as serving a protective function. Therefore, for these individuals, antisocial behaviour was normative. Others described behaving badly as a means of enhancing status in the peer group, thus portraying their involvement in antisocial behaviour as purposive. All, however, emphasised the importance of their peer group in shaping their behaviour.

5.2.1.2. Accounts of Adversity in Family Background

Whilst many participants contextualised their behaviour in relation to their peer group, some participants hinted that their behaviour was partly caused by difficult circumstances at home. In describing her involvement in fighting, Jillian suggested a range of reasons for her behaviour, including self-defence, taking advantage of others, family circumstances, the need to protect her friends, and anger:

> Oh fighting, it was mostly because *I was just always told tae stand up for myself* and not 'ae take shit and, and people, I don't know, I think *I took advantage of some people sometimes*, you know, if people like you, em, fighting you know. Cause I could fight, right *I've always been able 'ae fight because o' my dad, and because o' my two brothers*, I have always been able 'ae fight, and em like, and eh, you know, *I'll always back up my pals and fight for them* and stuff because I, I actually enjoyed fighting. I think that's because *I like tae get my anger out*, you know, cause I didn't know what other way 'ae get it out so I'd somebody for it, d'you know what I mean. I'd, I'd get intae, I'd cause a fight, you know, to get rid o' my anger and stuff. [Jillian, CD]

Jillian's complex account of her motives for fighting can be understood in the context of her biography, which depicted a troubled home life. In her opening sentence in the interview, she described her dad as a "bad man," and went on to say in the next paragraph:

> ...I'm too much like my dad, I'm too much, I'm a bit of a control freak as well. I'm like you know, no I'm not letting **him** control me, I'll do what I want. And em because I was rebelling against him, he, he actually **hated** me, absolutely hated me (emphatic tone), I mean he's disowned me, he says I wasn't his daughter, I wasn't his real daughter and everything, em and em you know he, he used to hit me, a' the time, he used to hit my mum a' the time because I was trying 'ae save my mum, he was hitting me and he was getting really, I mean it was really really bad, I've been in hospital like twice because of it. [Jillian, CD]

This anger, which was present at the outset of the interview, surfaced regularly, expressed through strong, emotive language, such as the word "hate" and through emphasis on particular words, as indicated in bold type. Jillian's relationship with her abusive father appeared to have culminated in strong feelings of anger, which

she said she was still having difficulty controlling despite having left the family home. Although Jillian did not directly attribute her involvement in antisocial behaviour to her family situation, she inferred a link in alleging that her anger towards her father surfaced when she fought.

At another point in the interview, Jillian cited family background as the main factor underlying young people's involvement in trouble, asserting that she was from a "nice wee family" and that her behaviour was influenced by her friends, who were in turn influenced by **their** parents:

> ...it's the parents but then it's like the group o' the people you hang aboot wi', em which I think's totally true, but my parents, when I grew up, it was like you know, I was always well spoken, never swore, phew, too scared to swear, em, you know, always just, you know, nice wee family and nice wee em like d'you know what I mean, the way I was brought up, it was like to be well spoken and come from a nice family and to go to have all this stuff, and your business and stuff when you're older. But, cause like I did like come from an alright family, it's like when I hung aboot wi' people from like a different area, it's like I went down 'ae their level and eh it's like, so I started wearing, you know, my socks in my joggies and started talking like a pure ned (impersonating accent), and you know, starting fighting and wanted to be one o' them, started drinking dead young and stuff, it's because o' the people I hung aboot wi', but yeah, I think it's like basically they, because o' their parents, cause their parents let them go out, their parents let us come into their house to drink, let us come into their house to smoke hash and stuff, d'you know what I mean.   [Jillian, CD]

Therefore, it is possible that Jillian's repeated emphasis throughout the interview on the impact of families on individuals' development mirrored her experience of physical abuse, which she believed triggered her violent conduct through her need to seek an outlet for her anger. However, the excerpt above also suggests that she did not want to create the impression that her family experiences had shaped her, and that aspects of her upbringing had been positive, in contrast to "people from like a different area." This in turn suggests that Jillian's analysis of general motives for engaging in antisocial behaviour were associated with social class, in addition to upbringing, and that she depicted her involvement in antisocial behaviour as

different from that of young people who behave badly "because o' their parents." Thus, Jillian implied that her behaviour was due to her identification with a "ned" subculture, among whom she regarded antisocial behaviour as a product of family circumstances (as argued by Moffitt in relation to adolescence-limited versus life-course-persistent CD).

Tom's position with regard to the influence of his family circumstances on his behaviour was similarly ambiguous. He distinguished between his personal motives for behaving badly and those of individuals he described as "major trouble-makers":

> That's just normal, most boys will make trouble, that's what they do, that's what boys and teenagers do, make trouble, that's just normal. But I think major trouble-makers, they, I, they're doing that because they've got a problem. Like I, I used to cause trouble just, and I still do, just for a laugh really, and that's just, just what you do. And I think major trouble-makers, they've got real problems at home and stuff like that. [Tom, CD]

Therefore, whilst Tom portrayed his own behaviour as normative and fun, he associated more severe conduct disturbances with family problems. He then described his insights on why a friend of his had "never caused trouble in his life":

> Cause he's got brilliant, it's just cause he's got two, he's got a brother and a sister, and they're like best friends, they're all like best friends. His parents are super sound, I just think it's because he's got such a nice family. He gets on really well at home. [Tom, CD]

Having linked antisocial behaviour to the difficult family circumstances of "major trouble-makers," and then attributing his friend's lack of involvement in trouble to his excellent relationship with his parents, Tom then described the circumstances of people like him who cause trouble for fun:

> **So he gets on really well and then there's people that get on really badly at home, and do cause trouble. So what's the group in the middle who you were saying, 'Well they just do, it's part of growing up, it's a laugh'?**

163

Just like me. Like I've got, I've got a decent family, I think. Eh, but I just, know what I mean just, I just think it's normal...

* * *

And my family's decent, they don't really do much bad to me or anything like that but eh, I don't talk to them much so I just had an ok family, you know, d'you know what I mean?

No, I see what you're saying. So how did that come about, do you think, that you maybe, you don't speak as much?

I can't, I can't, I've got no time for them, I really, I think they're the most daftest bunch o' people ever.

How do you mean, daft?

I've got, I've got, three o' my sisters, I like my little sister but my two other sisters would just, they just do anything they can to annoy me, so I'm just best staying out the way. And I always get into trouble for everything, it doesn't matter what happens, if my sister says to my dad that I did something, then I'm in trouble. And I, I'm, you know what I mean, I try my best just not to do anything, I just try to stay away from them. My sisters are, oh they're cows, man, I really hate them. [Tom, CD]

Initially describing his own family as "decent," Tom concluded this section by describing his problems with his family and expressing his hatred towards his sisters, who he resented for getting him into trouble with his father. Despite these comments, Tom did not directly link his behaviour with his problems at home, instead associating his history of vandalism, theft, arrest, and unprovoked assault with having fun and the influence of alcohol. However, his view that his friend had never caused trouble because of his positive family relations also demonstrates his belief about the importance of family relationships as having either a protective (Henry, Tolan and Gorman-Smith, 2001) or causative effect on antisocial behaviour (e.g. Bor and Sanders, 2004). Despite this, he remained ambiguous about the effect of his own family circumstances on his behaviour.

Therefore, although a few participants hinted at the effect of their family background on their behaviour, these individuals also seemed unwilling to state that their actions were caused by these difficult circumstances. This may reflect participants' unwillingness to portray their behaviour as outwith their control.

5.2.1.3. Linking Behaviour to Mental Distress

Participants' accounts were analysed in order to investigate whether there was any evidence to support the notion that antisocial behaviour is indicative of mental disorder. Although young people did not refer to these concepts directly in the sense of the meanings associated with the psychiatric paradigm (distress, impairment, dysfunction etc.), the themes that emerged in general accounts to indicate psychopathology (see p.118) guided this analysis. This led to the identification of two participants who implied that their behaviour was linked to their troubled mental state.

Peter described a serious assault which resulted in police involvement, initially discussing a range of possible reasons for his behaviour:

> ...I got done for that, well I didn't actually get charged but, for serious assault. (Participant is speaking very hesitantly and thoughtfully here; his pace has slowed down). I was younger and I, this, *I totally forgot about this when I was speaking about fighting earlier*, and eh I actually was looking for a fight. I was up the park and so, and so this guy, I was fifteen, this other guy, he was about my age now, nineteen, and eh, well you do but, you look up to people, know what I mean, so like, eh so he gave us eh some cider, nasty stuff, I drank kinna like two litres, well I was quite out of it, eh so he was like that, 'D'you want 'ae go up the park and batter some queers?' And I was like pure, 'Aye, whatever,' you know what I mean. So I went up and eh, he done that, I mean they could o' just been passers-by, you know what I mean, eh but, so this wee guy was on separate occasions and em, it wasn't just, I mean, even the guy, he started the ball rolling, he was like, 'Right what have you got on you?' and all that, like to get his stuff off him as well, then so it was assault and mugging, d'you know what I mean. Eh... that was my last fight actually, cause I learned the hard way, d'you know, eh, well not, I'm saying last fight, em it hasn't like pure been the last fight but I've definitely calmed down, em, but I, we got away with it cause it was me and my, a guy fae school and this other guy, we got away wi' it cause we were minors. We got a social

worker thing and asking me everything about my life and stuff like that, pure pretty much every detail and eh, so they thought, aye well I think cause I told them about, they could, he said it could be something 'ae do wi', like I was taking my anger out on the guys that followed me, I could have been taking that out on these guys, it could have just been passers-by, but I don't know. He says that was something it could have been, like a factor, you know what I mean, of why I done it. Even though at the time I just, I don't know, I think I just, I feel as if I'm contradicting myself over and over but, I suppose I did, but I did but, I looked up to this guy when I said I didn't really look up to people, I mean I kinna did when I think about it.   [Peter, CD]

Therefore, despite being provided with a 'professional' account of his behaviour by his social worker, Peter was ambiguous about the motives for his behaviour. As well as citing his experience of being followed in a park by two men, he also mentioned the influence of the older role model, and an intrinsic drive as explanations for his behaviour:

So how did like, see when you were in like, this guy said 'D'you want to go and beat someone up?' and that was, that was different to the other times you were talking about in school where you would maybe throw the second punch, how did you feel in that situation?

Scared. That was something I never got when I was fighting properly but, it was, my heart was beating really fast, em... but I don't know what I, I don't think I enjoyed it, like the whole thing at all, but I was scared. Probably cause I knew that it was different this time and I'm kinna wrong for doing it, <u>maybe it was something in there (pointing to head)</u> that I just couldn't touch on at the time. I mean alcohol was there but I'm no' wanting 'ae blame alcohol I mean for me doing stuff. I know it can cloud your judgement and things like that but I don't think it's a main excuse for things.   [Peter, CD]

Peter was very pensive throughout the interview and seemed reluctant to portray his actions as determined by the trauma of being followed by two men, or other factors such as alcohol. However, he settled on the idea that he felt an internal urge to fight on this occasion, also conceding that his actions were "wrong," therefore accepting full responsibility for his behaviour.

Similar to Peter, Greg mentioned a range of reasons for his involvement in antisocial behaviour, including the influence of his peers, his difficult family circumstances, and his troubled mental state:

Do you think you got led astray?

Ah, some o' it, some o' it, but some o' it was my own fault, aye, some, some I was a bad person, a lot o' anger, wi' like my wee brother dying and no' having a mum and stuff like that, I mean my mum no' being there and stuff, but I can deal wi' that noo cause I'm old enough and I've got, <u>I've fixed my head</u>, so...

What d'you mean by fixed your head?

<u>I was just all like mashed up</u>, you know, like, why has this happened to me? I don't know where I am. Just like, didn't know where I was and what my part in my life was, if you know what I mean, like how I was gonnae deal wi' life. But now I know, and now I know what I want 'ae do...   [Greg, CD]

Therefore, as well as describing aspects of his behaviour as bad, Greg also portrayed some of his behaviour as normative, both within the context of his peer group and family. For example, he described following his father's advice on how to fraudulently claim wages:

I mean me and my mate for like three months, signed, sent timesheets intae another company that we'd just been sacked from, kept faxing timesheets and we were getting paid for it.

* * *

I mean I'd like four and a half grand in the bank for Christmas.

Oh did you?

Just for presents, and tae do what I wanted, and I didn't even plan on going on holiday or anything, so all I, so what I done was I stopped. My mate got caught and he's still paying the money back cause he went another two weeks. He went another two weeks so I was lucky cause if I hadn't, I would still be paying this money back the now. But he's still

paying it back the noo. I stopped because I was like that, 'That's enough, I'm no' greedy, that's enough for me,' and he just went, 'Naw, naw, we could do this for a year,' and a' this, and I was like that, 'They're no'...,' I mean you're talking about maybe, I think it was aboot six, seven hunner pound a week between us right? It was aboot 350 we were getting, six, seven hunner pound a week between us every week, but somebody's gonnae notice that after a while are they not? Cause if like, well the money's going oot and the job's no' getting done... (laughs).

They might start thinking...

But it must have been the, but we don't know how it happened, it must have been the wages woman or something, but see it was my dad told me about it, because he said, 'Just try it if it's timesheets, because he done it before, and him and his mate ended up getting aboot ten grand each...   [Greg, CD; para. 530, 538-546]

Greg's comment that he stopped submitting the false timesheets because he is not greedy implies that within his social group and family, his behaviour was not particularly unusual. However, Greg also linked his bad behaviour to anger and mental torment. It is noteworthy that Greg's comment about 'fixing' his head emerged at the end of the (very lengthy) interview, therefore suggesting that the level of rapport achieved as the interview progressed may have provided data that allowed additional readings (Cornwell, 1984). Interestingly, a very good level of rapport was also established in the interview with Peter (field notes, f18), and this may therefore partly account for why these participants felt comfortable discussing their behaviour in these terms. Although their depiction of their actions as caused by internal mental torment could be interpreted as an excuse for their actions (Scott and Lyman, 1968), there was a sense that Peter and Greg accepted responsibility for some aspects of their behaviour. Both Greg and Peter described aspects of their behaviour as wrong, and in this way, their accounts were different from those of other participants, who often stated that they did not regard their actions as bad.

5.2.1.4. Summary

Participants' ambiguity about the influence of their peer group and family background on their behaviour appears to be partly explained by their tendency to attribute different explanations to their own and others' behaviour. Although there were some occasions where participants hinted at the influence of various adverse circumstances on their behaviour, individuals generally portrayed their own behaviour as socially oriented and normative. This contrasted with the tendency to describe antisocial behaviour in others as related to family background and other adverse circumstances, as described in Chapter 4. In general, participants played down the severity of their behaviour although the two participants who linked their behaviour to internal distress also described their behaviour as wrong. It is possible that participants' notions about the morality of their behaviour were related to the type of explanation they provided, although there are not enough cases to fully explore this hypothesis. It is also possible that individuals' observations of more serious behaviours in their peer group and school led them to play down the importance of their own family circumstances, and to depict their behaviour as normative or purposive.

5.3. Patterning of Accounts by Gender and Class

5.3.1. Gender

This section presents an analysis of gender differences in accounts across the sample of participants interviewed. The total number of females interviewed was 11 (7 CD and 4 non CD), in comparison with 21 males (17 CD and 4 non CD).

There was a pattern among the female participants to describe engaging in antisocial behaviour in order to "fit in" with the peer group and to avoid the negative consequences of being regarded as an outsider:

> **...why do you think you did drink when you were younger for the first time?**

...I think a lot o' peer pressure was to do wi' it cause a lot o' folk were doing it and you just feel as if you've got to cause everybody else is and you feel like a loser if you don't, kinna thing.   [Suzanne, No CD]

Similarly, Paula described truanting from school because she did not want to attend classes without her friends, and risk being seen as "a loner":

So why in third and fifth year did you not go [to school]?

Em third year I didn't go because the people I was hanging about with didn't go, and obviously it was a case of, oh I'll be sitting in the class myself, I'll have nob'dy 'ae talk to, I'll look like a loner, so obviously if my friends weren't going, I couldn't go.   [Paula, CD]

These extracts suggest that the peer group afforded a sense of belonging for the girls but that this sense of comradeship also led to involvement in trouble. Therefore, antisocial behaviour was sometimes depicted as a by-product of peer relationships in girls.

Many of the males described the quest to enhance status as a motive for behaving badly. Specifically, males tended to link fighting to attracting girls. For example, Greg attributed his involvement in fights to the need to protect his reputation as "one o' the best fighters" in his area, which he explained was beneficial because of the female attention it afforded him:

...when you and your mates were hanging about, did you ever get involved in any fighting or...?

Och aye, aye, I was like known as one o' the best fighters, so that wasn't good, and it's still not good the now, because...

Why not?

I don't like fighting at all. And I've never liked fighting, but I've always had tae fight tae keep my name when I was younger right? But noo, I don't want my name, I don't want my nickname, I don't want anything 'ae do wi' a' that.

* * *

Why do you think you wanted to keep your name?

Oh, cause I got hunners o' birds and a' that if you've got a good name and that, in't you? So that's wh-, that's why, basically. [Greg, CD, para. 568-574; 604-606]

Other participants also linked fighting to relationships with females, although they framed fighting as a response to individuals who threatened these relationships. Steve described fighting on occasions when other males had shown an interest in his girlfriend:

Em... only other times I've really been fighting is because o' lassies actually. Just because o' who I've been going oot wi' or that at the time.

* * *

And what kind of thing was it over girls, like?

Em just people trying 'ae steal your girlfriend or whatever, anything like that.

[Steve, CD; para. 437; 443-445]

Therefore, males appeared to use antisocial behaviour as a way of constructing their masculinity, particularly in situations which they perceived as threatening to their masculinity.

Glen described fighting in heroic terms, possibly reflecting his attempt to offset the challenge to his masculinity he faced from the males in his school who gave him and his friends "a hard time":

...there was all the nutters that hang about wi' each other and then there was me and all my group o' friends, and eh they just didn't like any of us and they'd, no' exactly pick on us, but eh just give us a hard time. Like we weren't, we, we aren't looking for trouble, and we were just, we weren't a quiet bunch but we were just there 'ae go 'ae school and then after school

we'll go out and do whatever and they just didn't like us cause more girls hung about wi' us or whatever and we'd always get intae fights wi' them and I just never backed down cause I didn't like any o' them either.   [Glen, CD]

Thus, Glen implied that envy about the number of females in his group caused the friction among his peers which culminated in fighting. However, he also described the social rewards associated with fighting:

I can see why these other people fight all the time as well cause people do respect you in a way, they do look at you different just cause they can see you're sticking up for yourself...
                                                                                              [Glen, CD]

Glen's account therefore suggests that fighting allowed him to assert his masculinity and reap the social rewards associated with fighting.

Emily was the only female to link her involvement in antisocial behaviour to gender relations. She described fighting with girls from a different area who were perceived as "a threat" because they were taking the focus away from her and her friends:

Just like girls'll pick a fight for no reason so they will, like em, like if us, other lassies had come up and hung aboot, we'd have probably picked a fight wi' them because they were in our area if you know what I mean and like, pardon me, girls are really bitchy and everything, d'you know what I mean, it's like, I don't know, they're just a threat to them I suppose so they just totally pick a fight wi' them.

What do you mean "a threat"?

Like well, cause they're taking away the, know how they're new people so they're taking away like the kinda, I don't know how, what word to use, but they're taking away like, whatever focus is on them, they're taking away and putting it on the new people if you know what I mean...   [Emily, CD]

Emily's account highlights that trouble among females arose in her group when they observed that newcomers were receiving more attention than them, which in turn led them to fight in order to defend their status in the group.

These passages suggest that males and females use antisocial behaviour to construct their identities, although there may be differences in the way this is achieved across the sexes. Emily's account suggested that fighting was a response to the threat of girls from other areas receiving more attention than her group, and therefore concurred with the males' accounts of fighting, which were linked to enhancing status and defending their relationships (Messerschmidt, 1997). However, antisocial behaviour was regarded as a means of achieving group membership and protection among the other girls interviewed. These patterns warrant further exploration due to the small number of females in the current study, but suggest that antisocial behaviour may be an important means of marking territory, attaining group membership, and constructing identity for both males and females. Again, this analysis of gender differences highlights that behaviour among both males and females was depicted as socially oriented, and associated with certain rewards in the context of the peer group.

5.3.2. Social Class

As described in Chapter 2, participants could broadly be split into 'working class' and 'middle class' groups on the basis of information on parental occupation collected for the 11-16 study (West, Sweeting, Der et al., 2003; see Appendix C). In total, 19 participants were classified as middle class, 11 as working class, and there was one individual whose social class status was not classified. Therefore, this section reports findings relating to the patterning of responses by social class status.

While there was evidence that individuals categorised as middle class and working class were equally likely to relate involvement in antisocial behaviour to social class background, those in the middle class group were more specific about the mechanism by which social class impacts behaviour. These individuals were also

more likely to portray antisocial behaviour among the lower classes as more serious. For example, Louise (middle class) differentiated between antisocial behaviour among middle class people like herself, whom she argued tend to be influenced by their friends and engage in trouble to enhance their status, and those from lower social class backgrounds who get involved in trouble as a result of their mentality and upbringing:

> Cause I think there's different kinna levels of people who get into trouble. There's people who are from the really bad backgrounds, who you have to have a kinna more respect for. But there's people from middle class areas, maybe like myself. Cause I didn't really, I didn't go about causing trouble, or start, like go round starting fights, or trying like, hurt people or anything. It wasn't that kinna, or act like, I, know how when people go out wi' knives and everything and think they're smart, it was never like that, I just wasn't interested. I hung about wi' them, I drank in streets, but I didn't go out to cause trouble. But there's different levels of people. There's people who I would say from my experience are the ones are kinna a bit mental, they've grown up in a really bad household or with a big family, they *give threats* and they're gonnae use them. There's people, then the next level I'd say, there's people who come from a kinna bad area, they *like to think they're gonnae cause trouble* and they, they mess about and everything, but they wouldn't really intentionally go out to hurt people and they would be scared if they were ever confronted. And there's people like from the upper class, or middle class, who hang about with these people or think that they're mad and they go out and they probably cause more superficial kind of damage I'd say, like more graffiti and *to try and show that they're smart and they're hard.* But they would, if the police come they cry, because their mums are gonnae get told. Or if it came 'ae a fight with someone who they were out-numbered by, they wouldn't like, they would back off and be like, 'Oh no, I don't want to,' and they would run home to their mums and dads. So I think there's definitely a difference between that and then, they're, these are the kind of people who'll probably grow up, grow out of it, and go 'ae college, go 'ae uni, or get an alright job. But they're the people who are, d'you know what I mean, if they got into a fight they would be like, they would stab them or they would think, and they don't care if the police arrest them because they'll tell their parents, their parents'll just go, 'Oh well done,' or, 'Och so what,' And I think they're the ones who're gonnae be the ones who get intae long term trouble. Like my friends, like if they got, like some, some of them got home, taken home by the police for drinking, and their mums, their dads would go mental. And they've got respect for themselves now and everything but the ones, like the ones who are on drugs and everything now, they would, if they got taken home from the police they'd be like, 'Oh no

don't drink, don't, don't do that,' (disinterested tone) instead of, 'No don't do that,' (authoritarian tone). And they'd be like, 'Och don't drink,' (disinterested tone) and then they would forget that they were out and they wouldn't ground them or discipline them or anything. They would just say, 'Oh don't do that again, eh?' And I think that's, that's obviously a big difference as well. I think there's different levels of people who get into trouble and different reasons behind it. [Louise, CD]

This passage demonstrates the complexity of Louise's account of antisocial behaviour, which reflected the insight gained from her direct experiences (see underlined text) and her observations of others. The excerpt illustrates Louise's belief that the level and nature of an individual's engagement in antisocial behaviour is related to class background. However, she also portrayed behaving badly as a choice at each of the class levels she described through her reference to giving threats, those who "*like to think* they're gonnae cause trouble," and individuals who "*try and show* that they're smart and they're hard" (italicised in passage). Therefore, while her account does not emphasise that antisocial behaviour is determined by social class background, it does suggest that poor parenting leads to increased involvement in trouble among individuals in lower social class groups. Louise illustrated this point by describing friends whose parents were disinterested in their behaviour and who engaged in antisocial behaviour for attention:

...my friends were caught stealing key rings... Like, cause there's a difference, what happened was, it's a friend who comes from my area and a friend who comes from [names area with high level of deprivation], got arrested shop-lifting key rings. One was crying cause she didn't want her parents to find out, that's the one from my area. The other was laughing, having a great time. She was enjoying it. She was winding the police up and everything. And it just shows. That's another example of the difference. Cause her mum would have just been like 'oohh.' But the other one's mum and dad went off their nut. But, so I think she just wanted to say she was bad and the other one just wanted attention.

[Louise, CD]

Therefore, it can be seen that Louise was reluctant to generalise in her explanations of behaving badly, but that she attributed different motives to individuals on the basis of their class background.

Glen (middle class) linked antisocial behaviour to social class, and explained that his behaviour was a response to the attitude of individuals at his school who initiated fights because of jealousy or because they "thought they were mentaler":

> ... a lot o' the time I got intae fights in school and it was only because I was, I wasn't taking shit off o' somebody just because they thought they were mentaler than me or cause I'd too much money or cause I was dressed too good and stuff like that, it's stupid. And then they don't wanna back down cause they think they're crazy and a lot o' people just like fighting. I know a lot o' people that just get intae fights cause they like fighting. They've said to me before, 'Oh I'd rather get intae a fight than pull a bird,' and I can't really understand that, cause fighting for me is the worst feeling in the world, I hate it, the way my body feels and it goes a' tingly and it's horrible.   [Glen, CD]

Implicit in Glen's account was the notion that the individuals who provoked fights in his school were from lower social class backgrounds. Glen emphasised these class differences through his assertion that fighting was a last resort for him, in contrast to the people in his school who liked fighting and who he suggested coerced other people into getting involved in trouble:

> And like myself, there's too many people that can't get on wi' going to school because o' all the idiots that go there and just don't want 'ae go 'ae school but they get forced to go so they just carry on and pull other people intae trouble as well...   [Glen, CD]

Therefore, Glen suggested that antisocial behaviour in males is caused by the frustrations of lower class position, in line with Cohen's (1957) strain theory, which posits that working class males experience "status frustration" and use delinquency as a means to enhance status and gain rewards.

Paula (working class) described different behavioural norms in upper and lower class areas, commenting that individuals from more affluent backgrounds are less likely to get involved in trouble:

I think it's basically 'ae do wi' money and...

How does money come into it?

I don't know, it's see like, well rich people don't behave like that, like people, not rich people but people fae [area with low level of deprivation] or, you know, like upper places like [area with low level of deprivation] and stuff, they don't behave like that, they don't run aboot getting drunk and run aboot in gangs and, wi' knives in their pocket. Whereas people fae like [names area with high level of deprivation], [names second area with high level of deprivation] do and it's, I think it's basically like em to do with money. That's the only thing I can explain it... because see I noticed as well, cause people fae [names own area; high level of deprivation], their parents as well, if their parents are like junkies or..., I know a lot, I knew a lot o' people that went 'ae [names school], their parents were, not junkies as such but took a lot o' drugs or were alcoholics or didn't pay attention 'ae their, used to beat them up and stuff, that was a lot to do wi' it as well. And it was just a case o' people like that always end up in they kinda areas, I think, because they're council houses or..., I think that's why.   [Paula, CD]

Paula linked her own behaviour to her peer group as discussed in section 5.2.1.1., and suggested that she had to change her accent to fit in at school:

Obviously em I went 'ae school there so obviously it did affect me, I mean I obviously don't talk polite, really, really polite or anything, that's because I went to school and nobody talked polite, so obviously you had tae blend in, I mean cause when I went 'ae school I was all, you know, really, really polite and everything but then when I went, obviously went 'ae secondary, everybody sorta spoke, I don't know, kinna slang so I had to kinna start talking like that. Em...

So you were conscious that, 'I think I better change the way I speak'?

Yeah. Cause obviously I've stood out. Em... as well nob'dy, sorta school was like a meeting place, we didn't go to the class, you went there 'ae meet your friends but then you'd go 'ae the park or you'd go 'ae like the chippie, or you'd go through 'ae [names industrial estate] and go 'ae Burger King, you didn't really go 'ae class.   [Paula, CD]

Thus, Paula suggested that other people's values and upbringing influenced her identity and behaviour. Like Paula, Emily was classified as working class but also made reference to "underprivileged" people, among whom she depicted antisocial behaviour as more serious. Her comment that "you could probably get a big businessman that's pure got loads o' money that could be a murderer" suggests that Emily was attempting to reverse the stereotype that an "underclass" is responsible for the majority of antisocial acts (Murray, 1996). Similarly, Calum (working class) suggested that:

> I'm sure if you give a lawyer or something... or a doctor, if you get them like high on something, they would just be as nuts as a homeless person or something, just as crazy and destructive as anybody else   [Calum, No CD]

Thus, there was a sense that individuals classified as working class attempted to reverse social stereotypes regarding individuals who get into trouble. Moreover, some of these individuals identified a class of individuals beneath themselves, whom they portrayed as more troublesome. Thus, while participants classified as middle class tended to produce quite consistent social class stereotypes, individuals in the working class category produced accounts which implicitly challenged such stereotypes. Participants' tendency to ascribe causality to other people's social class but not to their own suggests that social class was used as a way of marking identity.

5.4. Chapter Summary and Conclusion

The findings presented in this chapter illustrate that whilst most participants portrayed their involvement in trouble as purposive and normative, there were two individuals who linked their behaviour to their troubled mental state. These accounts therefore pose a challenge to the view that behaving badly is normative and rational, and suggest that some forms of antisocial behaviour might indicate impairment and distress, in line with psychiatric perspectives on CD. In addition, these findings problematise the application of universal classificatory systems for identifying disorder since a variety of explanations were attached to behaviour

across individuals with different levels of experience, from different social class backgrounds, and across the sexes.

There was also evidence in the accounts of a few participants that strained family relationships may contribute to young people's tendency to engage in antisocial behaviour, although explanations of the nature of the link were more ambiguous. Applying the techniques of narrative analysis illustrated the complex layers of meaning in young people's accounts, and how general explanations related to personal accounts. For example, it was demonstrated that apparent differences between personal accounts and general explanations may be partly explained by a change in the way individuals attribute meaning to behaviour as they get older, rather than a perceived difference between their own behaviour and that of others. Whilst participants tended to depict adolescence as a period of freedom from responsibility, and emphasised the social rewards of behaving badly during adolescence, there was a general sense that they could no longer derive a sense of fun from getting involved in trouble. This fits in with Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) argument that antisocial behaviour (or crime) fails to provide long-term rewards or a sense of purpose.

This chapter responds to Hill's call "to enrich the conceptual framework in which conduct disorder research is carried out" (p.156). On the basis of the extracts presented, it might be argued that epidemiological research focuses on the negative aspects of antisocial behaviour since young people's accounts suggest that behaving badly can be interpreted as a positive or adaptive response to the pressures of parental alcoholism, physical abuse, separation, and other problems. Thus, epidemiologists may be neglecting the more positive functions of antisocial behaviour. Furthermore, the complexity of young people's accounts also illustrates the problems associated with attempting to measure the full range of factors which might influence young people's behaviour in epidemiological research. However, the use of a narrative approach to analysing the rich, lived accounts of young people

paves the way for a fuller understanding of the factors underlying antisocial behaviour, which could in turn inform the debate on classification.

Chapter 6: The Role of Justifications and Excuses in the Construction of Identity

6.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the narrative analysis focusing on the interview as an interaction, and examining the ways in which participants may have used the interview to construct a social identity. The analysis presented in this chapter is based on the techniques used by Radley and Billig (1996) to examine the activity of accounting, and the framework outlined by Scott and Lyman (1968) for "explain[ing] unanticipated or untoward behaviour." As discussed in Chapter 3, both of these approaches view accounts as arguments, and as bounded by the situation in which they occur. Therefore, this chapter will draw on the ideas of identity theorists by considering accounts as stories with a purpose. In particular, the analysis will focus on aspects of the interaction which suggest that individuals may be using particular techniques or rhetorical devices to accomplish a particular goal, for example, projecting a positive social identity or displaying moral worth. As an in-depth narrative analysis is outwith the scope of the study, the current analysis is based on a case study approach as outlined in Chapter 3. This stage of the analysis will examine the identity work achieved in the interviews by unpicking the underlying meanings and the arguments being advanced in the accounts. The first section of this chapter explores the strategies used by participants to normalise their behaviour, which is followed by an analysis of the types of justifications and excuses used to explain involvement in antisocial behaviour. The final section of the chapter presents evidence which challenges the view that participants used their accounts as a means of constructing a favourable impression in the interview.

6.2. Techniques for Normalising Behaviour

There was evidence in the accounts that participants used a range of strategies to normalise their behaviour, as well as simply depicting antisocial behaviour as the

'norm.' Some participants redefined their behaviour, while others argued that their behaviour was not bad, often contradicting their general accounts in which they depicted the same type of behaviours in others as bad, wrong or abnormal. The final technique that participants used to normalise their behaviour was to emphasise that their actions were responsible. Each of these strategies for normalising behaviour is now discussed in turn.

6.2.1. Defining Behaviour as Normal

There was a sense among those who admitted to getting into trouble that some antisocial acts were normal during adolescence. One-third of the participants claimed that aspects of their behaviour were normal, as illustrated below for a range of behaviours:

Staying out late

... it's just part of growing up, in't it? Staying out, cause I remember, cause I used to have, like when I was young, really young, I used to have a curfew of like half past ten and stuff like that. So obviously you're gonna try and milk it, but eh, that's just, *that's just normal, in't it?*   [Tom, CD]

Truancy

... I don't really know anyone that didn't, really.   [Peter, CD]

Vandalism

... everybody wrote their menchies [signature, gang affiliation, territory], uh-huh, it just, you always wanted to write your menchy, you wrote your menchy.   [Lucy, CD]

And what about you yourself, would you say you've done anything that could've got you into any trouble at any point, like, or that did get you into trouble?

Em, well when I was younger there was, I think *everybody did it*, it was just like *normal stuff*, just like running aboot the street and em, drinking and smashing windows and that, just, just being a wee idiot really. *Everybody done that* so, em... aye, just stuff like that.

[David, CD]

These quotes highlight the tendency of participants to emphasise the normality of their own behaviour, which was expressed using a common language, for example, "that's just normal" and "everybody did it." Whilst Tom portrayed behaving badly as being developmentally normal through his assertion that "it's just part of growing up," others inferred that their behaviour was normal in the context of the area that they grew up in or their particular peer group. For example, Dean's account ties his behaviour during his teenage years to the group of friends he was associating with at the time:

> ... so you when you go to school, you make friends within the environment you are which is the school, so I had classmates and that and it basically came to sixth year, they all left. I could... the majority of... the majority of fifth year and the whole of sixth year, I didn't go about wi' anybody from my school, apart fae like school functions, et cetera, I went, I spent, went about wi' my friends from the Catholic school, just sorta, just related to them better and they were like more fun, if you were... they'd, they'd play, go out and do stuff whereas the guys at the... at my school were just like, you know, the bottle o' Buckie at weekends up the park or whatever which I found quite boring. [Dean, CD]

Later in the interview, Dean added that:

> ... fourth year was not so good cause I kinda got in wi' the wrong crowd. No, my friends even, got in the wrong crowd and, and as I say that's when I found it boring, going up to the parks and drinking and stuff like that... [Dean, CD]

Dean thus related his involvement in antisocial behaviour to his friendship with pupils at his school, whom he dissociated himself from, opting to spend time in the company of friends at another school. It is possible that Dean's emphasis on the social context of behaviour was due to the nature of his experience across the two peer groups, which allowed him to reflect on the topic as both an 'insider' and 'outsider.' For other participants, there was evidence that they regarded antisocial behaviour as normal among young people, irrespective of the social context, as highlighted in the quotes from the interviews with Tom and David.

These excerpts demonstrate the ways in which participants portrayed their behaviour as normal, although this technique tended to be used in relation to less serious behaviours. This was perhaps due to the frequency with which these behaviours are encountered by young people, which in turn lead to them being regarded as normative in this age group. However, Dean's account illustrates that some participants regarded behaviours as normative only within a particular social context (area, school or peer group), and in relation to particular groups of young people.

6.2.2. The Badness Paradox

Of the participants who discussed involvement in more serious and sustained antisocial behaviour, many challenged the notion that their actions were bad. For example, despite defining bad behaviour as involvement in vandalism and stealing a car (both personally experienced), Steve discounted the idea that his actions constituted bad behaviour:

Like [can you provide] an example of bad behaviour?

Vandalising something, stealing a car, something like that.

So are you saying, would you say that you've been badly behaved?

No' ever in a way, *no' ever in a way that would harm anybody.* But noo and again, aye, I've done some stupid things, but no' ever anything tae, that would harm anybody else, just daft things. [Steve, CD]

Therefore, Steve appeared to redefine bad behaviour as actions which directly harm other individuals. This renegotiation of the boundaries of bad behaviour allowed Steve to counter the notion that his behaviour was bad. Similarly, Nick spontaneously challenged the notion that drug dealing represented bad behaviour:

...I used tae, not sell dope but I used tae, I did used to sell it but *no' in a bad way* ...

[Nick, CD]

He then explained that the clause "not in a bad way" related to the group of people he sold drugs to, who were his friends and not young, impressionable or vulnerable clients. These examples show that Steve and Nick defined badness on the basis of the consequences of behaviour, and drew on this to argue that their actions did not amount to bad behaviour.

Emily also described her group as "good in our way" despite describing a history of involvement in gang fights, a charge for racial abuse and discrimination, and the night she spent in prison for insulting a police officer:

> ... although I hang aboot the streets, I hung aboot the streets and that, right, I think we were good in our way, you know what I mean, like we didnae really really behave really really badly, we werenae pure vicious and, like regardless o' everything I've just told you, we werenae like vicious and everything, so we were good in our way and like, but I'd say bad when you're really really bad, it's really taking it to the extent o', I don't know, like hurting people constantly, like stabbing people and that, and like maybe just like, I don't know, just taking it too far. I don't, like see when I, right see when I look at people hanging aboot the streets, I don't see it as being bad behaviour...   [Emily, CD]

Like Steve and Nick, Emily defined bad behaviour as that which adversely affects others, and therefore countered the notion that her behaviour was bad. This suggests that the notion of badness was paradoxical, since on the one hand badness was often linked to others' behaviour, but, on the other, participants were not prepared to label their own behaviour as bad. This was the case even when their general definitions of bad behaviour mirrored their own experiences. This boundary between antisocial behaviour and badness emerged in Charlie's account:

> Most o' the behaviour I done was never bad and never really affected anybody else.
> [Charlie, CD]

These extracts highlight that participants played down the severity of their own behaviour, reserving the notion of badness for their description of others' behaviour.

6.2.3. Redefining Behaviour

Another technique participants used to normalise their behaviour was to redefine it. For example, David described taking sweets from the local shops but claimed that he "wouldn't even call it shop-lifting":

> ...I wouldn't even call it shop-lifting (indignant tone), we just like, I used to like, if I didnae have enough money, I would just go in and like take sweeties and that *but nothing, nothing big* or anything, *just* a couple o' Mars Bars, a packet o' crisps or something.   [David, CD]

David depicted his behaviour as harmless and inconsequential in stressing that the items he stole were "nothing big" and through his language ("**just** a couple..."). He also justified his actions by pointing out that he would only steal if he lacked the resources to pay for the items.

Another example of redefining behaviour is presented below, in which Brendan described smashing bottles against walls, but argued that his behaviour did not constitute vandalism:

> But not really any vandalism, we used to, oh when we were really wee, we used to find it funny 'ae throw bottles against walls and stuff but I mean that's all, maybe that's not harmless, but it was harmless to us, there wasn't anything extreme like whit you could do, like walk about stabbing people or whatever. It's just, it was harmless at the time, that's about it.   [Brendan, No CD]

Therefore, by depicting his behaviour as harmless, and contrasting it with more serious behaviour, Brendan challenged the belief that his actions amounted to vandalism. However, it is clear that he recognised that his behaviour might be labelled as vandalism by others and it is notable that when discussing vandalism more generally later in the interview, Brendan claimed that it was "wrong" and "not right at all." This again highlights the contradiction between personal accounts and general explanations, and illustrates how participants attributed different meanings to their own and others' behaviour.

6.2.4. Notions of Responsibility

In describing their personal involvement in antisocial behaviour, many participants depicted their actions as responsible, by emphasising that they did not directly harm others, and that their behaviour was controlled and therefore not dangerous. For example, Paula was one of only two participants who discussed involvement in arson, but argued that her behaviour did not amount to anything serious since there were no houses in the vicinity, and therefore no serious consequences of her actions:

> There was a wee rope swing thing that, I'd had a box matches, I was smoking and I had matches that day and I thought, oh I'll go and light this bit o' grass, but it just, I didn't expect it to go up the way it did. And eventually the whole thing was ablaze and I thought, oh we need 'ae get oot o' here (laughs). Cause I wasn't staying cause obviously you can get charged and stuff like that, so I thought, no we need 'ae go, c'mon. And *there wasn't anybody's house or anything round about* and it was just on like open bit o' grass, *there wasn't anything really, you know once the bit o' grass burned oot, it, it would o' went out* so I just ran away (laughs). But when I came back it was a' black and charred, I don't know if they'd o', the em fire brigade put it out or whether it was just burned (laughs). [Paula, CD]

Thus, despite laughing when she reflected on her behaviour, it is clear that Paula recognised the potential consequences of her actions if she had been caught. However, rather than justifying her behaviour per se, she appeared to be justifying her decision to flee the scene rather than raise the alarm by stressing that her actions did not put anyone at risk. Therefore, even when describing what may be construed as a serious act of arson, Paula was able to demonstrate that she did not act irresponsibly.

Steve described his involvement in a burglary, but drew a distinction between stealing in a commercial context and targeting private property:

> **So what about you, why are you making the difference between like say a house and a shop or a pub?**

> Em I don't know how that's a difference, maybe a shop, a hoose is just straight off o' someb'dy, so's a pub right enough but a pub or that, I don't know, you think they've got a lot o' money anyway. If they, well if they've got enough 'ae run a pub, they're no' going 'ae miss it as much but *breaking intae someb'dy's hoose, maybe they are a wee bit hard up and they need whatever you're stealing aff them, I'd never steal aff someb'dy directly like that.* [Steve, CD]

In principle, Steve suggested that whilst he was comfortable in stealing from the rich, who he claimed are "no' going 'ae miss it as much," he believed that it would be wrong to target the poor. He therefore demonstrated a 'responsible' approach to selecting victims to steal from.

These examples are illustrative of a common technique used by participants to reduce the severity and impact of their revelations about their behaviour. Furthermore, the excerpts above demonstrate how participants were able to establish that they had acted responsibly even when discussing involvement in relatively extreme forms of antisocial behaviour.

6.2.5. Summary

The use of these strategies to normalise behaviour suggests that participants may have been attempting to construct a favourable impression in the interview (Goffman, 1959). Therefore, the next section will investigate this hypothesis by assessing the extent to which participants appeared to justify and excuse their behaviour.

6.3. Justifying and Excusing Behaviour

Scott and Lyman (1968) described four categories of excuses which may be used to account for 'deviant' behaviour: appeal to accidents; appeal to defeasibility (inability to exercise freewill); appeal to biological drives; and scapegoating. Drawing on Sykes and Matza's notion of "techniques of neutralization," they also outlined various justifications which may be used, namely "denial of injury;" "denial of

victim;" "condemnation of condemners;" and "appeal to loyalties." Scott and Lyman added another category of justification based on the work of Goffman (1961) and Westwood (1960), namely "sad tales," where individuals blame their current behaviour on difficult past events. Finally, they included a 'modern' category of justification – "self-fulfilment" – citing the example of an "acid head" who wishes to experience a different level of consciousness. Young people's accounts will be explored in the context of Scott and Lyman's framework in order to examine the ways in which young people may have used the interview exchange to construct a positive social identity.

6.3.1. The Use of Justifications and Excuses to Portray a Positive Social Identity

6.3.1.1. Denial of Injury

In the passage below, Nick used the justification of 'denial of injury' to account for his decision to sell drugs at school:

... I hate to sorta, (very fast pace of speech), I used tae, not sell dope but I used tae, I did used to sell it but no' in a bad way...

See when you were talking about there, you were saying you sold hash like to friends or people at school or whatever, and you said, 'not in a bad way,' what did you mean by that, 'not in a bad ... ?'

Well I meant it, meant it sorta like, I was saying to you I sell hash and people get an assumption, I don't like people assuming things, like I wasnae pure selling massive bits o' hash to wee boys and something like, it was my mates and just my mates, it wasnae pure ten-year-old boys coming up and going, 'Hello,' but it was just my mates basically cause we could get it. And a lot o' people want 'ae dae it but they just cannae dae it cause they don't know how to get it or, the people they want 'ae get it off of are people you don't want 'ae go and get it off of, cause what happens, what happens is, if you go 'ae get it off these people, cause I've done it myself and, used to do it myself a' the time, you'd get it off the people but the people would be like that, 'D'you want that with it?' You'd be like that, 'Naw I've no' got enough money.' 'Oh it's alright, pay me another time,' and then they get a pure cycle starting where you owe money 'ae people. So it's, it was just us getting it off our mate's big brother, he would gee us a, a wee chunk and then we'd sell it 'ae my mates and it was

simple. It was nice as well cause it was sorta like (small pause), I know like, like you goes like but it gets your sorta status, not, if you know what I mean, in school it sorta goes sorta like, I quite liked that in school...   [Nick, CD]

Nick immediately defended his behaviour, claiming that it was not "bad," with his pace of speech mirroring his frustration and indignation at others' stereotypical views on selling drugs. In contrasting his actions with those of individuals who indiscriminately sell drugs to "wee boys," Nick appeared to be justifying his actions by creating the impression that his behaviour was responsible and by inferring that he was protecting his friends from the "cycle starting where you owe money 'ae people." His soft depiction of the act of selling drugs ("it was simple," "[i]t was nice") contrasts sharply with the harsh tone of his account at the start of the passage when he is challenging others' 'misconceptions' about drug dealing. This suggests that he is using language to convey his honourable intent, and therefore to strengthen his defence of his actions. This passage highlights the multiple goals achieved by Nick in his account and the ways in which individuals may use the interview exchange as a means of describing, explaining *and* defending their behaviour.

6.3.1.2. Condemnation of the Condemners

In recounting his experiences of truanting from school, Brendan appeared to be justifying his actions by demonstrating that he did not experience any adverse consequences as a result of his behaviour:

I dogged school quite a lot in 6th year, eh just because, at that stage you were getting fed up with it really, eh but I wasn't doing Highers, I was doing Intermediate 2s *and I got all my Intermediate 2s, saying that*. Eh, but it wasn't like we dogged whole days, we'd go away maybe for two sessions, but we'd make sure we'd cover ourselves, like we'd maybe write notes out or something and get permission forms so *we weren't marked, marked absent* and stuff and you've just got to be smart about it, you'd get away with it. Eh, but we done that quite a lot, we'd either go up and play pool or go down the town centre or something. Eh, *we didn't get in any bother*, like nothing really came of it, it wasn't serious like taking the whole year out, it was only like maybe few, maybe four sessions a week or something at the most, nothing too much. Nope, not like every day.   [Brendan, No CD]

In pointing out that he passed all his exams, Brendan implies that he behaved responsibly, in turn allowing him to justify his decision to truant from school. He also depersonalised his account (*"you* were getting fed up with it," *"you've* just got to be smart about it"* etc.), which served to normalise his behaviour and convey the ordinariness of his feelings and actions. He expressed his belief later in the interview that truancy was only bad if it was used as an opportunity to engage in other antisocial behaviours:

> But I mean, some, when I dogged school... I didn't see anything bad about it.
>
> **Ih-hm, do you think it can be bad?**
>
> Eh, it can be if you're doing, if you're doing stuff like dogging school and maybe go down the centre shop-lifting with your friends or whatever but it's harmless unless you're doing it a' the time.   [Brendan, No CD]

Hence, Brendan used the technique of "condemnation of the condemners" in highlighting "the irrelevancy [of the act] because others commit these and worse acts," (Scott and Lyman, 1968, p.51) since he compared himself with others who truant from school with worse intent. Through demonstrating that his behaviour did not negatively impact on his academic achievement, and by normalising his experiences, it might be argued that Brendan justified his behaviour and emphasised his responsible attitude in order to project a positive social identity in the interview.

6.3.1.3. Scapegoating

As discussed in the previous chapter, Greg described choking an individual whose friends were threatening him, using the excuse that he "had to do that" but emphasising that he used a responsible method which he was taught by his father:

> **So what would you say is the most like serious thing you've ever done to anyone, in one of those kind of fights?**

Hmm, nothing serious, I wouldn't, I don't, like a' my mates kick people in the heads and that. I don't. I just let them know that, I maybe, maybe choke, I've choked a guy, and I've choked him, like my dad showed me a way 'ae choke him right oot, and that's him out cold, but you can just wake him back up, you just pinch him or, it's, but *I had to do that* but because he was like, it was one o' my mates, he was, I don't know what, I can't remember really what happened, it was just one night when everybody was drunk, but he was like telling me stuff about somebody else, and I was just telling him stuff and I was just like, 'Och, look mate, it doesnae matter.' He's like that, 'What, are you no' backing me up?' and a' that, 'You're supposed to be my mate,' and a' that. And I was like that, 'Look mate, forget aboot it'. Next thing I know, he's, he's punching me, so I was like that, like in, like, it was like he was just, started hanging aboot wi' this, oor crowd, and he thought, him and two o' his mates, so see when I've grabbed him in a headlock, his two mates have just like kinna waddled over as if they're gonnae do something 'ae me, and I was that, 'Look I'm telling you the noo, if you, if you don't get back away fae me, he's gonnae die.' And they're like that, 'Aye, right,' and a' that. And I says, 'Look do you see his heid going purple?' And I says, 'He'll be out cold within the minute,' and then that was it, but a' my mates have just went, 'Look, yous two and your mate, just beat it, we don't want yous to hang aboot wi' us, because you're starting 'ae fight wi' us already,' and it was just, I think it was over a, a, I dunno, I think it was over a daft bird or something, I cannae remember. But that's aboot the worst thing, choked somebody oot, I've never slashed anybody or anything like that. No, no, I've no' got the balls to do that, know what I mean. I might kid on but I wouldn't do it.

[Greg, CD]

Despite describing choking someone as the "worst thing" he had done in a fight, Greg inferred that his behaviour was responsible on three different levels: firstly, that it avoided resorting to "kick[ing] people in the heads;" secondly, that his fighting was sanctioned by his father; and thirdly, that he could easily reverse his actions and therefore was not endangering the life of his rival. Furthermore, he excused his behaviour in claiming that he acted out of self-defence, and by depicting fighting as a last resort after his attempt to be diplomatic failed. Scott and Lyman (1959) labelled this type of excuse 'scapegoating' where "a person will allege that his questioned behavior is a response to the behavior or attitudes of another" (p.50). In closing the passage by stating that he would not have the courage to "slash anybody," Greg may also have been attempting to lower the impact of his revelations about fighting, and to project a favourable self-image by asserting that he

would not generally have the courage to carry out his threats. Therefore, Greg appeared to present an "advantageous identity" (Scott and Lyman, 1959) by portraying his behaviour as controlled and responsible, which in turn allowed him to construct a positive social identity "in the face of implied criticism" (Radley and Billig, p.230).

6.3.1.4. Appeal to Loyalty and Denial of the Victim

Paula described fighting to protect her friends, therefore justifying her behaviour through her "appeal to loyalties":

> ...I wasn't fighting because I wanted to fight them, I was only fighting to the point where I could get my friend out, or get enough o' them off her 'ae, you know, stop it, I wasn't fighting because I wanted to fight or because I said, 'Right that's it, I'm gonnae get her,' it was just because, right they're battering my pal, I'm not gonnae stand back and watch the three o' them get, a kicking into their face, so I'm gonnae have to do something so...

So how did you feel after it?

> Well they'd started it. They were trying 'ae be hard, three o' them on one, so whatever they got, they deserved. Basically, that's my opinion.

Yeah. Did you ever get hurt?

> Em, no (laughs), no' really. I think I probably got, lost a couple o' chunks o' my hair at the most, but if I was ever getting intae it, I was getting intae it when they didn't know because they were already focussed on somebody else, so I used to just go up, you know, grab them from the back and pull them down and, and that was it.

And what did you do once they were down?

> (Laughs). You make me sound like a pure thug! Em... I'd, uhh. it depends, it was just instinct, if they were, you know if they were kicking my friend, I'd pull them away and maybe punched them or kicked them so that they, they were, that was it, they knew 'ae get away, and then maybe go for the next one, or whatever, or maybe that one got back up, you know fight her again. It was usually just a case o' I was trying 'ae defend myself and defend

my friends, em, you know I was just trying 'ae restrain them, I wasn't trying 'ae really hurt anybody but it was just a case o' well they're gonnae get me if I don't get them so (laughs)...   [Paula, CD]

Paula was clear from the outset that she did not choose to fight but felt obliged to in order to help her friend. However, she also pointed out that her role was a response to others' actions, perhaps attempting to absolve herself of blame. As well as excusing her actions through her "appeal to loyalty," she also justified them through "denial of the victim." However, her remark that "[y]ou make me sound like a pure thug" also demonstrates that she was aware of the condemnation her behaviour could attract, and that she may have been testing the interviewer's opinion of her behaviour. Her repetition of the word "defend" suggests that she was attempting to justify her actions, but the laughter which surfaced three times in this short extract also suggests that she felt uncomfortable in discussing her behaviour. Hence, Paula appeared to use a mixture of excuses and justifications, linguistic devices, and laughter to offset any negative judgments about her conduct.

6.3.1.5. Sad tales

Based on the work of Goffman, Schutz, Becker and others, Scott and Lyman defined a 'sad tale' as "a selected (often distorted) arrangement of facts that highlight an extremely dismal past, and thus "explain" the individual's present state" (1968, p.52). A few interviewees used "sad tales" to account for their actions. For instance, Jillian justified fighting with a group of girls at her school by describing the bullying she endured, hence "denying the victim," but also by recourse to her difficult home life and the abuse she suffered at home:

But I actually got expelled from [School 1] because em, I was in a fight wi' a few girls because I got bullied for six months, solid, off these girls everyday, day in, day out, for nothing, d'you know what I mean, just cause I was, I was different, I didn't wear the wee tiny short skirts wi' them and I wasn't you know, all posh and, you know I was, hey, d'you know what I mean, who do they think they are? Know what I mean, I'm, I am who I am and I ain't changing for naebody. Eh and they would just, they just didn't like me, and eh, *one day I just pure flipped* and I absolutely battered the hell out o' a' o' them, honestly, *I just*

194

flipped and they were like, 'Oh,' totally scared and they didn't realise this was, this was happening, and *I just went mental* and *I just flew a' them* and battered them, and they were a' crying and everything, they were a' scared of me and everything.   [Jillian, CD]

A few paragraphs later, a different tone emerged when Jillian described her family background:

...people didn't know about my life, really, and I was like, I was this troubled little girl walking about that didn't really know what was right and what was wrong like in, like, like in a family life. And I wanted a normal family and they all had it and they didn't know what was going on in my head, they didn't know what happened to me every day of my life and stuff, they didn't know. And em because like they didn't know, they thought I was just this wee rich kid, you know, cause my dad used to come up...

Yeah so they...

Uh-huh, so right he came up in like, you know, all these fancy cars and everything and cause they thought like I was a rich kid, you know I was always spoilt and everything, they didn't know what was on, what went on behind closed doors, so they just thought, you know, oh just pick on her, kinna thing, for nothing so...   [Jillian, CD]

In the first passage, Jillian seemed indignant, as reflected in the fast pace of her response, and through her use of direct speech and a rhetorical question. In this section she carved out an identity in describing herself as "different," and in emphasising her resolve to maintain her individuality at school in spite of the peer pressure she encountered. Jillian reinforced the notion that she had a stronger character than the girls she fought with by claiming that she "battered them" and that "they were a' scared of me." The resolve and strength of character she projected in the first passage contrasts with her tone in the second passage, in which she depicted a lack of control over her life and expressed a felt injustice about the way she was treated by her peers. In this 'sad tale,' she portrayed herself as a victim by claiming that she was taunted "for nothing" and, through a slower pace of speech and powerful imagery ("behind closed doors"), implied that the bullying she endured was unjust. In linking her involvement in fighting and subsequent expulsion to her

experiences of being bullied, she drew on her difficult school experiences to explain her behaviour. In expressing her feelings of envy about the other girls' circumstances through her statement that she "wanted a normal family," she affirmed the notion that there were mitigating factors governing her behaviour and therefore created the impression that she should not be held accountable. By eliciting sympathy in her account and by portraying her behaviour as an angry reaction to her childhood experiences (see italicised text), Jillian justified her behaviour, thereby reducing her level of responsibility and allowing her to construct a positive self-image and gain respect in the interview situation.

6.3.1.6. Summary

These extracts demonstrate that there was evidence in some accounts that participants were attempting to justify or excuse their behaviour in order to construct a positive social identity, in line with the predictions of Scott and Lyman (1969) and Radley and Billig (1996). However, participants' choice to discuss their behaviour at all suggests that presenting a favourable impression was not their sole concern. Although participants were informed about the topics which would be covered in the interview in the information sheet, and therefore probably agreed in the knowledge that they might be asked to discuss more negative aspects of their behaviour, they also made a choice about what to reveal in the interview situation. The decision of some participants to discuss assault, drug dealing, and other more serious behaviours implies that constructing an "advantageous identity" was not a priority for all participants. The next section presents data which poses a challenge to Scott and Lyman's theory on the nature of accounting.

6.3.2. Beyond the Construction of Identity: Evidence Against Scott and Lyman's Framework

Having explained her tendency to stay out late when she was younger by claiming that she consistently missed the bus which got her home in time, Suzanne subsequently admitted that she sometimes used this as an excuse to allow her more time out with her friends:

Well, when I stayed, when I used to hang about wi' like wi' that group of friends kinna thing, they stayed a bit away, by the time I got buses and everything else, sometimes the bus wouldn't turn up and it wasn't in like, em, intentional o' staying out late, it was just kinna thing, I missed the bus and the time it takes to get another one, it's like an hour later or if I was to walk home, it would take me about half an hour 'ae walk home kind of thing so it wouldnae really be intentional 'ae stay out later (laughs).

Uh-huh, that's just the way it happened and what... sorry?

But sometimes they [parents] wouldnae believe me and it would be just, 'Oh, you missed it intentionally,' and stuff like that but it wisnae really.

Right, did you ever sort of do it, eh stay out later and say it was the bus and it wasn't?

Aye, I've done that (laughs), I've done that before.   [Suzanne, No CD]

In the first paragraph, Suzanne reiterated the notion that her actions were not intentional, blaming the unreliability of the bus for staying out later than she was allowed. However, her laughter at the end of the paragraph suggested that she might have been embellishing her story, and that she was uncomfortable with what she was saying. After a brief interruption from the interviewer, she went on to describe how her parents sometimes accused her of lying, but again denied that she intentionally stayed out late. However, when asked directly if she had ever used this excuse when she had deliberately stayed out later, she admitted that she had. Suzanne's initial attempt to frame her behaviour as an accident suggests that she was aware that her behaviour might be deemed unacceptable or irresponsible by others. Her subsequent decision to admit using this as an excuse may reflect her perceptions about the acceptability of such behaviour after it was mentioned by the interviewer since a direct question prompted her to change her account. Whilst some commentators may attribute this turning point in the interview to a leading question (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994, but see also Kvale, 1996), this exchange also challenges Scott and Lyman's framework since Suzanne did not simply rely on an "appeal to accidents"

in her account of her actions. Instead, she admitted that this (potentially valid) excuse was not a full explanation of her actions. However, it is also noteworthy that Suzanne was accounting for a less serious form of antisocial behaviour and may have felt less pressure to justify her actions as a result.

Despite being cited by Scott and Lyman (1968) as an example of an "appeal to defeasibility," intoxication was not generally regarded as an excuse for behaviour by participants. For example, Tom mentioned the influence of alcohol in relation to his tendency to get involved in fights but went on to supersede this excuse with other explanations for his behaviour:

... I usually get into trouble as well though, so (laughs)...

What kind of things?

Just anything man, just fights and stuff a lot, yeah.

Do you? So how does that come about?

I don't know. Drinking too much, I think.

Right. Do you ever get into fights when you've not been drinking?

No.

So it's just drink?

Yeah.

What kind of thing, can you remember? Can you remember, d'you remember what...?

Eh... it's embarrassing. (Pause). I don't know, I'm trying to think. I cannae get anything specific, just stupid stuff. I always get into fights for stupid reasons.

And does it actually go the full blow, like you...?

Eh, I've never really had a big doing. I did when I was abroad, yeah, but not, not in Glasgow, I've never had a doing but I usually, I get in fights over really stupid stuff. And just like the, just if anyone says anything or they just stares over like that, right...

What kind of thing, just to get me an idea?

Just anything, like I, oh man, just so stupid, it's quite embarrassing but I was in a fight like a couple o' weeks ago wi' this English guy and he was wearing a, an England top that said 1966, that was the year they won the World Cup, and he had come up to me and he was like 'Ahh, ahh, ahh,' he was pure mouthing off and all this and I just, I just snapped and I hit him. I got chucked out for that, yeah...

Right, where was that?

[Names club].

In [names club]?

Yeah.

And do you think he expected that? Like what, why did he come up to you I mean?

I don't know. No, it was just like we were just all drunk and we were just having a laugh and eh... I think maybe I picked on him though, maybe, I'm not sure.

What do you mean?

I maybe, maybe I saw him with the England top and I've got a thing against England, I really don't like England. So maybe, maybe I just went up to him, I'm not sure, I can't, I really can't remember though.   [Tom, CD]

Tom's repeated reference to his behaviour as "stupid" and his assertion that he felt embarrassed about his actions suggests that he was taking some responsibility for his conduct despite being under the influence of alcohol. Furthermore, he contradicted

himself in accounting for his most recent fight, by firstly claiming that he was provoked, and then by conceding that "maybe I picked on him though," adding that his dislike of English people may have been a motive. Tom appeared unconcerned about the impression he created in the interview, given the frankness with which he expressed his racist views, which surfaced again at the end of the interview in relation to Jewish people:

> Like I'm not racist or anything, but most Jewish people, like I've got nothing against Jewish people, I've got a lot o' Jewish friends and stuff like that, but a lot, I went to school wi' a lot o' Jewish people and, as a kind of, eh, as a group, Jewish people are just, they think, they're so arrogant, it's ridiculous. It's, it's, oh it's disgusting how arrogant they are though, and they, I went to school wi' a lot o' Jewish people, I think it's probably about, say 30 percent of [names secondary school] is Jewish and I, it's mostly that are just, they think they're the business.
>
> * * *
>
> ...I grew up with him man, me and him were best pals, and then just when he turned 18 or whatever, he just suddenly, just pure eh, shut out everyone that wasn't Jewish, and he just started to hanging about wi' the Jewish peole a' the time. He wouldn't hang about wi' normal people, it's just something strange about Jewish people, d'you, d'you know what I saying?   [Tom, CD; para 1281, 1285]

Tom was at pains to point out that he is not racist but at the same time expressed very negative views about Jewish people and English people. It is possible that Tom felt able to express these views because he was comfortable in conceptualising the session as a 'sounding board' given that he had no established relationship with the interviewer and that he had been assured of confidentiality at the outset. Alternatively, he may have felt less bound by societal rules and conventions than other participants appeared to be. However, this also strongly suggests that not all participants were aiming to construct an "advantageous identity," as argued by Scott and Lyman, and that some participants may have had other political or social agendas which they wished to pursue in the interview. In addition, since being under the influence of alcohol might be regarded as an added slur on identity, the

inclusion of this as an excuse in Scott and Lyman's framework may itself be challenged.

Similarly controversial is the inclusion of "self-fulfilment" in Scott and Lyman's framework as a "modern" excuse for deviant behaviour. As demonstrated throughout this thesis, the pursuit of fun was often cited as an explanation for behaving badly but it is questionable whether this "excuse" allowed participants to construct a positive social identity. George associated the desire for "self-fulfilment" with a recent incident of theft:

Uh-huh, so is there any other like things that you'd say you've got yourself into trouble at any point?

I wouldn't say like intae trouble cause I usually get away wi' most things.

Right, so what kind of things have you got away with?

Eh, just like, most recently I stole some garden furniture (laughing).

Where was that from?

Eh someb'dy's garden. We were all just steaming, and we were going for a fire and we just seen it, and we took the seats and that, to sit on.

* * *

Aye, aye so we were just like wrecked and we just seen them, instincts took over (laughing). We went and stole them and it was in the paper.

It was in the paper?

Aye, the local one. It was saying they must have needed a van and that 'ae take it away (laughing).

Did it?

Aye, and it was only four bodies there, took it away (hearty laugh).

So they were thinking they were looking for a van?

Aye they're thinking they're looking for a racket going on, going aboot stealing garden furniture and selling it on (laughing). And actually just a bunch o', a bunch o' young ones, all wrecked, going for their party (laughing). [George, CD; para 569-579, 587-599]

George's irreverent and heroic account was delivered in a manner which seemed to divert attention from his actions. His light-hearted attitude and consistent laughter may have been a strategy employed to reduce the impact of his revelations. In describing his group of friends as "young ones," and through a comparison of their motives for behaving badly with media speculation about their actions, George portrayed the incident of theft as harmless fun, underscored by alcohol and instincts. While offering a number of reasons for stealing the furniture, George reinforced the idea that, in general, his actions were fuelled by the desire for "self-fulfilment" at the end of the interview:

No, no regrets, don't, don't regret doing anything. If I, if I hadn't done any of it (louder voice here, seemingly for emphasis), then I'd look back when I'm older and go, 'I've like lived a boring life.' At least I've done everything I wanted to do, so there's, I've not held back or anything like that. But I might've got intae trouble for it but as long as I enjoyed myself, that's all that really matters. [George, CD]

In raising the issue of regret, George inferred in his account that he recognised that his behaviour was bad. However, this did not lead him to justify or excuse his actions. In contrast to other participants, George did not attempt to normalise or redefine his behaviour, but consistently stated that his primary concern was having fun.

Other participants alluded to the pursuit of "self-fulfilment" in describing their reasons for behaving badly. For example, Nick described the social rewards associated with drug dealing:

It was nice as well cause it was sorta like (small pause), I know like, like you goes like but it gets your sorta status, not, if you know what I mean, in school it sorta goes sorta like, I quite liked that in school if everybody sorta knew who you were type o' thing and sorta you could say hello 'ae people, a lot o' people'd say hello 'ae you and if you ever needed any help, no' like, just say, 'I've no' done my homework,' you'd always have people 'ae turn back on...

[Nick, CD]

In this case, the benefits associated with drug dealing were described by Nick as being known and respected by his peers, and being able to ask favours of those around him. Charlie similarly associated drug dealing with enhanced status and the advantages of being perceived as "dodgy" and "a big man." Despite the disapproval which their actions could attract, as directly acknowledged by Nick (see page 181), these participants justified their actions by recourse to the desire for "self-fulfilment."

6.4. Chapter Summary and Conclusion

The analysis of these interview extracts has provided mixed support for Scott and Lyman's model of excuses and justifications. While there was evidence that some participants used excuses and justifications to construct a positive social identity in the interview situation, there were also examples where participants failed to justify or excuse their behaviour. There are two main explanations for the failure of participants to attempt to justify or excuse their behaviour. Firstly, it is possible that some participants did not feel that their behaviour threatened their identity, and therefore that there was no need to attempt to justify or excuse it. Secondly, it may be that, put simply, some participants did not care about the impression they created in the interview, and therefore did not feel motivated to construct a positive social identity. The first explanation ties in with the findings presented throughout this thesis which have shown that young people often regarded their behaviour as normative, purposive, responsible and socially oriented. Since participants did not regard their behaviour as "untoward," this logically negates the need to justify or excuse behaviour. Furthermore, the argument put forward by participants that

behaving badly is normal suggests that discussing antisocial behaviour was not seen to threaten their social identity. The second explanation suggests that accounts can be regarded as more than simply strategies of "impression management" (Goffman, 1959), and also that participants' explanations have validity and generalisability outwith the context of the interview. Since Scott and Lyman wrote at a time of greater social cohesion and structure, it is possible that their framework reflects the social stability of the period of late modernity and the notion of a single identity and ubiquitous moral code. Interviewees may have felt more able to express themselves freely in a climate of less well defined morality and fluid identities (Hall, 2000), and therefore less wedded to a framework of justifications and excuses in the construction of their accounts.

The analysis of the accounts of those participants who did appear to justify or excuse their actions showed that a common strategy was to emphasise their sense of responsibility and purpose when engaging in antisocial behaviour. This supports the findings presented in previous chapters which have demonstrated that antisocial behaviour was often depicted as purposive among the young people interviewed. Therefore, the findings of the social constructivist approach to narrative analysis complement the findings of the two other approaches to data analysis, and illustrate that participants regarded their behaviour as normative, purposive and adaptive, even in circumstances where they described their actions as bad or wrong.

The difference in the tendency of individuals to construct an "advantageous identity" in the interview encounter may in turn reflect the level of rapport established in the interview. The willingness of some participants to describe more negative traits or behaviours suggests that some individuals felt more at ease than others. Taken together, these findings suggest that the social context in which knowledge is created does not necessarily affect its validity although it may, to a greater or lesser degree, determine the extent to which individuals attempt to construct a positive social identity.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

7.1. Introduction

Through a critical evaluation of the diagnostic criteria and findings from epidemiological research, the literature review highlighted some of the problems associated with classifying CD as a mental disorder. It asked whether the collection of behaviours defined as CD constitutes a mental disorder or whether such behaviours are better understood within a sociological frame by reference to young people's accounts of behaving badly. So far, the only work to address this area has been quantitative, and has been carried out to explore the interpretation of the diagnostic criteria by clinicians and other professionals (Kirk and Hsieh, 2004; Spitzer and Wakefield, 1999), rather than seeking to understand the meaning of behaviour from young people's perspectives. Although other researchers have questioned the reliability of the diagnostic criteria for CD (Kutchins and Kirk, 1997; Richters and Cicchetti, 1993), their arguments have mainly been theoretical, and they have failed to substantiate their views with empirical research. Therefore, the current study aimed to address this question by exploring the meaning that young people, most of whom met criteria for CD, attached to their own behaviour. The findings highlighted that antisocial behaviour was generally perceived as normative, purposive and adaptive, and that only a few individuals linked their behaviour to adverse circumstances and/ or mental distress. The implications of these findings are discussed in this chapter, which begins with a summary of the findings in relation to the aim and research questions.

7.2. Addressing the Aim and Research Questions

The aim of the current study was to explore sociological and psychiatric perspectives on antisocial behaviour. To this end, a tripartite analysis was conducted to probe alternative meanings in young people's accounts of behaving badly. This involved examining accounts from a social realist perspective (Bhaskar, 1989); employing an

interpretive approach to narrative analysis to contextualise accounts in relation to biography (e.g. Bryman, 2004); and using a constructivist approach to narrative analysis in order to understand the layers of meaning and the use of accounts to construct identity (e.g. Rosenthal and Fischer-Rosenthal, 2004). The results of this layered analysis demonstrated that antisocial behaviour was generally depicted as purposive and rational by the young people interviewed. The strength of this study lay in the use of 'first person' accounts to understand the meaning of antisocial behaviour to young people who met criteria for CD. This allowed young people's lived accounts to be interpreted in the context of the abstract, universalist system of classification reflected in the DSM and ICD nosologies. Giving young people a voice, in keeping with the emergence of "postpsychiatry" movement which prioritises service users (Bracken and Thomas, 2001), served to challenge the labelling of antisocial behaviour as CD. Although other studies have elicited 'first person' accounts of antisocial behaviour (e.g. Teevan and Dryburgh, 2000), this was the first study to explore accounts which map onto DSM-IV diagnoses.

Below is a summary of the findings as they relate to each of the research questions set out in Chapter 1:

7.2.1. How do young people define and explain antisocial behaviour?

7.2.1.1. Definitions

Findings showed that there was no universal understanding of what it means to get into trouble among the young people interviewed. Instead, participants' definitions of antisocial behaviour were linked to their own behaviour and experiences. In view of the shift towards considering service "users" in the development of psychiatric services (Mental Health Foundations, 1999; Thomas and Bracken, 1994), this finding problematises the application of rigid criteria in diagnosing CD since behaviour which is deemed antisocial by one individual may not have the same significance to another. In addition, these findings illustrate the disadvantages of the use of a categorical system for classifying CD since it fails to address the alternative

meanings of behaviour. Whilst hanging around the streets, drinking alcohol and swearing was considered to be antisocial by individuals with limited personal experiences of behaving badly, a pattern of more serious behaviours tended to be included in the definition of antisocial behaviour among those with little or no experience of behaving badly. The relativity of young people's definitions highlights the problems associated with identifying disorder solely on the basis of behavioural 'symptoms,' and illustrates the importance of the social context clause in classifying CD. However, both young people and psychiatrists suggested a demarcation of normal and abnormal behaviour on the basis of the severity of behaviour, whereby arson, unprovoked violence and sexual aggression were considered indicative of psychopathology. This finding suggests that current diagnostic criteria may be over-inclusive.

7.2.1.2. Explanations

The findings of the thematic analysis revealed that young people and psychiatrists broadly described three types of individuals who behave badly: firstly, the behaviour of the majority of individuals was described as normative, and linked to social circumstances and having fun; secondly, a smaller group of persistent trouble-makers was identified in whom behaviour was described as a protest about difficult family background; and finally, antisocial behaviour was depicted as linked to developmental problems in a small minority of cases. Therefore, broadly speaking, antisocial behaviour was generally regarded as a social problem. Only in a very small proportion of cases was behaving badly thought to be indicative of disorder. The identification of these two groups maps onto the Adolescent-Limited and Life-Course-Persistent typologies proposed by Moffitt (1993). The depiction of behaving badly as socially oriented and purposive ties in with the Moffitt's explanation of Adolescent-Limited conduct problems by reference to a "maturity gap," during which adolescents strive for independence and material gain. The association of neurological impairment and difficult upbringing with Life-Course-Persistent conduct disturbances in turn reflects young people's views about more persistent trouble-makers. In general, the findings of the current study suggest that

understanding the reasons for behaving badly is a very important factor in distinguishing between behaviour indicative of mental disorder and that which is normative and socially oriented.

The importance of causation for interpreting the meaning of antisocial behaviour sets CD apart from other psychiatric disorders since the phenomenological approach to psychiatry traditionally describes signs and symptoms without theorising about cause (Jaspers, 1963). Rutter (1965) stated that one of the basic principles of classification is it categorises disorders rather than individuals. However, the overwhelming support for interactionist theories in young people's and psychiatrists' explanations of antisocial behaviour provide support for the view that CD is "a stigmatising diagnosis" (Shaffer, 2001), and that the classification of CD might reflect a process of social control and labelling (Becker, 1963; Lemert, 1972).

7.2.1.2.1. Overlap Between Young People's Views and Sociological Theories

Socialisation was cited as the main causative factor for behaving badly. Participants explained that being perceived as badly behaved was associated with status and respect in the context of the peer group, and that some forms of antisocial behaviour were therefore normative within the adolescent subculture. Young people's views therefore tied in with interactionist theories on delinquency which posit that behaviour is not inherently deviant (Becker, 1963; Lemert, 1972; Taylor, Walton and Young, 1973; Young, 1998). The findings also substantiate Matza's conceptualisation of delinquency as a state of "drift" resulting from an "episodic release from moral constraint" (1964, p.69). In keeping with Matza's theory, young people's explanations served to blur the boundary between individuals who engage in antisocial behaviour and those who do not by framing behaving badly as normative and purposive.

Being male and from a lower income area was also associated with the tendency to engage in antisocial behaviour. Therefore, young people's explanations broadly reflected sociologists' accounts of delinquency as "status frustration" among males

in the lower classes (Cohen, 1955; Merton, 1968). In keeping with these theories, increased exposure to antisocial behaviour in deprived neighbourhoods was associated with different values and norms, which served to increase the likelihood of engagement in this behaviour.

Whilst most antisocial behaviour (staying out late, truancy, vandalism and fighting) was regarded as purposive, in line with interactionist theories, theft was explained in terms of anomie (Merton, 1968) since it was mainly depicted as a means of achieving financial gain. The explanations of arson, unprovoked assault and mugging tended to reflect control theories, and the idea of a risk-taking personality (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). Explanations of more serious behaviours were more often based on individual characteristics or notions relating to psychopathology. Therefore, there was a sense that these behaviours were more problematic, and might be indicative of disorder and distress.

7.2.2. What features of individuals' biographies, family background, and peer relationships might add to the understanding of their involvement in, and beliefs about, antisocial behaviour?

The narrative analysis revealed that accounts of behaving badly could be understood by reference to aspects of participants' biography. In particular, some participants' accounts suggested that antisocial behaviour represented a norm among their friends or within their family. This appeared to increase the acceptability of some antisocial acts and contributed to participants' tendency to normalise, justify and excuse their behaviour. In addition, some participants inferred that getting into trouble was related to adversity, particularly within their family background. While these factors might be interpreted as excuses for behaving badly, participants generally did not blame their behaviour on their circumstances, sometimes leading to conflicting and ambiguous accounts. Such ambiguities could be understood in relation to the depiction of behaviour as purposive. Two "deviant cases" were described in which participants related their behaviour to their troubled mental state, therefore providing

support for the view that some forms of antisocial behaviour may reflect disorder. These participants who linked their behaviour to internal distress also described their behaviour as wrong, thus it is possible that notions of morality shaped their explanations. However, this could not be fully explored since most participants challenged the notion that their behaviour was bad. In general, personal accounts provided anecdotal support for the range of sociological theories, again demonstrating the diversity in the meanings attached to behaviour by the young people interviewed.

In turn, the inconsistencies and ambiguities in personal accounts were shown to partly relate to features of the interview as a social encounter. Using Scott and Lyman's (1968) framework of justifications and excuses to guide the analysis revealed mixed support for the view that individuals used the interview as a means to construct a positive social identity. It was suggested that the failure to attempt to justify or excuse their behaviour might relate to the participants' depiction of their behaviour as normative. This arguably negated the need to construct a positive social identity and also suggests that participants did not feel compelled to produce "public" accounts of their behaviour (Cornwell, 1984). On the other hand, it is possible that participants did not care about the impression they created in the interview. Regardless of the reasons for participants' failure to excuse their behaviour, this finding suggests that the accounts produced by young people in the current study can be viewed as more than simply strategies of "impression management," and that the findings have validity outwith the context of the interview.

The theme of antisocial behaviour as purposive was prominent among the group of participants who did appear to justify or excuse their behaviour, which appeared to be related to the construction of a positive social identity (Radley and Billig, 1996). Since the theme of purposive behaviour was important across all of the approaches to analysis, the findings of this study suggest that epidemiological research may be

neglecting the positive functions of antisocial behaviour, which may, at least in some cases, represent an adaptive response to problems faced by adolescents.

7.2.3. Is there a gender and class patterning of young people's accounts?

The findings suggested that males and females use antisocial behaviour to construct their identities, although there may be differences in the way this is achieved across the sexes. Whilst males' accounts of fighting suggested that their behaviour was linked to enhancing status and preserving their "ego" (Messerschmidt, 1997), antisocial behaviour was regarded as a means of achieving group membership and protection among the girls interviewed. These patterns warrant further exploration due to the small number of females in the current study, but suggest that antisocial behaviour may serve different functions for males and females.

Although there were no prominent differences in the personal accounts provided by individuals in the working class and middle class groups, there was a sense that individuals classified as working class challenged typical social stereotypes about young people who get into trouble. Whilst it was clear that individuals in the middle class group alluded to class in their general explanations of behaving badly, some participants in the working class group seemed to play down the notion that young people from lower class backgrounds are more likely to get into trouble (Miller, 1962; Murray, 1996). However, a few of these individuals also referred to a group of individuals beneath themselves, whom they depicted as more likely to get into trouble. Therefore, the theme of social class was only implicit in these accounts.

7.2.4. How do these accounts, biographies and explanations vary across individuals with and without Conduct Disorder?

One of the main findings of the current study related to the similarity of explanations of behaving badly across individuals who met criteria for CD and those with 'sub-threshold' antisocial behaviour tendencies. Since antisocial behaviour was generally

depicted as normative, purposive and adaptive by individuals with personal experience of behaving badly, this suggests that antisocial behaviour reflected a tendency to "drift" between 'deviant' and 'nondeviant' behaviour (Matza, 1964) among the participants in this study. This finding also suggests that there were no fundamental differences in the meaning of behaving badly for individuals who met criteria for CD and those who did not, which provides further evidence of the problematic status of CD as a mental disorder.

There was also evidence that the participants with no personal experiences of behaving badly depicted antisocial behaviour as less purposive, tending to place more emphasis on adverse circumstances and family background as explanations for behaving badly. The small number of individuals in the sample with no personal experiences of behaving badly prevents any firm conclusions being drawn about these 'outsider' accounts, but these findings illustrate the importance of contextualising participants' explanations in relation to their experiences.

7.3. Implications of Findings

7.3.1. For Practice

The main argument debated throughout this thesis has been whether the behaviours currently defined as CD are best understood as constituting a discrete mental disorder, or as behaviour that is meaningful in a particular social context. Therefore, if the weight of evidence suggests that the behaviour is meaningful and adaptive, this provides support for the view that the syndrome currently classified as CD should be revised or even dropped from psychiatric nosology (Huffine, 2002). However, findings indicating that the behaviour is indicative of mental distress would support the alternative view that CD should be classified as a mental disorder. The findings of the current study provided support for both views, but suggested that the current criteria may be over-inclusive and not helpful for identifying mental disorder. The in-depth qualitative analysis of young people's accounts suggest that four amendments to the criteria for CD may be necessary in order to distinguish between

212

normative and socially oriented behaviour, and abnormal behaviour indicative of underlying dysfunction and distress. These relate to the symptomatology; the social context clause; the developmental course; and the definition of impairment and distress. Each will now be discussed in turn.

Firstly, there was overwhelming evidence that the symptom list is over-inclusive. According to the criteria, an individual with a background of staying out late, truancy and theft may be diagnosed with CD if these symptoms are accompanied with significant impairment and distress. However, the data suggested that these are generally regarded as normative behaviours by young people in the West of Scotland. Participants tended to define behaviour as problematic on the grounds of its consequences, and particularly if it directly harmed others. Behaviours which were associated with psychopathology were arson, mugging, unprovoked assault and sexually aggressive behaviours. These findings therefore suggest that the symptom list is over-inclusive, and that the type of behaviour may be more appropriate for identifying disorder than the number of symptoms, which is currently regarded as a marker for severity in DSM-IV and ICD-10.

Both the young people and psychiatrists interviewed suggested that the social context of behaviour is an important consideration for identifying disorder. However, the findings indicated that the DSM-IV social context clause may be too narrow and inadequately defined. Specifically, the data highlighted that taking account of the social, economic **and** cultural context of behaviours may be important for eliminating individuals in whom behaviour may be deemed socially mediated, adaptive or purposive. The accounts of the young people interviewed demonstrated that the social context clause should be extended to include circumstances where behaviour is normative within the peer group, or carried out to secure rewards or enhance social status. This also points to the importance of including a social context clause specifically in the criteria for CD in ICD-11.

A third (related) issue to arise from the data related to the importance of the developmental course of CD, and particularly the need to consider the causes and consequences of behaviour in diagnosing disorder. Both the accounts of young people and the professional views of psychiatrists highlighted the potential of Moffitt's (1993) typologies for identifying individuals with clinical needs as opposed to transitory antisocial behaviour. Overall, there was a sense that the majority of interviewees who met criteria for CD in the current study might be classified as Adolescence-Limited CD. Although this is purely speculative since information about CD status was only available at two time points (age 15 and 18), it might account for the finding that antisocial behaviour was generally viewed as normative, purposive and adaptive. This in turn suggests that a six or twelve month time-frame for identifying symptoms may be too limited for identifying disorder, and that considering the age of onset of behaviour may be crucial. In short, the current practice of subtyping cases of CD on the basis of the severity of behaviour and age of onset may be undermining their importance for identifying internal dysfunction, such as features of Autistic Spectrum Disorder or Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, which are known major developmental risk factors for CD (e.g. Rutter, 2005). This in turn suggests that Wakefield's (1992) harmful dysfunction definition of disorder may be more appropriate in relation to classifying CD since it explicitly focuses on the developmental course of the disorder, in addition to considering social and cultural factors. Focusing on the developmental course of CD would also be more likely to result in the identification of those with neuropsychological impairment and other risk factors associated with a worse prognosis (Moffitt, 1993). The potential importance of developmental factors for detecting disorder suggests that CD does not sit comfortably within the current definition of disorder in view of the importance of understanding causation. This has traditionally been considered irrelevant in clinical decision-making in keeping with the phenomenological approach to psychiatry espoused by Jaspers in 1963.

The final implication of the findings for classifying CD relates to the definition and operationalisation of the impairment criteria, and the meaning of distress. The

accounts of young people suggested that they did not experience "clinically significant impairment in social, academic or occupational functioning," since behaviour was generally depicted as normative, purposive and adaptive. It is possible that the distress associated with CD might be more likely to relate to the burden on care-givers, teachers and others around the individual (Mental Health Foundation, 1999). This is potentially important since the reports of parents and teachers are normally considered in the clinical assessment and diagnosis of CD. This again points to the need to rethink the impairment criteria to facilitate the identification of those whose behaviour is indicative of disorder.

In summary, the findings of the current study suggest that the diagnostic criteria for CD are over-inclusive and insensitive for identifying disorder. However, it has been shown that various amendments to the diagnostic criteria may help to identify those with internal dysfunction, a group for whom it may be important to consider the collection of behaviours defined as CD as indicative of mental disorder.

7.3.2. For Policy

The implications of the findings for policy mainly relate to dealing with transitory antisocial behaviour profiles in adolescence. Since there is evidence to suggest that the majority of individuals currently classed as conduct disordered belong to the Aolescence-Limited category (Moffitt, 1993), there is a need to recognise antisocial behaviour in young people primarily as a social problem, rather than a medical problem, and to develop a multi-agency approach for addressing it (Henggeler, Schoenwald, Pickrel et al., 1994). Revising the criteria for CD to make it easier to identify individuals with clinical needs would also mean that other agencies and services would have to recognise their role in dealing with behaviour which is not deemed to be indicative of disorder. The psychiatrists interviewed interpreted CD behaviours in young people as a protest about their circumstances, thus highlighting the need to address the socio-economic circumstances of young people by funding additional services in schools and in the community (Mental Health Foundation, 1999). Furthermore, such community-based services might be in a better position to

deal with young people with behavioural problems in view of the stigma associated with going to see a psychiatrist for young people (Shaffer, 2001; van Beinum, 2004).

Huffine (1999) has argued that the failure of treatment relates to the fact "that there is no pathologic process common to every child with the disorder." The results from the current study support this notion, and suggest not only that the label of disorder is inappropriate for a number of young people who engage in antisocial behaviour, but that there may be multiple risk factors and pathways underlying the development of CD. In recognition of this, the findings suggest that prevention and intervention programmes should be context-specific, with different aims in school, at home and in the community, and focused on individual needs. In addition, the finding that young people were unwilling to acknowledge that their behaviour might be regarded as dysfunctional also has implications for intervention since such views might affect individuals' receptiveness to intervention programmes. This implies that intervention efforts may have to focus on changing young people's beliefs about their behaviour before they accept the need to change and become responsive to help or treatment.

7.3.3. For Research
7.3.3.1. Ideas for Revising the Method
It would have been advantageous to have been able to categorise individuals into groups of AL and LCP CD (Moffitt, 1993). This was outwith the scope of the current study since LCP CD was traced back to childhood in Moffitt's original typologies, and information on psychiatric profile was only available for participants at ages 15 and 18 (West, Sweeting, Der et al., 2003). It would also have been beneficial to include individuals with more extreme behavioural profiles in the current study. One approach would have been to sample from prison populations. Including individuals who had been charged with an offence (or those who have been sent to a juvenile detention centre) would also have allowed the systematic investigation of the impact of official labelling on beliefs about behaviour.

In addition, it would have been interesting to interview participants at the time of their involvement in antisocial behaviour to see how that impacts on their explanations. However, there may also be some advantages associated with individuals explaining their actions retrospectively since the factors which affected their original behaviour (e.g. peer group) might not be as influential, making them easier to identify and discuss. It would also have been advantageous to interview participants more than once so that findings were not based on participants' accounts at one point in time, which might be subject to fluctuations in mood, impact of recent experiences or other individual factors or circumstances. Triangulation would represent another way to supplement the data provided in accounts, and would also allow investigation of the relationship between participants' interpretations of their behaviour and others' views, for example by accessing police records, school reports or by administering questionnaires to teachers or parents. Unfortunately, this was outwith the scope of the current study.

Another problem associated with the design of the current study related to the volume of data generated, and the implications for analysis. In total, the project generated 1,228 pages of transcripts, with an average of 38 pages per participant. This reflected the breadth and depth of the data, which was related to the (possibly over-)ambitious interview schedule. Kvale (1996) has argued that 1,000 pages of transcripts (corresponding to between 30 and 40 hours of interviewing) is too much to submit to an in-depth qualitative analysis. This was borne out in the current study, and resulted in the exclusion of some data from the analysis. Whilst the analysis concentrated on young people's personal accounts and general explanations of behaving badly, other data on notions of accountability and recommendations on prevention and intervention could not be considered. However, it is intended to extend the analysis and feature these data in future papers, reports and presentations. The length of the interviews – up to 2½ hours in some cases – may reflect young people's interest in the topic, which points to the potential to develop and extend the findings of the current study in future research.

7.3.3.2. Ideas for Future Research

The major hypothesis which was generated from the findings of the current study relates to the potential for Moffitt's AL and LCP typologies to distinguish between those whose behaviour is normative and those for whom it is indicative of underlying dysfunction. Therefore, future research should assess the validity of this distinction by interviewing individuals with more serious and varied behavioural profiles. The design of a longitudinal study would also allow an in-depth exploration of the meaning attached to behaviours at different ages. Using a prospective design would eliminate the problems associated with retrospective recall.

Further research is also needed to explore the ways in which identity is constructed using accounts of behaving badly. There was a hint in the current study that girls may be increasingly using their involvement in trouble as a means of constructing their identity in similar ways to males, but the small number of females in the sample made such findings very tentative and further work exploring this possibility is warranted. In turn, antisocial behaviour may serve different functions for males and females. These hypotheses merit further exploration in view of the implications for tackling antisocial behaviour, both in schools and in the community.

In order to directly compare young people's beliefs about antisocial behaviour with the opinions of others, it would also be desirable to replicate the current study using a range of participants, for example, parents, teachers, social workers and psychiatrists. In addition, it would be interesting to replicate this research in other parts of the UK, and internationally, since some participants situated their descriptions of gangs and violence within the culture of the city of Glasgow. These descriptions resonated with a participant observation study carried out in the 1960s (Patrick, 1972) although more recent work in other parts of the UK suggests that antisocial behaviour is associated with gang culture and territoriality in other cities (Winlow, 2001). However, further research would be required to assess if the conclusions can be generalised to young people throughout the UK and beyond,

which is particularly important in light of the social context clause and possible cultural differences in the interpretation and significance of antisocial behaviour.

7.4. Dissemination

So far, interim findings from the current study have been presented at annual departmental seminars between 2002 and 2005, and at the Residential Meeting of the Royal College of Psychiatry Faculty of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry in 2004. As well as presenting the findings to academics, clinicians and policy-makers at future national and international conferences, it is intended that papers will be submitted to peer-reviewed academic journals. In addition to discussing the implications of the findings for defining CD, future papers will also have a policy focus and will outline the range of interventions proposed by young people for tackling antisocial behaviour.

7.5. Chapter Summary and Conclusion

Given the evidence for the increasing prevalence of CD among young people (Collishaw et al., 2004), it is essential that antisocial behaviour is conceptualised and classified in a way that meets the needs of individuals and addresses the social costs. This project has shown that many of the behaviours currently used to define CD may be normative, adaptive and purposive, but has also suggested that more serious behaviours such as arson, assault and sexual misconduct may reflect internal dysfunction and distress. It was therefore suggested that, although some aspects of behaving badly should not be thought of as being indicative of a mental disorder, these more serious behaviours may signify disorder. As well as changing the list of symptoms, other suggestions for revising the diagnostic criteria for CD included amending the social context clause, redefining impairment and distress, and considering developmental factors. These areas merit further research in order to produce a set of diagnostic criteria which are sensitive and specific for identifying disorder. The findings of the current study suggest that other approaches, which

complement the body of quantitative research in this area, are required in order to understand the nature and meaning of antisocial behaviour among young people. While this study represents a response to the challenge "to enrich the conceptual framework in which conduct disorder research is carried out" (Hill, 2002, p.156), more research is needed to find the most appropriate way to distinguish between individuals with disorderly conduct and those with Conduct Disorder before the publication of DSM-V and ICD-11.

References

American Psychiatric Association (1968). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. Washington D.C., American Psychiatric Press.

American Psychiatric Association (1980). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. Washington, DC, American Psychiatric Press.

American Psychiatric Association (1987). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. Washington, DC, American Psychiatric Press.

American Psychiatric Association (1994). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. Washington, DC, American Psychiatric Press.

Anderson, J. C., S. M. Williams, et al. (1987). "DSM III disorders in preadolescent children." Archives of General Psychiatry 44: 69-76.

Aneshensel, C. and C. Sucoff (1996). "The neighborhood context of adolescent mental health." Journal of Health and Social Behavior 37: 293-324.

Angold, A. and E. J. Costello (2001). The epidemiology of disorders of conduct: nosological issues and comorbidity. In J. Hill and B. Maughan. Conduct Disorders in Children and Adolescents. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Angold, A., E. J. Costello, et al. (1999). "Comorbidity." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 40: 57-87.

Barsky, A. J. and J. F. Borus (1931). "Somatization and medicalization in the era of managed care." Journal of the American Medical Association 274(24): 1931-1934.

Becker, H. S. (1963). Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance. USA, The Free Press of Glencoe.

Bender, D. and F. Losel (1997). "Protective and risk effects of peer relations and social support on antisocial behaviour in adolescents from multi-problem milieus." Journal of Adolescence 20: 661-678.

Berg, B. L. (1998). Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences. MA, Allyn & Bacon.

Bhaskar, R. (1989). Reclaiming Reality. London, Verso.

Blaikie, N. (2000). Designing Social Research: The Logic of Anticipation. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Bor, W. and M. R. Sanders (2004). "Correlates of self-reported coercive parenting of preschool-aged children at high risk for the development of conduct problems." Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry 38(9): 738-745.

Boyle, M., D. Offord, et al. (1987). "Ontario Child Health Study I. Methodology." Archives of General Psychiatry 44(826-831).

Boyle, M. H. and E. L. Lipman (2002). "Do places matter? Socioeconomic disadvantage and behavioral problems of children in Canada." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 70(2): 378-389.

Bracken, P. and P. Thomas (2001). "Postpsychiatry: A new direction for mental health." British Medical Journal 322(7288): 724-727.

Bracken, P. J. (1999). "Phenomenology and psychiatry." Current Opinion in Psychiatry 12(5): 593-596.

Brennan, P. A., J. Hall, et al. (2003). "Integrating biological and social processes in relation to early-onset persistent aggression in boys and girls." Developmental Psychology 39(2): 309-323.

Breton, J.-J., L. Bergeron, et al. (1999). "Quebec child mental health survey: Prevalence of DSM-III-R mental health disorders." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 40(3): 375-384.

Bryman, A. (2001). Social Research Methods. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Bryman, A. (2004). Social Research Methods. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Burke, J. D., R. Loeber, et al. (2002). "Oppositional defiant disorder and conduct disorder: A review of the past 10 years, part II." Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 41(11): 1275-1293.

Burman, M., S. Batchelor, et al. (2001). "Researching girls and violence: Facing the dilemmas of fieldwork." British Journal of Criminology 41: 443-459.

Bury, M. (2001). "Illness narratives: Fact or fiction?" Sociology of Health & Illness 23(3): 263-285.

Butler, P. V. (1999). "Diagnostic line-drawing, professional boundaries, and the rhetoric of scientific justification: A critical appraisal of the American Psychiatric Association's DSM project." Australian Psychologist 34(1): 20-29.

Buysse, W. H. (1997). "Behaviour problems and relationships with family and peers during adolescence." Journal of Adolescence 20: 645-659.

Carrington, K. (1998). Postmodernism and feminist criminologies: Fragmenting the criminological subject. In P. Walton and J. Young. The new criminology revisited. Hampshire, Macmillan Press Ltd.

Caspi, A., A. Taylor, et al. (2000). "Neighborhood deprivation affects children's mental health: Environmental risks identified in a genetic design." Psychological Science 11(4): 338-342.

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. Handbook of Qualitative Research. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Charmaz, K. (2002). Qualitative Interviewing and Grounded Theory Analysis. In J. F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein. Handbook of Interview Research. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Chase, S. E. (1995). Taking narrative seriously: Consequences for method and theory in interview studies. In R. Josselson and A. Lieblich. Interpreting Experience: The Narrative Study of Lives. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Cloward, R. and L. Ohlin (1960). Delinquency and Opportunity. New York, The Free Press.

Coffey, A. and P. Atkinson (1996). Making Sense of Complimentary Data: Complimentary Research Strategies. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Cohen, A. (1957). Delinquent Boys. New York, The Free Press.

Cohen, P., J. Cohen, et al. (1993). "An epidemiological study of disorders in late childhood and adolescence - I. Age- and gender-specific prevalence." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 34(6): 851-867.

Collishaw, S., B. Maughan, et al. (2004). "Time trends in adolescent mental health." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 45(8): 1350-1362.

Comte, A. (1907). A General View of Positivism. London, Routledge and Sons.

Conrad, P. and J. W. Schneider (1992). Deviance and Medicalization: From Badness to Sickness. Philadelphia, Temple University Press.

Coolican, H. (1994). Research Methods and Statistics in Psychology.

Corbin, J. and A. Strauss (1990). "Grounded Theory Research - Procedures, Canons and Evaluative Criteria." Zeitschrift Fur Soziologie 19(6): 418-427.

Cornwell, J. (1984). Hard-earned Lives: Accounts of Health and Illness from East London. London, Tavistock Publications.

Costello, E. J. and A. Angold (2000). "Developmental psychopathology and public health: Past, present, and future." Development & Psychopathology 12(4): 599-618.

Costello, E. J., S. N. Compton, et al. (2003). "Relationships between Poverty and Psychopathology: A Natural Experiment." Journal of the American Medical Association 290(15): 2023-2029.

Costello, J., A. Angold, et al. (1996). "The Great Smoky Mountains Study of youth: Goals, design, methods, and the prevalence of DSM-III-R disorders." Archives of General Psychiatry 53(12): 1129-1136.

Denzin, N. K. and Y. S. Lincoln (2000). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. Handbook of Qualitative Research. London, Sage Publications, Inc.: 1-28.

Dishion, T. J., S. E. Nelson, et al. (2004). "Premature adolescent autonomy: Parent disengagement and deviant peer process in the amplification of problem behaviour." Journal of Adolescence 27(5): 515-530.

Dodge, K. A., J. E. Bates, et al. (1995). "Social Information-Processing Patterns Partially Mediate the Effect of Early Physical Abuse on Later Conduct Problems." Journal of Abnormal Psychology 104(4): 632-643.

Dodge, K. A. and G. S. Pettit (2003). "A biopsychosocial model of the development of chronic conduct problems in adolescence." Developmental Psychology 39(2): 349-371.

Duclos, C. W., J. Beals, et al. (1998). "Prevalence of common psychiatric disorders among American Indian Adolescent detainees." Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 37(8): 866-873.

Eley, T. C., P. Lichenstein, et al. (1999). "Sex differences in the etiology of aggressive and nonaggressive antisocial behavior: Results from two twin studies." Child Development 70: 155-168.

Entner Wright, B. R., A. Caspi, et al. (1999). "Low self-control, social bonds, and crime: Social causation, social selection, or both?" Criminology 37 (3): 479-514.

Esser, G., M. H. Schmidt, et al. (1990). "Epidemiology and course of psychiatric disorders in school-age children - results of a longitudinal study." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 31(2): 243-263.

Farnworth, M. and T. P. Thornberry (1994). "Measurement in the study of class and delinquency: Integrating theory and research." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 31(1): 32-62.

Farrington, D. P., D. Jolliffe, et al. (2001). "The concentration of offenders in families, and family criminality in the prediction of boys' delinquency." Journal of Adolescence 24: 579-596.

Feehan, M., R. McGee, et al. (1993). "DSM-III-R disorders in New Zealand 18-year-olds." Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry 27: 87-99.

Fergusson, D. M. and J. Horwood (1999). "Prospective childhood predictors of deviant peer affiliations in adolescence." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 40(4): 581-592.

Fergusson, D. M., J. Horwood, et al. (1993). "Prevalence and comorbidity of DSM-III-R diagnoses in a birth cohort of 15 year olds." Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 32(6): 1127-1134.

Fergusson, D. M. and L. J. Horwood (1999). "Prospective childhood predictors of deviant peer affiliations in adolescence." Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry & Allied Disciplines 40(4): 581-592.

Fergusson, D. M., L. J. Horwood, et al. (2001). "Unemployment and psychosocial adjustment in young adults: causation or selection?" Social Science & Medicine 53(3): 305-320.

Fergusson, D. M., Swain-Campbell, et al. (2004). "How does childhood economic disadvantage lead to crime?" Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 45(5): 956-966.

Fergusson, D. M., L. J. Woodward, et al. (1999). "Childhood peer relationship problems and young people's involvement with deviant peers in adolescence." Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology 27(5): 357-370.

Fergusson, D. M., L. J. Woodward, et al. (1999). "Childhood peer relationship problems and young people's involvement with deviant peers in adolescence." Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology 27(5): 357-370.

Finch, J. (1999). 'It's Great to Have Someone to Talk to': The Ethics and Politics of Interviewing Women. In A. Bryman and R. G. Burgess. Qualitative Research. London, Sage Publications Ltd. 2nd.

Flick, U. (2002). An Introduction to Qualitative Research. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Fombonne, E. (1994). "The Chartres Study: I. Prevalence of psychiatric disorders among French school-aged children." British Journal of Psychiatry **164**: 69-79.

Ford, T., R. Goodman, et al. (2003). "The British child and adolescent mental health survey 1999: The prevalence of DSM-IV disorders." Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry **42**(10): 1203-1211.

Foucault, M. (1967). Madness and Civilization. London, Tavistock Publications.

Frick, P. J. (1994). Family Dysfunction and the Disruptive Behavior Disorders: A Review of Recent Empirical Findings. In T. H. Ollendick and R. J. Prinz. Advances in Clinical Child Psychology. New York, Plenum.

Glaser, B. G. and A. L. Strauss (1968). The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Goffman, E. (1959). The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. London, Allen Lane.

Goffman, E. (1968). Asylums. Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Goodey, J. (2000). "Biographical lessons for criminology." Theoretical Criminology **4**(4): 473-498.

Gottfredson, M. and P. Hirschi (1990). A General Theory of Crime. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Guba, E. G. and Y. S. Lincoln (1998). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Hall, S. (2000). Who Needs Identity? Identity: A Reader. P. du Gay, J. Evans and P. Redman. London, Sage Publications.

Heggeler, S.W., S.K. Schoenwald, et al. (1994). Treatment Manual for Family Preservation Using Multi-Systemic Therapy. Columbia, SC: State of Columbia Health and Human Services Finance Commission.

Henry, D. B., P. H. Tolan, et al. (2001). "Longitudinal family and peer group effects on violence and nonviolent delinquency." Journal of Clinical Child Psychology **30**(1): 172-186.

Henwood, K. L. and N. F. Pidgeon (1992). "Qualitative Research and Psychological Theorizing." British Journal of Psychology **83**: 97-111.

Hill, J. (2002). "Biological, psychological and social processes in the conduct disorders." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines 43(1): 133-164.

Hill, J. and B. Maughan, Eds. (2001). Conduct disorders in childhood and adolescence. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hirschi, P. (1975). The Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Holstein, J. A. and J. F. Gubrium (1995). The Active Interview. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications, Inc.

Homan, R. (1991). The Ethics of Social Research. Essex, Longman Group UK Limited.

Hsieh, D. K. and S. A. Kirk (2003). "The effect of social context on psychiatrists' judgments of adolescent antisocial behavior." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 44(6): 877-887.

Huffine, C. (2002). "Child & adolescent psychiatry: Current trends in the community treatment of seriously emotionally disturbed youths." Psychiatric Services 53(7): 809-811.

Hughes, J. A. and W. W. Sharrock (1997). The Philosophy of Social Research. London, Longman.

Hunt, G. and K. Joe-Laidler (2001). "Situations of violence in the lives of girl gang members." Health Care for Women International 22: 363-384.

Ingleby, D. (1982). The social construction of mental illness. In P. Wright and A. Treacher. The problem of medical knowledge: Examining the social construction of medicine. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Ingoldsby, E. M. and D. S. Shaw (2002). "Neighborhood contextual factors and early-starting antisocial pathways." Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review 5(1): 21-55.

Jarjoura, G. R., R. A. Triplett, et al. (2002). "Growing up poor: Examining the link between persistent childhood poverty and delinquency." Journal of Quantitative Criminology 18(2): 159-187.

Jaspers, K. (1963). General Psychopathology. Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Johnson, J. G., P. Cohen, et al. (1999). "A longitudinal investigation of social causation and social selection processes involved in the association between socioeconomic status and psychiatric disorders." Journal of Abnormal Psychology 108(3): 490-499.

Johnson, J. M. (2002). In-Depth Interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein. Handbook of Interview Research. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Juby, H. and D. P. Farrington (2001). "Disentangling the link between disrupted families and delinquency." British Journal of Criminology 41: 22-40.

Kazdin, A. E. (1995). Conduct Disorders in Childhood and Adolescence. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Kirk, S. A. and D. K. Hsieh (2004). "Diagnostic Consistency in Assessing Conduct Disorder: An Experiment on the Effect of Social Context." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 74(1): 43-55.

Kirmayer, L. J. and A. Young (1999). "Culture and context in the evolutionary concept of mental disorder." Journal of Abnormal Psychology 108(3): 446-452.

Knapp, M., S. Scott, et al. (1999). "The cost of antisocial behaviour in younger children." Clinical Child Psychology & Psychiatry 4(4): 457-473.

Kroneman, L., R. Loeber, et al. (2004). "Is neighborhood context differently related to externalizing problems and delinquency for girls compared with boys?" Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review 7(2): 109-122.

Kutchins, H. and S. A. Kirk (1997). Making Us Crazy. DSM: The Psychiatric Bible and the Creation of Mental Disorders. New York, The Free Press.

Kvale, S. (1996). Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Lahey, B. B., B. Applegate, et al. (1993). "DSM-IV field trials for oppositional defiant disorder and conduct disorder in children and adolescents." American Journal of Psychiatry 151(8): 1163-1171.

Lahey, B. B., R. Loeber, et al. (2002). "Adolescent outcomes of childhood conduct disorder among clinic- referred boys: Predictors of improvement." Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology 30(4): 333-348.

Lahey, B. B., R. Loeber, et al. (1998). "Validity of DSM-IV subtypes of conduct disorder based on age of onset." Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 37(4): 435-442.

Lahey, B. B., I. Waldman, et al. (1999). "Annotation: The development of antisocial behavior: An integrative causal model." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 40(5): 669-682.

Laidler, K. J. and G. Hunt (2001). "Accomplishing femininity among the girls in the gang." British Journal of Criminology 41(4): 656-678.

Lemert, E. M. (1972). Human Deviance, Social Problems, and Social Control. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall.

Lewin, L. M., B. Davis, et al. (1999). "Childhood social predictors of adolescent antisocial behavior: Gender differences in predictive accuracy and efficacy." Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology 27(4): 277-292.

Lewinsohn, P. M., H. Hops, et al. (1993). "Adolescent Psychopathology .1. Prevalence and Incidence of Depression and Other Dsm-Iii-R Disorders in High-School-Students." Journal of Abnormal Psychology 102(1): 133-144.

Lincoln, Y. S. and E. G. Guba (2000). Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions and Emerging Confluences. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. Handbook of Qualitative Research. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Loeber, R., J. D. Burke, et al. (2000). "Oppositional and defiant disorder: A review of the past 10 years, Part 1." Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 39(12): 1468-1484.

Loeber, R., S. M. Green, et al. (1995). "Which boys will fare worse? Early predictors of the onset of conduct disorder in a six-year longitudinal study." Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 34(4): 499-509.

Loeber, R., B. B. Lahey, et al. (1991). "Diagnostic conundrum of oppositional defiant disorder and conduct disorder." Journal of Abnormal Psychology 100(3): 379-390.

Loeber, R. and M. Stouthamer-Loeber (1996). "The development of offending." Criminal Justice and Behavior 23(1): 12-24.

Lucas, C. (2003). The Use of Structured Diagnostic Interviews in Clinical Child Psychiatric Practice. In M. B. First. Structured Evaluation in Clinical Practice (Review of Psychiatry, Vol. 22). Washington D.C., American Psychiatric Press.

Lynam, D. R. and B. Henry (2001). The role of neuropsychological deficitis in conduct disorders. In J. Hill and B. Maughan. Conduct Disorders in Childhood and Adolescence. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Mason, J. (2002). Qualitative Researching. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Matza, D. (1964). Delinquency and Drift. London, John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

Matza, D. (1969). Becoming Deviant. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall Inc.

May, T. (1997). Social Research: Issues, Methods and Process. Buckingham, Oxford University Press.

Maykut, P. and R. Morehouse (1994). Beginning Qualitative Research. London, Falmer Press.

McCabe, K. M., R. Hough, et al. (2001). "Childhood and adolescent onset conduct disorder: A test of the developmental taxonomy." Journal of Abnormal Psychology 29(4): 305-316.

McGee, R., M. Feehan, et al. (1992). "DSM-III disorders from age 11 to age 15 years." Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 31(1): 50-59.

McGee, R., M. Feehan, et al. (1990). "DSM-III disorders in a large sample of adolescents." Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 29: 611-619.

McGee, R., S. Williams, et al. (2000). "A longitudinal study of cannabis use and mental health from adolescence to early adulthood." Addiction 95(4): 491-503.

Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, Self and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist. London, Cambridge University Press.

Mears, D. P., M. Ploeger, et al. (1998). "Explaining the gender gap in delinquency: Peer influence and moral evaluations of behavior." Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency. 35(3): 251-266.

Meltzer, H., R. Gatward, et al. (2000). Mental health of children and adolescents in Great Britain. London, The Stationery Office.

Mental Health Foundation (1999). Bright Futures: Promoting Children and Young People's Health. London, The Mental Health Foundation.

Merton, R. (1938). "Social structure and anomie." American Sociological Review 3.

Miech, R. A., A. Caspi, et al. (1999). "Low socioeconomic status and mental disorders: A longitudinal study of selection and causation during young adulthood." American Journal of Sociology 104(4): 1096-1131.

Miles, M. B. and A. M. Huberman (1994). Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Miller, J. and B. Glassner (1997). The 'inside' and the 'outside': Finding realities in interviews. In D. Silverman. Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Miller, W. B. (1962). Lower Class Culture as an Operating Milieu of Gang Delinquency. In M. E. Wolfgang, L. Savitz and N. Johnston. The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency. New York, John Wiley and Sons.

Miller-Johnson, S., J. D. Coie, et al. (2002). "Peer rejection and aggression and early starter models of conduct disorder." Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology 30(3): 217-230.

Mishler, E. G. (1986). Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Moffitt, T., A. Caspi, et al. (2001). Sex Differences in Antisocial Behaviour: Conduct Disorder, Delinquency, and Violence in the Dunedin Longitudinal Study. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Moffitt, T. E. (1993). "Adolescent-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy." Psychological Review 100(4): 674-701.

Moffitt, T. E. and A. Caspi (2001). "Childhood predictors differentiate life-course persistent and adolescence-limited antisocial pathways among males and females." Development and Psychopathology 13(2): 355-375.

Mooney, J. (1998). Moral Panics and the New Right: Single Mothers and Feckless Fathers - Is this Really the Key to the Crime Problem? In P. Walton and J. Young. The New Criminology Revisited. Hampshire, Macmillan Press Ltd.

Morgan, D. L. (2002). Focus Group Interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein. Handbook of Interview Research. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Murray, C. (1996). The Underclass. In E. McLaughlin, J. Muncie and G. Hughes. Criminological Perspectives: Essential Readings. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

National Institute of Mental Health (1997). The Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children Version IV.

Newman, D. L., T. Moffitt, et al. (1996). "Psychiatric disorder in a birth cohort of young adults: Prevalence, comorbidity, clinical significance, and new case incidence from ages 11 to 21." Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology 64(3): 552-562.

Oakley, A. (1981). Interviewing Women: A Contradiction in Terms? In H. Roberts. Doing Feminist Research. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Offord, D., M. Boyle, et al. (1987). "Ontario Child Health Study II. Six-month prevalence of disorder and rates of service utilization." Archives of General Psychiatry 44: 832-836.

Offord, D. R., M. H. Boyle, et al. (1996). "Integrating assessment data from multiple informants." Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 35: 1078-1085.

Ohannessian, C. M., V. M. Hesselbrock, et al. (2004). "The relationship between parental alcoholism and adolescent psychopathology: A systematic examination of parental comorbid Psychopathology." Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology 32(5): 519-533.

Patrick, J. (1973). A Glasgow Gang Observed. London, Eyre Methuen Ltd.

Pattman, R. and M. J. Kehily (2004). Memories of youth and interviewing young people: Reflections on young people's understandings of drug use. In D. Robinson, C. Horrocks, N. Kelly and B. Roberts. Narrative, Memory and Identity: Theoretical and Methodological Issues. Huddersfield, University of Huddersfield Press.

Piquero, A. R., T. Brezina, et al. (2005). "Testing Moffitt's account of delinquency abstention." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 42(1): 27-54.

Poland, B. D. (2002). Transcription quality. In J. F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein. Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Poulton, R., A. Caspi, et al. (2002). "Association between children's experience of socioeconomic disadvantage and adult health: a life-course study." Lancet 360(9346): 1640-1645.

Radley, A. and M. Billig (1996). "Accounts of health and illness: Dilemmas and representations." Sociology of Health & Illness 18(2): 220-240.

Richters, J. E. and C. Cicchetti (1993). "Mark Twain meets DSM-III-R: Conduct disorder, development, and the concept of harmful dysfunction." Development & Psychopathology 5: 5-29.

Riessman, C. K. (2002). Narrative Analysis. In M. Huberman and M. B. Miles. The Qualitative Researcher's Companion. A. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Riessman, C. K. (2004). Narrative Analysis. In M. S. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman and T. F. Liao. The Sage Encyclopaedia of Social Science Research Methods. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications, Inc.

Roberts, R. E., C. C. Attkisson, et al. (1998). "Prevalence of psychopathology among children and adolescents." American Journal of Psychiatry 155(6): 715-725.

Robins, L. N. (2001). Making Sense of the Increasing Prevalence of Conduct Disorder. In J. Green and W. Yule. Research and Innovation on the Road to Modern Child Psychiatry. London, Gaskill.

Robson, C. (2002). Real World Research. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Rock, P. (1997). Sociological Theories of Crime. In M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner. The Oxford Handbook of Criminology. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Rosenthal, G. and W. Fischer-Rosenthal (2004). The Analysis of Biographical Narrative Interviews. In U. Flick, E. von Kardoff and I. Steinke. A Companion to Qualitative Research. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Rutter, M. (1965). "Classification and Categorization in Child-Psychiatry." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines 6(2): 71-83.

Rutter, M. (2001). "Childhood onset of "adult" psychopathology. Clinical and research advances." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines 42(3): 422-422.

Rutter, M. (2001). Conduct Disorder: Future Directions. An Afterword. In J. Hill and B. Maughan. Conduct Disorders in Childhood and Adolescence. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Rutter, M. (2003). "Commentary: Causal processes leading to antisocial behaviour." Developmental Psychology 39(2): 372-378.

Rutter, M. (2003). "The interplay of nature, nurture, and developmental influences: the challenge ahead for mental health (vol 59, pg 996, 2002)." Archives of General Psychiatry 60(2): 203-203.

Rutter, M. (2005). "Environmentally mediated risks for psychopathology: Research strategies and findings." Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 44(1): 3-18.

Rutter, M., A. Pickles, et al. (2001). "Testing hypotheses on specific environmental causal effects on behavior." Psychological Bulletin 127(3): 291-324.

Sampson, R. J. and J. H. Laub (1993). Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points through Life. Cambridge, Massachusettes, Harvard University Press.

Sarup, M. (1996). Identity, Culture and the Postmodern World. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Schmidt, C. (2004). The Analysis of Semi-Structured Interviews. U. Flick, E. von Kardoff and I. Steinke. A Companion to Qualitative Research. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Schutz, A. (1972). The Phenomenology of the Social World. London, Heinemann.

Schwandt, T. A. (1998). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. The Landscape of Qualitative Research. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Schwandt, T. A. (2000). Three epistemiological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructivism. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. Handbook of Qualitative Research. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Schwartz, H. and J. Jacobs (1979). Qualitative Sociology: A Method to the Madness. New York, The Free Press.

Scott, M. B. and S. M. Lyman (1968). "Accounts." American Sociological Review 33(1): 46-62.

Scott, S., M. Knapp, et al. (2001). "Financial cost of social exclusion: Follow up study of antisocial children into adulthood." British Medical Journal 323.

Seale, C. (1999). The Quality of Qualitative Research. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Seale, C. F. (2002). Computer-assisted analysis of qualitative interview data. In J. F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein. Handbook of Interview Research. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Shaffer, D. (2001). Classification and Categorisatoin Revisited. In J. Green and B. Yule. Research and Innovation on the Road to Modern Child Psychiatry; Vol. 1: Festchrift to Professor Sir Michael Rutter. London, Gaskell (Royal College of Psychiatrists.

Shaffer, D., P. Fisher, et al. (1996). "The NIMH Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children Version 2.3 (DISC-2.3): Description, Acceptability, Prevalence Rates, and Performance in the MECA Study." Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 35(7): 865-877.

Shaffer, D., P. Fisher, et al. (2000). "NIMH Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children Version IV (NIMH DISC-IV): Description, differences from previous versions, and reliability of some common diagnoses." Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry 39: 28-38.

Shipman, M. (1997). The Limitations of Social Research. Essex, Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Silverman, D. (2000). Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Silverman, D. (2001). Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction. London, Thousand Oaks.

Silverthorn, P. and P. J. Frick (1999). "Developmental pathways to antisocial behavior: The delayed-onset pathway in girls." Development and Psychopathology 11: 101-126.

Silverthorn, P., P. J. Frick, et al. (2001). "Timing of onset and correlates of severe conduct problems in adjudicated girls and boys." Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment 23(3): 171-181.

Simonoff, E., A. Pickles, et al. (1997). "The Virginia twin study of adolescent behavioral development: Influences of age, sex, and impairment on rates of disorder." Archives of General Psychiatry 54(9): 801-808.

Simons, R. L., E. Stewart, et al. (2002). "A test of life-course explanations for stability and change in antisocial behavior from adolescence to young adulthood." Criminology 40(2): 401-434.

Smart, C. (1976). Women, Crime and Criminology. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Smart, C. (1995). Law, crime and sexuality: Essays in feminism. London, Sage.

Smyth, J. and R. Hattam (2001). "'Voiced' research as a sociology for understanding 'dropping out' at school." British Journal of Sociology of Education 22(3): 401-415.

Sonuga-Barke, E. J. S. (1998). "Categorical models of childhood disorder: A conceptual and empirical analysis." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines 39(1): 115-133.

Spitzer, R. L. (1999). "Harmful dysfunction and the DSM definition of mental disorder." Journal of Abnormal Psychology 108(3): 430-432.

Spitzer, R. L. (2001). "Values and assumptions in the development of DSM-III and DSM-III-R: An insider's perspective and a belated response to Sadler, Hulgus, and Agich's "On values in recent American psychiatric classification". Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease 189(6): 351-359.

Spitzer, R. L. and J. C. Wakefield (1999). "DSM-IV diagnostic criterion for clinical significance: Does it help solve the false positives problem?" American Journal of Psychiatry **156**: 1856-1864.

Stanley, L. and S. Wise (1990). Method, Methodology and Epistemology in Feminist Research Processes. In L. Stanley. Feminist Praxis Research, Theory and Epistemology. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Sterzer, P., C. Stadler, et al. (2005). "Abnormal neural responses to emotional visual stimuli in adolescents with conduct disorder." Biological Psychiatry **57**(1): 7-15.

Storvoll, E. E. and L. Wichstrom (2002). "Do the risk factors associated with conduct problems in adolescents vary according to gender?" Journal of Adolescence **25**(2): 183-202.

Sucoff, C., D. Upchurch, et al. (1999). "Neighborhood influences on parent-child relations: Implications for adolescent health." Journal of Adolescent Health **24**(2): 113-113.

Sweeting, H., G. Der, et al. (2001). Bias, Attrition and Weighting in the West of Scotland 11 to 16 Study Baseline, S2 and S4 Sweeps. MRC Social and Public Health Sciences Unit Working Paper No.9. Glasgow, MRC Social and Public Health Sciences Unit available at *library@msoc.mrc.gla.ac.uk*.

Sykes, G. and D. Matza (1957). "Techniques of neutralization." American Sociological Review **22**.

Taylor, C. (1979). Interpretation and the Sciences of Man. In P. Rabinow and W. M. Sullivan. Interpretive Social Science: A Reader. Los Angeles, University of California Press.

Taylor, E. and M. Rutter (2002). Classification: Conceptual Issues and Substantive Findings. In M. Rutter and E. Taylor. Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. Oxford, Blackwell Science Ltd.

Taylor, I. (2000). "Making trouble: Cultural constructions of crime, deviance and control." British Journal of Criminology **40**(3): 545-548.

Taylor, I., P. Walton, et al. (1973). The New Criminology. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Teevan, J. J. and H. B. Dryburgh (2000). "First person accounts and sociological explanations of delinquency." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology **37**(1): 77-94.

Thapar, A. and P. McGuffin (1996). "Twin study of antisocial and neurotic symptoms in childhood." Psychological Medicine 26(6): 1111-1118.

Thomas, P. and P. Bracken (2004). "Critical psychiatry in practice." Advances in Psychiatric Treatment 10(5): 361-370.

Ungar, M. T. (2000). "The myth of peer pressure." Adolescence 35(137): 167-180.

Unit, S. E. C. R. (2002). Young People and Crime in Scotland: Findings from the 2000 Scottish Crime Survey. Edinburgh, Central Research Unit.

van Beinum, M. E. (2004). Teenage user perspectives of adolescent psychiatry outpatient services. Thesis Presented to the Faculty of Medicine. Glasgow, University of Glasgow.

Verhulst, F., J. van der Ende, et al. (1997). "The prevalence of DSM-III-R diagnoses in a national sample of Dutch adolescents." Archives of General Psychiatry 54(4): 329-336.

Verhulst, F. C., G. F. M. G. Berden, et al. (1985). "Mental health in Dutch children: (II) The prevalence of psychiatric disorder and relationship between measures." Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica 72(324): 1-44.

Vikan, A. (1985). "Psychiatric epidemiology in a sample of 1510 ten-year-old children - I. Prevalence." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 26(1): 55-75.

Wakefield, J. C. (1992). "The concept of mental disorder: On the boundary between biological facts and social values." American Psychologist 47: 373-388.

Walton, P. and J. Young (1998). The New Criminology Revisited. Hampshire, Macmillan Press Ltd.

Warren, C. A. B. (2002). Qualitative interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein. Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Warren, C. A. B. (2002). Qualitative Interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein. Handbook of Interview Research. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Weber, M. (1949). The Methodology of the Social Sciences. London, The Free Press.

Weber, M. (1964). The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. London, Collier-Macmillan.

West, P. (1990). "The status and validity of accounts obtained at interview: A contrast between two studies of families with a disabled child." Social Science & Medicine 30(11): 1229.

West, P., H. Sweeting, et al. (2003). "Voice-DISC identified DSM-IV disorders among 15-year-olds in the west of Scotland." Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 42(8): 941-949.

White, H. R., M. E. Bates, et al. (2001). "Adolescence-limited versus persistent delinquency: Extending Moffitt's hypothesis into adulthood." Journal of Abnormal Psychology 110(4): 600-609.

Widiger, T. A. and L. A. Clark (2000). "Toward DSM-V and the classification of psychopathology." Psychological Bulletin 126(6): 946-963.

Wight, D. (1994). "Boys Thoughts and Talk About Sex in a Working-Class Locality of Glasgow." Sociological Review 42(4): 703-737.

Williams, M. and T. May (1996). Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Research. London, UCL Press.

Willott, S., C. Griffin, et al. (2001). "Snakes and ladders: Upper-middle class male offenders talk about economic crime." Criminology 39(2): 441-466.

Winlow, S. (2001). Badfellas: Crime, Tradition and New Masculinities. Oxford, Berg.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). Transforming Qualitative Data. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Woodward, L. J., D. M. Fergusson, et al. (2002). "Deviant partner involvement and offending risk in early adulthood." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines 43(2): 177-190.

World Health Organisation (1965). The ICD-8 classification of mental and behavioural disorders: Diagnostic criteria for research. Geneva, World Health Organisation.

World Health Organisation (1975). The ICD-9 classification of mental and behavioural disorders: Diagnostic criteria for research. Geneva, World Health Organisation.

World Health Organisation (1993). The ICD-10 classification of mental and behavioural disorders: Diagnostic criteria for research. Geneva, World Health Organisation.

Wright, B. R. E., A. Caspi, et al. (1999). "Reconsidering the relationship between SES and delinquency: Causation but not correlation." Criminology 37(1): 175-194.

Young, J. (1998). Breaking Windows: Situating the New Criminology. In P. Walton and J. Young. The New Criminology Revisited. Hampshire, Macmillan Press Ltd.

Young, J. (1998). Writing on the Cusp of Change: A New Criminology for an Age of Late Modernity. In P. Walton and J. Young. The New Criminology Revisited. Hampshire, Macmillan Press Ltd.

Zahn-Waxler, C. (1993). "Warriors and worriers: Gender and psychopathology." Development and Psychopathology 5: 79-89.

Zoccolillo, M. M. D. (1993). "Gender and the development of conduct disorder." Development and Psychopathology 5: 65-97.

Appendix A

Subtypes of Conduct Disorder

ICD 8 (WHO, 1965)	ICD 9 (WHO, 1975)	ICD 10 (WHO, 1993)
Behaviour disorders of childhood	**Disturbance of conduct not elsewhere classified**	**Conduct Disorders**
• Adjustment reaction of infancy/ childhood	• Unsocialized disturbance of conduct	• Conduct disorder confined to the family context
• Jealousy	• Socialized disturbance of conduct	• Unsocialized conduct disorder
• Masturbation	• Compulsive conduct disorder	• Socialized conduct disorder
• Tantrum	• Mixed disturbance of conduct and emotions	• Oppositional defiant disorder
• Truancy	• Other	• Other
	• Unspecified	• Unspecified

DSM III (APA, 1980)	DSM III R (APA, 1987)	DSM IV (APA, 1994)
Conduct Disorder	**Conduct Disorder**	**Conduct Disorder**
• Undersocialized, aggressive	• Group type	• Childhood-onset
• Undersocialized, nonaggressive	• Solitary aggressive	• Adolescent-onset
• Socialized, aggressive	• Undifferentiated	
• Socialized, nonaggressive		
• Atypical		

Appendix B

Table 2: Summary of Epidemiological Findings

Study	Age	Sample Size	Criteria	Method	Informants	Measures	Prevalence
11-16 West et al. (2003)	15	1860	DSM-IV	One stage	C	Voice-DISC	M 14.5 F 3.2 both 9.0
MHCA Meltzer et al. (2000)	5 - 15	10,438	ICD-10	One stage Household survey + interview	C P T	Combination of specially designed questionnaires, structured and semi-structured interviews	**5-10** M 6.5 F 2.7 both 4.6 **11-15** M 8.6 F 3.8 both 6.2 **all** M 7.4 F 3.2 both 5.3
Quebec CMHS Breton et al. (1999)	6 - 14	2400	DSM-III-R	One stage	C P T	DISC-2.25	**6-8** C 1.9 T 0.7 P 0.2 **9-11** C 1.9 T 0.6 P 0.5 **12-14** C 2.3 T 0.7 P 0.4 **6-14** C 2.0 T 0.7 P 0.4
Simonoff et al. (1997)	8 - 16	2762	DSM-III-R	One stage	C	CAPA	**8-10** M 4.5 F 2.1 **11-13** M 4.7 F 2.3 **14-16** M 9.0 F 4.8 **all** M 5.9 F 2.9
Dutch Verhulst et al. (1997)	13 – 18 (int); 4 – 18 (screen)	1st: 2227 2nd: 200	DSM-III-R	Two stage	C P T	Youth Self Report CBCL Teacher Report Form DISC-2.23 DISC-P	**DISC-P** 1.2% **DISC-C** 5.6% **DISC-P or C** 6% **DISC-P & C** 0.6
GSM Costello et al. (1996)	9, 11, 13	1st: 3896 2nd: 1015	DSM-III-R	Two stage	C P	CBCL CAPA	M 5.43 F 1.13 both 3.32

MECA Shaffer et al. (1996)	9-17	1285	DSM-III-R	One stage	C P	DISC CGAS Columbia Impairment Scale	C 4.4 P 1.4 both 5.8
Cohen et al. (1993)	10 - 20	776	DSM-III-R	One stage (two waves of data collection)	C P	DISC-1	**10-13** M 16 F 13.8 **14-16** M 15.8 F 9.2 **17-20** M 9.5 F 7.1
Feehan et al. (1993)	18	930	DSM-III-R	One stage	C	Denver Youth Survey Youth Interview Schedule	5.5
Christchurch Fergusson et al. (1993)	15	961	DSM-III-R	One stage	C P	DISC + supplementary questions	C 3.2 P 3.3
Lewinsohn et al. (1993)	14-18	Time 1: 1713 Time 2: 1508	DSM-III-R	One stage (two sweeps one year apart)	C	LIFE Interview	**Time 1** M 4.88 F 1.68 both 3.22 **Time 2** M 4.01 F 1.6 both 2.72
Dunedin MHDS McGee et al. (1990)	15	943	DSM-III	One stage	C P	Self Report Early Delinquency scale Revised Behavior Problem Checklist	**CD (aggressive)** 1.6 **CD (nonaggressive)** 5.7

Anderson et al. (1987)	11		DSM-III	One stage	P T	Rutter Child Scale A Rutter Child Scale A	3.4 % (aggressive subtype; no other subtype present) M: F ratio 3.2:1
Offord et al. (1987); Boyle et al. (1987)	4 - 16	2679	DSM-III	One stage	C	Child Behavior Checklist Specially developed clinical interview	**4-11** M 6.5% F 1.8% **12-16** M 10.4% F 4.1% **all** M 8.1% F 2.7%

KEY	
M	**Male**
F	**Female**
C	**Child**
P	**Parent**
T	**Teacher**

Appendix C

Name	CD Status	Social Class Status	Impairment Status* (Age 15)	Impairment Status* (Age 18)
Keiron	No CD	MC		
Dean	CD Age 15	MC	Severe	
Brendan	No CD	WC		
Calum	No CD	WC		
Katy	No CD	MC		
Andrew	CD Age 15	MC	Severe	
Emily	CD Age 15	WC	Severe	
Jane	No CD	WC		
George	CD Age 15	WC	None	
Louise	CD Age 15	MC	Severe	
Naomi	No CD	MC		
Charlie	CD Age 15&18	MC	None	None
Greg	CD Age 15	WC	Severe	
Tom	CD Age 15&18	MC	Mild	None
Robbie	No CD	WC		
Gordon	CD Age 15	MC	Severe	
Suzanne	No CD	WC		
Peter	CD Age 15	N/C	Mild	
Jillian	Com CD/ Age 15&18	MC	Severe	Severe
Nick	CD Age 15&18	MC	Severe	Mild
Ricky	CD Age 15&18	MC	Mild	Severe
Moira	Com CD/ CD Age 15	MC	Severe	
Paula	Com CD/ CD Age 15	WC	None	
David	Age 18 CD	MC	None	
Justine	CD Age 15	MC	Mild	
Steve	CD Age 15&18	WC	Severe	Mild
Lucy	CD Age 15	MC	Mild	
Aaron	CD Age 18	WC	None	
Geoffrey	CD Age 15	MC	Severe	
Ahmed	CD Age 15	MC	None	
Simon	Com CD/ CD Age 15	WC	Severe	
Glen	CD Age 15&18	MC	None	None

Com   comorbid
MC   middle class
WC   working class

* (West et al., 2003)

Appendix D

Interview Topics

Biography
- Family
- Area
- Peers
- School

Antisocial behaviour
- Definitions
- Own experiences of "getting into trouble"
- General views
- Behaviour-specific explanations
- Main reason

Dealing with antisocial behaviour
- Recommendations

Aspirations
- Future plans
- Role model
- Satisfaction with current situation

MRC
Medical Research Council

Lifestyles Project
Information Sheet

UNIVERSITY
of
GLASGOW

This PhD project is being funded by the Medical Research Council and is being carried out by Dominique Harvey who is based at the MRC Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, 4 Lilybank Gardens, Glasgow.

Purpose of the project

The focus of this project is on young people and their lifestyles, with a particular emphasis on understanding why some young people seem to get into trouble while others don't.

What am I being asked to do?

Your involvement in this study will be to take part in a face-to-face interview with the researcher (Dominique Harvey) which will be recorded with your permission. This interview will include questions about you, your family, your friends, your daily life, school/ work, and your opinions on why some young people seem to get into trouble more than others.

Why have I been contacted?

You have recently taken part in the 16+ study and have been selected because of the answers you gave to some of the interview questions. We are interested in following up some of these questions and discussing your life and views in more detail.

Who will get to hear what I say?

Everything that you say in the interview is completely confidential and will not be passed on to anyone else. The only exception to this would be if you mention an ongoing situation in which you are placing another person's life or health at risk of significant harm (e.g. child sexual abuse). In such cases, we will discuss the best way to inform a responsible adult to help deal with the situation. Otherwise, everything you say will go no further than the research team.

Your name will be changed if any quotes are taken from the interview for inclusion in publications or presentations related to the project. Any other personal details (e.g. name of brother/ sister etc.) will be changed so that your comments cannot be traced back to you.

How will the information I give be used?

We hope to be able to develop a fuller understanding of young people's lifestyles and the reasons why some people get into trouble more than others and why some people are more prepared to take risks. It is anticipated that findings from the study will be used to provide information on how young people may avoid getting caught up in trouble and to inform policy makers of the best ways in which to help young people in trouble. If you choose to participate in the research, you will receive a feedback sheet which outlines the findings of the research at the end of the study.

What will I get for taking part in the study?

You will receive a payment of £20 once you have completed the interview and, if you decide to be interviewed in the university, your travelling costs will be reimbursed.

Appendix F

MRC
Medical Research Council

Social and Public Health Sciences Unit
University of Glasgow
4 Lilybank Gardens
Glasgow
G12 8RZ

Telephone	+44 (0) 141-357 7538
Fax	+44 (0) 141-337 2389
Web	www.msoc-mrc.gla.ac.uk
E-mail	Dominique@msoc.mrc.gla.ac.uk

Dear *participant*,

Lifestyles Project

Thank you for your ongoing support of the MRC research programme, 11-16 and 16+, looking at the health and wellbeing of young people in the West of Scotland. Your involvement has been crucial in building up a picture of the health of young people and is one of the first in-depth studies being carried out in Scotland. We therefore greatly appreciate your commitment to the study.

Previous phases of the study have involved you answering standard questions in interviews and questionnaires, without giving you much opportunity to talk more about your own lifestyle and issues that are important to you. This follow-up study aims to find out more about you and your lifestyle and, in particular, will explore why some young people seem to get into trouble more than others.

I am contacting you and a number of others who have taken part in the 16+ study, with a range of backgrounds and experiences, to try to shed light on this area. I will be especially interested in finding out what you do in your leisure time, your relationship with friends and family, what you think about the area you live in and the school you went to, as well as your opinions on why some young people seem to get into trouble more than others.

This session will therefore be very informal and will last between 1 and 1½ hours. I would very much like to meet you and hear your views at a time and place convenient to you (either in the university or somewhere closer to your home). In recognition of the time you are giving up, you will receive £20 and, if you decide to come to the university, your travelling expenses will be reimbursed.

Please contact me by telephone or e-mail if you are interested in participating in the study. If I don't hear from you, I will follow up this letter with a telephone call. I very much look forward to hearing from you and learning about your experiences. I hope that you will continue to support our study.

Yours sincerely

Dominique Harvey

MRC
Medical Research Council

Lifestyles Project

Consent Form

Please tick as appropriate:

☐ I agree to take part in the Lifestyles Project, as described in the information sheet (October 2002).

☐ I understand that I do not need to answer any questions if I do not want to and that I can stop the interview at any time. I realise that any information I give will be treated in strictest confidence.

☐ I agree that quotes from the interview can be included in the publications and presentations resulting from the project and I understand that my name will be changed so that no comments can be traced back to me.

☐ I understand that the interview will be recorded, and that my name, address and any other personal details will be removed from the transcript which will be stored in a locked cabinet in the MRC Unit for 10 years, in line with MRC policy.

Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____

MRC
Medical Research Council

UNIVERSITY
of
GLASGOW

Lifestyles Project

Contact Numbers

Childline

- Free, confidential helpline for children and young people in the U.K.

Tel: 0800 1111
Website: www.childline.org.uk

The Samaritans

- Provides confidential emotional support on all topics.

Tel: 08457 909090
E-mail: JO@SAMARITANS.ORG
Website: www.samaritans.org
Local branch: 210 West George Street
                Glasgow
                G2 2DQ
                Tel: 0141 248 4488

Youth Access

- Specialises in providing information about youth counsellors and support services.

Tel: 020 8772 9900
E-mail: admin@youthaccess.org.uk
Address: 2 Taylors Yard
                67 Alderbrook Road
                Clapham
                London
                SW12 8AD

Interview Schedule

Professional biography
- Previous occupation(s)
- Route into psychiatry
- Number of years in psychiatry
- No. of posts/ authorities
- Specialist area

"Epidemiology" of caseload
- Proportion of caseload CD; proportion girls/ boys
- Describing a "typical" case of CD
- Typical treatment programme; efficacy
- Beliefs about aetiology
- Comorbidity – issue in diagnosis/ treatment?
- Departmental vs. individual approach
- ODD – separate disorder or developmental precursor?

Diagnostic criteria
- Opinions on diagnostic criteria
- Implications of changing diagnostic criteria

Future projections
- Present vs. future challenges in dealing with CD
- Projecting 10 years on, estimating prevalence (sex ratio), intervention efforts etc.
- Do you think there are any aspects of CD which are particularly poorly understood/ deserve more research attention?

Table 4.1:Summary of Patterning of Behaviour-Specific Explanations

	Peer Influence	Family/ Upbringing	Power & Identity	Character Traits	Immaturity	Thrill	Personal Gain	Triggers	Psycho-pathy	Behaviour-specific
Staying out late	●	●	●		●					
Truancy	●	●	●	●						●
Vandalism	●	●		●	●	●		●	●	
Theft	●	●	●		●	●	●			
Arson	●	●		●		●	●	●	●	●
Assault & Mugging	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	

● denotes the categories of explanations covered in participants' general explanations