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Abstract
Physical contact is an inevitable aspect of physical education, yet the discomfort which this engenders in a risk averse climate makes tactile interaction between adult and child distinctly problematic. This thesis will analyse the contemporary challenges and practical tensions that surround the act of touch between physical education (PE) teachers and their pupils, attempting to understand the influence of a culture of accusation on professional identity. Utilising semi-structured interviewing with a range of PE staff, the findings have been analytically reinterpreted to form a fictional narrative, representing empirical discussion in a way that cultivates an evocative interrogation of adult/child discomfort. The use of two differing methodological approaches deliberately exploits parallels which may not be immediately apparent. The combination of ‘conventional’ empirical method with ‘alternative’ techniques allows us to redefine the traditional alongside a procedurally sound investigation, taking advantage of the interplay between what is both said and unsaid.

Benefitting from the theory of Michel Foucault, Ulrich Beck, Zygmunt Bauman and Anthony Giddens, the project engenders a collaborative conceptual outlook alongside a formative rationalisation of the contemporary educational landscape. Using this work has enabled an analysis of disciplined conditioning amongst PE teachers, the risk practice and fear which has contemporarily emerged, and the role of reflexivity within this. Given that current trends have prioritised suspicion, thereby undermining notions of practical freedom, it is important to explore the ways in which staff have alternatively reacted to this, since ‘traditional’ modes of interaction are gradually eradicated. Through the combination of appropriate social theory with an expressive methodological approach, it has become possible to attend to the current climate with an exploitation of discursive social formation. The study has ultimately recognised the potential for a disruption of fear based discourse thorough an alternative treatment of marginalisation, in ways both productively suggestive and previously underexplored.
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Chapter I
Introduction
**Touch, alarmism and intergenerational tension in physical education**

Being an adult who works with or indeed near children in contemporary contexts presents a particularly treacherous landscape to negotiate. The purpose of this thesis is to explore the difficulties and challenges which current perceptions surrounding adult/child contact have invoked, and moreover the consequences for physical education (PE) teachers in this climate. That PE staff are forced to make physical contact with children, largely against the rhetorical pressure which a society preoccupied with narratives of abuse exerts, represents a diametrical tension which underlines and symbolises the contradictory reality that now inhabits the discipline.

This chapter will attempt to lay the groundwork for an understanding of the intergenerational landscape and also discuss the factors which have contributed to its emergence. Given that the evolution of a climate of adult/child fear has been relatively swift, it is important that we confront its development immediately. Engagement with the empirical investigation and the subsequent methods of representation used later in the thesis depend, to an extent on a familiarisation with an environment which is evidently problematic, yet contrary to dominant narratives, therefore an introduction to the existential difficulty which surrounds adult contact with children will take place below.

**Setting the scene – Rampant anxiety, inadequate welfare?**

The last two decades have witnessed an identifiable shift in the way that adult interaction with children is interpreted, as notions of education, guidance and nurture have given way to a hypersensitive awareness of the potential for predatory, exploitative abuse (Clapton et al, 2012). The adult has been cultivated into a dangerous entity in modern settings, directly threatening the innocence and purity of childhood with a manipulative distortion of hierarchical
superiority. This is a hyperbolic and highly caricatured interpretation, however the idea that the adult is now a genuine threat to a vulnerable generation of children has come to influence policy, practice and personal disposition in ways both complex and far-reaching (Hacking, 1991, 1992). In addition to the routine emasculation, accusation and suspicion which a culture of prevention encourages, is the inherent difficulty with any resistance to this. Bemoaning an environment which is consistent in its regulation of adult/child interaction marks one out as a possible sympathiser, facilitating the intricate networks of abuse which have according to prevalent thought become central components of sexual criminality.

Whereas PE teachers, sports coaches, youth workers, volunteers and many other professionals have legitimate cause for concern when an atmosphere has predetermined their ‘dubious intentions’, the mere suggestion that regulatory method and preventative intervention is perhaps excessive has been deemed a somewhat irrelevant position, as the ‘fight’ against child abuse inexorably continues. Hysteria and existential fear has become so heavily inured in socially constitutive action that the subject of child abuse and the perpetuation of the idea that all children are at risk, entirely overshadows the grievances of a community of professionals whose social value has been sharply compromised. Indeed the motivation for this project lies not in the continuity of a discussion which concerns the existence of child sexual abuse, but rather the way in which PE staff have become redundant in this context, despite their obvious and largely unparalleled ‘insider’ knowledge. How is it possible to directly attempt to diminish the opportunity for and existence of child sexual abuse if those with unique insight into the dynamics of adult/child contact are increasingly distanced from their pupils and simultaneously ignored? Both figurative and literal barriers have been established between teachers and students and although rooted in the imperatives of child welfare, this has instead proved to be as damaging as non-intervention (see Duggan and Piper, 2013).
It will be necessary to deconstruct not only the problematic consequences of an environment which favours the removal of non-essential contact from PE, but also the paradoxical processes which have come to characterise approaches to adult/child interaction in both notion and reality. There is a functioning contradiction in place, as the circumspection of risk aversion becomes inextricably connected to the discordance of moral panic. Indeed it is sharply apparent here that a system of risk dominance in its various guises and a concurrent interpretation of moral panic operate reciprocally and with relatively little opposition. As Piper, Garratt and Taylor state (2013, p.592) ‘In the present case, the experience of many sports coaches and PE teachers, and the way in which their activities have been affected, suggests that the effects of this moral panic on a risk-averse society have been particularly intense.’ It is therefore important to attempt to highlight the incongruities which appear to sustain a climate of misdirected, and by definition misinformed, public outrage, as we rationalise the emergence of intergenerational tension and its subsequent establishment as a conventional aspect of social discussion.

The everyday practice of PE teachers will be under scrutiny here, in a bid to ascertain the extent to which it has been shaped and manipulated by the contemporary tendency to accuse first and investigate second. The action of the PE teacher, either physical or verbal, is now charged with a potency which implies that a strict, immovable hierarchy is in place, in which the adult controls and dominates the child, who is beholden to the intentions of a potentially predatory, naturally exploitative leader whose power is routinely abused. That the adult in this situation is in fact rendered ineffective by such a narrative has not been fully addressed. Child protection strategies largely bypass the reality of the situation in order to encourage a widespread yet incoherent system of prevention. Attempting to develop PE as a discipline under the auspices of such a climate presents teachers, heads, administrators and indeed those with an
interest in educational progression with a number of inherent challenges, and it is through a discussion with working practitioners that it will become possible to identify such difficulties. This will be confronted head on through the fieldwork, as a range of teachers from a range of schools will be spoken to in depth about their experiences of contemporary practice. An engagement with those who bear the brunt of an atmosphere of heightened suspicion has the potential to reveal not only the extent to which this climate has established itself but also the manner in which we have enabled or resisted it. The way that current attitudes surrounding intergenerational interaction have been shaped by cumulative concern and alarmist hyperbole has clouded rational measurement (see Furedi, 2004, 2013), yet the requirement to instigate workable, functioning systems which counteract the opportunity for sexually abusive behaviour is increasingly intense. This will remain unfeasible if the general approach to the issue of child sex abuse and its presence in schools and other contexts is so heavily dictated by the inconsistency of ‘mob’ induced pressure.

**The emergence of intergenerational fear**

It is possible to identify the way in which child safety has become a fundamental contemporary preoccupation by exploring its rise in mass media over the last twenty-five years and its now resident ubiquity in Anglo-American contexts. Although heightened discussion of child welfare has not necessarily been an exclusively ‘modern’ pursuit, as every generation has exercised some form of nurture (Alaggia, 2004), the tendency of modern news outlets to exaggerate and indeed perpetuate fear is of particular distinction. The way in which news became a product in American contexts in the Seventies and Eighties and was later commodified in Great Britain with the emergence of British Sky Broadcasting and twenty-four hour news, has come alongside a widely held interpretation of children and childhood that has been reflected in the cultivation of concern. Best (1990, p. 171) speaks of the American
perception of children during what was a pivotal era for the creation of a rhetorical narrative of heightened anxiety:

And what do children represent? ... First, children represent the future. American culture has been generally optimistic about the future, and American political rhetoric is filled with references to the children who are “our most precious natural resource,” “the future leaders of our country,” and “our nation’s future.” To do something for children is to do something for the future. Second, children represent vulnerability. They are small, innocent, weak, inexperienced; they need protection. They are themselves vulnerable, but they also often serve as symbols of a more general vulnerability.

Although there are marked subjective differences between American and British approaches to the notion of childhood, when communication in the U.K becomes so heavily influenced by American models, such has been the case in mass media contexts, similarities in meaning, intention and message begin to surface. The comment above can be as appropriately applied to a British setting, and although somewhat general in focus it is possible to see how a fixation with the preservation of ‘childhood purity’, and perhaps more significantly a recognition and subsequent amplification of threats to this, became an established social norm.

A combination of the way in which children represent a tangible link to the future fate of an entire nation and their simultaneous vulnerability again demonstrates a contradiction of sorts. We rely on children to continue the social stability and relative financial security to which we have become accustomed in the West, although they are also innocent versions of ourselves, unfettered by the often disilluisioning realities of adult life. How can we successfully connect the two when we exclude both a coherent preparation for the maintenance of our imagined societal permanence and a protection of the hope and lack of inhibition which childhood invokes? As a result there has been a distortion of the intervention which attempts to deconstruct adult/child interaction, reflective
as it is of our inability to process a shifting interpretation of the contemporary consequences of childhood and its meaning (see Darbyshire, 2007, Postman, 1994). Whilst it would be irresponsible to claim that all reporting of child sexual abuse is sensationalised scare mongering, the mere fact that it responds to our deepest existential discomforts, awakening a fear which is unrestrained by a lack of rationality, allows narratives of abuse to spread without question, often bypassing notions of integrity or legitimacy (Young, 2009). The effect of the discussion and dispersal of sexual abuse narratives is one which evokes a visceral, unaccountable reaction from a public which remains at odds with its own approach to childhood. Nurture, progression and protection are all necessary, and arguably fundamental, aspects of the adult’s socially developmental make-up when it comes to non-parental child rearing, yet they are not able to be utilised alone or collectively by a societal system which misappropriates each intergenerational action so drastically (Honoré, 2008).

It seems that the simultaneous rise in media saturation, its subsequent influence and the notion that children are under increasing threat has occurred in an inherently reciprocal way. Fear, concern and the call for intervention are invoked and sustained by media sensationalism of varying levels, yet the public discomfort which is seen when child sexual abuse is discussed also contributes to such narratives. This results in a cycle of salacious, interrogative ‘storyboarding’ of abuse and increasing unrest in a population which is by now genuinely concerned (Bell, 2002, Burke Draucker and Martsolf, 2008). The debate over which aspect initiated the contemporary preoccupation with child abuse is relatively immaterial; the real dilemma lies in exposing the damaging capability which the combination of an exploitation of deep seated fear and the inability to disregard discussion of a particularly unsettling social ill can wield. Drawing attention to the wholesale docility of a social group in addition to the interrogation of subject matter which can be topically volatile, not only allows us to explore the miscommunication which further incongruities can encourage,
but also the real dangers resident in an environment which appears to favour a response to instinctive, overt and sometimes superficial problems before the more nuanced aspects of the situation are approached. We rely on our base fears in this context to a large degree, in many instances bypassing any possibility for a rationalisation of the subject (Soothill and Francis, 2002). The recognition of this by media interests has represented a lucrative and perhaps more significantly, well established cultivation of reactionary association, obscuring a more measured investigation on behalf of those attempting to counteract abuse and silencing the voices of the teachers and staff affected by this. There is little call for reasoned debate when an issue which evokes such collective hysteria and generates such far reaching publicity is encountered. The way in which child sexual abuse has become a topic of central populist importance serves to incentivise its sensational distortion, by appealing to its marketability and embedded public interest at the same time. There is no legitimate space to contest this, either in the interests of an interrogation into the actual existence of abuse or indeed the negative and damaging consequences of a climate of suspicion. The development of contemporary perception surrounding child sexual abuse has been wholly within the confines of a notion which places the act(s) on a pedestal, subversively revering culprits with an almost demented lust for ‘justice’. The fact that this approach is unsustainable has not been accounted for, as suspicion and indeed accusation are allowed to flourish in settings which are often harmed by such prevalence.

There is an inherent and even urgent need to re-evaluate the way in which child sexual abuse, as it is now nominally identified in British contexts, is processed by populations which remain unable to coherently confront such subject matter. Kincaid (1998, p.3) has called for and subsequently explored an alternative interpretation of child molestation, as the way in which the idea straddles the line between reality and abhorrent, demonic invention has yet to be investigated. He states:
Few stories in our culture right now are as popular as those of child molesting, and I wonder why this should be so. We are likely to say that the reality of child sexual abuse compels us to speak, to break the silence, but I would like to poke at that compulsion and at the connections between “the reality of child sexual abuse” and the stories we tell about it. Why do we generate these stories and not others? What rewards do they offer? Who profits from their circulation and who pays the price?

These questions are of the utmost relevance to both the intentions of this thesis and indeed the contemporary public perceptions that surround child sexual abuse in its real and imagined terms. The implication here is that there is far more to the sexual abuse of children than mere thought or action. Just as children are exploited by adults who wish to abuse, the process as a whole gets utilised and manipulated according to the moral inconsistencies of a society which struggles to approach the issue with any constructive rationality. There is subsequent value in the perpetuation of narratives which both denounce and sensationalise as the ‘reality of child sexual abuse’ is diluted in a competitive landscape of blame and appropriation. That Kincaid discusses the ‘storied’ nature of child abuse is itself highly appropriate. The issue has taken on a narrative resonance which extends and exaggerates whilst undermining the genuine presence of child molestation in diverse and often unaccountable contemporary contexts.

**The narrativisation of abuse**

The primary dissemination of child sexual abuse has manifested itself in the widespread, alarmist immediacy of a culture that seemingly benefits from a cultivation of this nature, and the ‘story’, whether accurate or fabricated, has gained particular credence in current settings (Garland, 2008). As we apply a system of *storification* to an issue which is greatly influenced by the runaway imaginations of a now over stimulated audience, child sexual abuse becomes
separated into conflicting states of public and private processing. It needs to be dealt with objectively, taking fact and empirical evidence into consideration, however the tendency of a public, hungry for a discourse which categorically bemoans and then prosecutes largely without any investigatory diligence, creates the perfect conditions for misinformation and hysterical rhetoric to thrive. It is impossible to accommodate both reason and irrationality under these circumstances, although the manner in which intergenerational tension has become so heavily inured in narrative re-appropriation speaks of an attempt to process the subject on a number of conflicting levels (see Butler and Drakeford, 2005).

Whereas convention consistently tells us that child sexual abuse must be confronted with a disregard for any indirect consequences, the divergence of opinion which storied predominance encourages suggests a dangerous interplay between benign subjectivity and problematic objectivity. As the teacher, sports coach or youth worker is characterised as a dubious and dangerous adult ‘other’, it is then possible to reveal a process of unfair marginalisation at work in an underlying system of operation. This has prompted the utilisation of a fictional investigation, and although this will be explored in far greater detail elsewhere, the methodology provides an overarching philosophical grounding which refers to and informs the intentions of the thesis. In addition, is the cultivation of the notion of audience and the collectivism which the subject of child sexual abuse has engendered. The thesis uses the term ‘we’ throughout, as the way in which social consensus and group mentality has influenced the dynamics of adult/child interaction is a telling indicator of the significance of discourse. With this in mind, the idea that there has been a powerful display of rhetorical union should be acknowledged and accommodated, providing as it does an explanation of the seductive, sociable and applicable aspects of an extended moral panic. To reinforce this, influence has again been taken from Kincaid (1998, p.5) who states:
And why, to deal openly with a vexing issue, speak of “we”? We who? ... I am speaking of stories that blow through all of us and of locations on a map where we find ourselves without being aware that we are anyplace in particular or that where we are conditions what we see ... I am trying to get at the commonality formed by a set of culturally and historically specific stories that we are told and tell quite earnestly, without recognising their source or their consequences. “We” is the we watching *60 minutes*, protecting our children, chemically castrating “sexual predators”.

The wholesale and now ubiquitous discussion of child welfare in contemporary Western contexts concerns almost everyone and although inherently divisive in empirical terms, the notional dispersal of a language of protection and prevention has made the debate universal. Indeed, Kincaid goes on to say (1998, p. 5-6) that; ‘we are all implicated in a contemporary discourse on children, sexuality and assault so mighty that it comes close to defining our moment.’ Child protection, the subsequent associations with the issue of child abuse and its discussion, exploration and deconstruction have become fundamental characteristics of modern social ordering. It is impossible to bypass or ignore this debate as it contributes to the formation of an environment to which we all, to some degree belong and exist within. Describing the theme as ‘moment defining’ although written sixteen years ago, loses none of its potency, as stories remain in print concerning abuse on levels which appear to plumb new depths of depravity and in increasing volume. Whether this is a genuine trend or indeed a superficial consequence of the saturation of media outlets is subject to debate; what is not is the durability of a narrative of adult exploitation, as the early Twenty First century continues to maintain a disproportionate preoccupation with a theme which goes beyond mere topicality.

Using ‘we’ throughout the thesis is a conscious effort to remind myself and the audience that child abuse as an ‘issue’, social ill, psychological disorder or
contemporary phenomenon holds sway over entire populations with relatively few exceptions. Not only does this present the researcher attempting to encourage an alternative approach to the discussion with a sometimes problematic complexity, it also ties up debate in the vagaries of position and dualistic selection. Utilising ‘we’ and the associated meanings offers an opportunity to project the way in which public opinion, an important and influential aspect of the discursive construction of child sexual abuse, will process the multi-faceted circumstances which the topic provokes, without the need for a demonstration or assertion of categorical ‘position’. Although there is an argument which would perhaps counter the use of ‘we’ in a project which critiques the influence of a collectivised hysteria, this misses the point somewhat, as the ‘we’ recognises the development of this climate of fear and functions as a representation of the ease with which social ‘codification’ takes place and manifests itself.

**PE teachers and professional responses**

It has become apparent that child sexual abuse and the preconceptions which are encouraged by a subsequent preoccupation with the notion have established themselves to the point of convention (see Johnson, 2013, McWilliam, 1996). The interest therefore lies in the ways in which teaching staff have responded or reacted to this. Is it even possible to counteract the influence of the tension which surrounds adult/child interaction, when it appears to consume social contexts so intensively? PE teachers have been selected for analysis here as they represent a professional community that arguably has one of the strongest connections to the challenges surrounding intergenerational tension.

There is value in exploring the experiences of broadly equivalent professionals, including youth workers or sports coaches, however the regular and inevitable
contact with children (both physical and otherwise) which PE teachers must negotiate brings the debate into particularly sharp focus. We have the opportunity to discover and understand a great deal about intergenerational dynamics, however the pressures which are exerted by mounting fear, causes administrators and policy makers to routinely ignore the adult practitioner in favour of a constant and exhaustive system of bureaucratic regulation (Piper, Taylor and Garratt, 2012). Teachers are often only referred to in a punitive context, ‘named and shamed’ in the light of transgression, yet overlooked completely when they legitimately help children. Relationships cannot be forged without there being accompanying suspicion, as intention and motive become naturally questioned by a complex public interrogation. Why would an adult go out of her/his way to help a child without holding some sinister and perverted desire? What is in this for the adult except for an opportunity to manipulate and exploit a vulnerable, developing mind? Whilst these questions may seem unnecessarily alarmist, they evidently represent the kind of attitudes which have become commonplace in intergenerational contexts (Sikes and Piper, 2010). The idea that adults can either remain cold and distant or involved and corrupting has established itself firmly in associated discussion, again perpetuating a misleading dualism which serves populist concern and little else.

Teaching staff are forced to negotiate this, in an environment which diminishes notions of personal choice and individual expression in favour of approaches which exclusively attempt to expel damaging complaint. Such is the pressure to avoid accusation, or indeed suspicion, there has been a failure to acknowledge any positive potential which adults may hold in these contexts, as the predominant focus has centred around the limitation of physical contact and the removal of doubt. As members of staff become more disposable, their contemporary role being more one of abstract surveyor than effective and demonstrative teacher, the realities of the situation will present a particular problem for those burdened with recruitment. Continuing to overlook teachers,
dehumanising them under the auspices of an underlying desexualisation, will in effect render PE teaching a decidedly unattractive career to enter or indeed remain within.

There are, at first glance, a number of practical and figurative obstacles to overcome over the course of a typical PE teaching career, however this adversity is potentially tempered by a new and evolutionary form of inter-professionalism which ‘unseen’ marginalisation has provoked (Jones, Bailey and Santos, 2013). It is hoped that we can discover the steps which need to be taken in order to either encourage new forms of collective cohesion in teaching communities, or indeed galvanise and build upon the structures which already exist. As teachers represent what can be regarded as the ‘front line’ in the conflict which rages on between the almost autocratic techniques which have inhabited child protection schemes (Bolen, 2001) and the consequences for the adult professionals which readily emerge, the passivity which this climate incites is unlikely to be entirely accommodated. Teachers have been beset with limitations and inhibition on a regular and now highly predictable basis, and to expect a wholly docile acceptance of such measures implies that any notion of professional identity, unionised reaction or indeed simple personal integrity has been completely extinguished.

With this in mind it is important to assess the potency of intergenerational fear and the way in which this climate has influenced and perhaps manipulated populations. How feasible is communal or individual reaction when notions of child welfare and default suspicion have such oppressive capability? It is important to acknowledge the fact that we are drawn into an argument here which surrounds two definable and for the most part incongruent realities. There is however some potential in accommodating an idea which does not present a climate of fear or professional reaction in a mutually exclusive model. After all, if the two are both such resolute characteristics of contemporary
circumstance then why should they not both function? Investigating the
dynamics of PE teaching and by extension PE staff, in an environment of
intergenerational tension presents a complex challenge, and we should
therefore be prepared to accept hypotheses which contradict or subvert our
original preconceptions.

**Fictional construction**

Benefitting from (i) an empirical investigation, (ii) fictional reinterpretation and
(iii) the on-going application of social theory, the thesis will attempt to connect
these three approaches with a view to defining and explaining how a system as
problematic as this evident climate of fear emerges, is maintained and then
challenged. The fictional reinterpretation will adapt and ‘tease out’ the verbatim
dialogue collected during the interviewing stages, as the meaning, intention and
message behind what has and has not been said will be provocatively explored
through a process of storied (de)construction (see Garrett, 2006). Utilising these
techniques allows us to process the notion of child sexual abuse and its
influence on intergenerational interaction, in ways which both appeal to our
more conventional sensibilities and also the ability to look beyond the
traditional, itself important when exploring an issue which has upset a number
of previous equilibriums.

Employing a relatively ‘stable’ methodological approach by using semi-
structured interviewing and an ethnographic commentary helps the audience to
situate the debate within a context which is clear and definable. As the
environment in schools and other adult/child settings has become one of
particular complexity, this will potentially enable readers to engage with the
challenges facing PE staff on a practical level, as behaviour is gradually modified
in line with the subtle yet identifiable consistencies in contemporary schooling.
This complexity can also be harnessed, as the fictional representation gives
audiences the opportunity to individually interpret this context in a way which builds upon and develops their earlier conclusions. The way in which this may consolidate their thoughts or indeed contradict them encourages an interesting process of reflexive deconstruction, essentially bringing to life many of the emotions, fears and concerns which this subject often privately evokes (Witherell and Noddings, 1991). The reader is forced to confront the uncomfortable associations which are brought about by a discussion of this nature, in such a way as to position the debate on another existential level. The empirical study introduces the audience to the scenarios under scrutiny, largely retaining an interpretation of objectivity which the reader will no doubt be searching for, whilst this objectivity is then interrogated and challenged in the fictional piece.

Depicting the comments of teachers in a way that builds a story out of their words re-imagines the idea of objectivity in qualitative social research, and subsequently offers audiences an opportunity to interact with the subject matter in a manner which would not be possible if they were simply exposed to a conventional empirical representation. The empirical interviewing and ethnographic report is arguably no more ‘objective’ than a fictionalised story, and the intention here is to recognise this and perhaps make reference to the tendency to mislead when describing a particular method as ‘reliable’ or ‘valid’ (see Inckle, 2010, Rhodes and Brown, 2005). The juxtaposition and similarities between conventional empiricism and fictional representation offer an approach to social research which engenders a more variable and perhaps well rounded response from the reader. Audience populations become able to step outside of the traditional boundaries of academic convention and assess this environment personally and productively as the process becomes informative on various levels (see Frank, 2000, Jones, 2011, Sparkes, 1996, 2007).
**Intentions**

The way in which contemporary systems tend to gravitate towards accusation in the first instance, not only speaks to us about a collective desire for the notion of abuse to be eradicated, but also demonstrates a subsequent disregard for other members of this increasingly fragile social union (McWilliam and Jones, 2005). It is hoped that this project can interrogate both the existence of and reasons behind an environment that cultivates concern in ways which remain unnecessary and damaging. Identifying the extent to which PE teaching has shifted in focus since the 1980s onwards will be of huge importance here, as the imperatives of an entirely new, yet firmly established culture of child welfare exerts its influence. Physical education becomes fundamentally different when the elements which control its provision have alternative motives. Sport and the physical contact and relational behaviour which it encompasses represent significant cause for concern in a climate that attempts to stifle the autonomy and freedoms of athletic interaction, instead replacing this with a sanitised but topically ‘safe’ approach to practice (Scott, 2013). There is then a troubling dilemma in place when the practical realities of PE are deconstructed, as they do not fit with contemporary standards of acceptability in spite of school sport being a supposedly valued aspect of childhood development. The somewhat grudging acceptance of PE as an unavoidable but potentially fractious aspect of the curriculum situates teachers, students and parents in positions where needs are seldom met and questions are left unanswered. PE and by extension the intergenerational touch which it precipitates is the educational ‘elephant in the room’ as the obvious but largely ignored tension between its necessity and the discomfort invoked continues to place practitioners under significant pressure.

It is hoped that we can at least draw attention to the processes which have been responsible for what is an almost unworkable organisation, as the interaction between adult and child remains both necessary and subject to
increasing scrutiny (Jenkins, 1998, Kennedy, 2006). Indeed when we examine
the tensions evident in PE teaching in the first instance, it is difficult to see how
intervention has not already taken place. The consistent irrationality of the
climate and a wholesale disregard for the plight of an entire community of
professionals are convincing enough reasons, yet we seem intent on
perpetuating these systems with a dogmatic commitment to pervasive and
exhaustive notions of child protection.

Throughout the course of the thesis I will attempt to explore the emergence
and establishment of these narratives of fear and how evidence and reason
have become insignificant in modern contexts. Indeed the redefinition of proof,
and the increasing currency of conjecture and hyperbole have had considerable
influence over PE and education as a whole (Piper, Duggan and Rogers, 2013).
It is important that we approach the issues surrounding intergenerational
concern with a recognition of the way in which thought has been altered here.
Without taking ‘conventional’ interpretation for granted, we should be prepared
to accept and explore the ways in which adult/child concern has played a major
role in a societal transition that now favours and legitimates accusation as a
predominates, as we continue to plunge headlong into a social landscape which
has comprehensively shifted towards one of ‘sentient moralism’. This term is
reflective of the new immediacy of moralistic concern in contemporary contexts.
The way in which notions surrounding behavioural standards and expectations
are becoming more invasive, more intelligent and effectively ‘alive’, has created
a difficult and routinely hazardous environment for adult workers who are
seemingly responsible for their thoughts in addition to their actions. There is
subsequently great value in assessing the levels to which this new moralistic
organism has dictated the pedagogical interpretations of PE teachers, and the
way in which new behavioural norms have been constructed. Within this
characterisation of moralistic growth we can also address the changes which
have undergone contemporary ideas of truth and representation, as we begin to see how this environment has been allowed to flourish under a system which distorts through fear, and a necessary, ‘socially dutiful’ agenda of continuity.

It is clear that the discussion of adult/child interaction under contemporary circumstances is heavily associated with a new interpretation of the way in which we process information. Indeed ‘information’ becomes subject to considerable change as we accept and reject with a proclivity towards outrage rather than truth (Piper and Stronach, 2008). It is therefore very easy to become caught up in an evaluation which is itself motivated not by fact and evidence, but by the conclusions reached by a consensus which mollifies the concern of an interested, restless population. Remaining mindful of the public and private tendency towards misinformation, and its appropriating capacity in this landscape, the depiction of empirical evidence under the auspices of a fictional narrative represents an accommodation of this new convention, whilst its empirical foundation safeguards the accuracy of the investigation. The way in which child sexual abuse is portrayed and then broadcast has turned the public into an audience, and the methods by which this audience processes the issue are largely guided by salacious exaggeration and moralistic rhetoric. A significant proportion of media reportage is couched in agenda and manipulative intent, thereby reflecting the potency of sexual misconduct narratives and their currency amongst contemporary populations (see Kehily, 2010, Weber, 2009). By engaging however, with a development which has a legitimate grounding, such as the situation resident in PE teaching, and then joining this new form of inherently ‘storied’ exchange, there is opportunity to communicate a problematic social reality on a populist, and therefore far reaching, scale.
Utilising a manipulative media

There is an important distinction to be made here between the ‘story telling’ which is motivated by an exploitative, market driven intention and that which has the interests of a marginalised community of professionals in mind. Whereas it may appear as though a media which remarks upon the prevalence of abuse is performing an important and necessary public act, and the construction of a fictional narrative based around the experiences of PE teachers somehow detracts from ‘truth’, this can in fact be challenged. The sheer volume of media material which covers child sexual abuse far outweighs any notion of service, as it in fact responds to and exacerbates the discomfort which the subject invokes. It is difficult to distinguish between measured and salacious broadcasting with any real confidence, as the issue has been produced, re-produced and manipulated with such exhaustive repetition. Whilst there are legitimate attempts to attend to child sexual abuse in a responsible way, the public clamour to hear about the latest scandal and the subsequent thirst for justice to be meted out to a stylised transgressor makes opportunistic journalism both obligatory and dominant.

Conversely, when we approach PE staff, who are themselves detrimentally affected by this discursive preoccupation with abuse, and discuss the very real challenges which they face on a consistent basis, the human resonance and genuine evocation provides a suitable basis for the development of an empathetic and provocative narrative fiction. These stories differ from the majority of media coverage in that they are not told with capitalisation and wanton publicity at the forefront of intention, and rather illustrate the unfortunate and largely overlooked difficulties which now constitute an established aspect of physical education.
The main problem with a media which routinely engenders accusation in its clumsy approach to representation is the way in which alternative voices are often silenced regardless of message or impact (Mawby and Walklate, 1994). If the content of dialogue is not in alignment with dominant thought then it is not entertained by a discourse which forgoes argument in favour of expressive outrage. Discussion with teaching staff about accusation and the associated risks involved in daily conduct is overshadowed by an encouragement to accuse such professionals, who have become perennial suspects in contemporary contexts. This offers research such as this a vitality which provokes interesting and varied debate, although the way that this has also marginalised the teacher has had damaging consequences for the profession, and our perceptions surrounding adult/child interaction.

**Aspects to investigate**

The thesis will explore the following three main areas:

(i) the status of touch in contemporary PE
(ii) the influence and currency of moral panic within intergenerational contexts
(iii) how PE teachers (and others) have responded to this climate

Broadly speaking, the notion of touch and the action itself have become disconnected in modern contexts. Touch is for many, an instinctive, expressive act which is entirely separate from forethought or reflection. However the increasing significance of and far greater consequences arising from physical contact, especially between an adult and child, have reconstructed touch as both an idea and an action (Field, 2002, Owen and Gillentine, 2011). As touch is analysed and reflected upon to such an extensive degree any genuine expression or spontaneity is diluted by a collective adherence to a new moral
code. Touch is now purely notional, as its actual performance is embedded within an idea of acceptability and the way that this protects and cleanses both act and actor (Jones, 2004). The ramifications for the PE teacher are considerable. Pedagogical individuality, initiative and technical demonstration are all subject to reinterpretation here, and touching practice guides and dictates this. Touch is no longer real, as real touch carries with it a potency and unpredictability which cannot be accommodated in an environment as tenuous and potentially fractious as an intergenerational one. Whether this has been responsible for or indeed a result of the establishment of adult/child interaction within a narrative of moral panic is difficult to tell. What is fairly clear however is the way in which touch as a proscriptive, premeditated by-product of professional practice lends itself to an atmosphere that has been influenced and in many ways dictated by rising collective concern. Touch is an indirect consequence of adult/child interaction, yet the way that it is directly approached, with fear and regulation, speaks of an inherent connection to a climate of panic.

The act of touch between an adult and child is first invested with problematic meaning, which is then realised in every subsequent occurrence. The action becomes highly problematic as it responds to and confirms our concern, as we negatively ratify the act based upon a prevalent idea of standards, intent and meaning. Indeed when we discuss moral panics and their ‘conventional’ formation under social analysis, the idea of disproportionality comprises one of the five main constituent themes (Goode and Ben-Yehuda 1994). Addressing touch between an adult and child under the auspices of a concern centred around the intentions of the adult and whether the child is at risk has absolutely overlooked the realities of threat, as the actual hazard posed by a PE teacher is completely overshadowed by a projection of danger. Empirically speaking, the ratio of legitimate touch to sexually abusive touch in PE is in favour of legitimacy by a considerable margin, yet this is of little import to the populations
which subscribe to the perception that touch between adult and child is in fact loaded with exploitative potential.

Given that fear and concern surrounding adult/child interaction has begun to moderate our collective behaviour to such an extent, there is support for the contention that the notion of moral panic is itself evolving. Whilst this will be explored in greater detail below, the way in which the coercive force of moralistic concern dictates action when the subject of child abuse is broached suggests that the characteristic ebb and flow of more ‘traditional’ moral panics is absent. Child sexual abuse remains static in its capacity for invoking public fear and perhaps moves beyond the narratives of panic which we have seen manifested in youth movements or conceptually ‘amoral’ cultural trends. With this in mind there is added value in exploring the manner in which teachers have responded to this. As levels of concern within this landscape are at unprecedented levels will they perhaps encourage unprecedented professional reaction? With this it becomes possible to assess the true intensity of modern intergenerational pressure as we investigate the lengths that teachers go to, to counteract an established and evolving form of concern.

The ease or indeed difficulty with which PE staff have adapted to a new model of interrogative regulation, one which functions on a number of levels, will offer an illustrative representation of the ‘status’ of the adult in a climate that continues to isolate the individual in an intergenerational context. We have referred to the need to accept alternatives in the discussion of professional reaction, and this remains significant as the processes which may have come before are rendered ineffective under a more active climate of suspicion (Goode and Ben-Yehuda, 2009). Engaging with teaching unions in ways that look beyond traditional methods can offer a constructive voice to a professional population which has undergone drastic change in recent years. Rather than resist this shift, unions and other supportive bodies should be willing to adapt as
the teachers have had to, and it will be of great interest to explore the potential for this in a contemporary environment.

From an outside perspective it appears as though the National Union of Teachers (NUT) is an extensive and in many ways invaluable resource for the staff member, however given that the public concern surrounding intergenerational touch has become so well established, the union tends not to approach the implications of this beyond ruling and regulation (NUT, 2013b). Whilst there are numerous guidelines, codes of practice and legislation associated with this subject, the deeper, more abstract manifestation of this is overlooked. It is possible to account for public concern by encouraging an adherence to governmentally sanctioned regulation, although there is inherent difficulty in attempting to affect or predict the influence which a climate of suspicion has on a profession using such rigid parameters as a gauge. If the NUT could somehow explore the unseen consequences of a system of intergenerational regulation, then transmit these findings to a population which has been inundated with ‘accountable’ reporting, there is potential for a fresh approach to an issue which continues to favour the idea of concern over the realities of marginalisation.

In addition, the inclusion of the NUT in the difficult and often ‘unaccountable’ landscape of fear which this climate so readily produces, allows more communicative possibility amongst a community which is subject to sharp polarisation (Stidder, 2002). Not only do we have the relatively obvious schisms between parent and teacher, both of whom want the best for the child, there are also potential sources of fracture amongst the PE teachers themselves. Aside from the age differences in the profession, there is a new tendency for two divergent positions to be adopted: one which accepts and adheres fully to the separation of adult and child, and one which attempts to counteract this. Discussing PE staff as a collective may indeed be a counterproductive
assumption given the divisive capabilities of the contemporary atmosphere. It would be somewhat utopian to suggest that teachers will rise up against this ‘benevolent tyranny’ with the quiet dignity of a wronged population without any internal tension or opposition. In-fighting is after all characteristic of a system which divides and conquers in a way as subtly effective as the prevalent adult/child narrative.

Investigation of the extent to which teaching staff have been allowed to respond to a climate of increased concern and the prioritisation of risk will perhaps prove more revealing. Whilst the internal turmoil which an environment such as this is wont to create is likely to continue, providing a turbulent professional environment under the auspices of this new ‘hyper-moral panic’ (see Cottle, 2006, Zanker, 2012), the way in which the dominant, welfare centric narrative loses none of its efficacy represents challenges to the formation of any ‘real’ alternative. Seeing as the scope for a legitimate challenge to the orthodoxy of heightened child protection is relatively limited, the potential for a constructive acceptance of this becomes apparent. Have teachers in effect interpreted the contemporary restrictions placed upon them in a way which simultaneously adheres to preventative method and offers a platform for self-expression? As the conventionally established outlets of collaboration such as union mobilisation and democratic protest may not be available or indeed particularly influential here, there is an opportunity to adapt contemporary structures of power in ways that work to the advantage of the teaching community.

Whilst we have established some interesting points for discussion here, they remain just that. The next section attempts to bring together the literature which has informed this thesis in a way which builds upon and theoretically develops the themes explored above.
Chapter II
Literature Review
Reviewing the literature: discourse vs. construction

The following will approach the previous work that has in the first instance contributed to the discourse surrounding the separation of adult and child and in the second, enabled and enlightened a re-interpretation of what has become a conventional moral position. If this thesis were exploring a different topic it may be appropriate to identify, and give equal weighting, to the work which has developed alongside the environment which is under critique, although in this case a simple referral to such work without an admission of its role would represent something of an oversight. Regarding the study of intergenerational interaction, there has emerged two distinct fields of investigation. This includes work which has attempted to analyse, deconstruct, prevent and expose child abuse, and conversely and in this instance constructively, work which focuses on the damaging nature of a singularly focussed narrative of blame.

This review therefore introduces the investigation which has both contributed to and been influenced by the necessary adoption of child welfare strategy and then moves on to discuss the work which maps and subsequently interrogates the emergence of such a climate. This will be organised into contributions which develop earlier moral panic models, complimentary social theory, and then thematically consider the writing which has informed and facilitated this study. The production of these thematic sections has been reciprocally beneficial, as the literature has lent itself well to such an approach. Rather than force work into subsections and categories which are of passing relevance or too broad a focus, the way that the ideas surrounding moral panic, intergenerational interaction, social change, and touch itself allow an illustrative yet previously underexplored picture to be drawn can help in turn, to justify the organisation below.
The production of discourse

There has been a significant trend in academic writing to focus upon narratives of abuse. This has been sharply focussed within sporting contexts: (see Alaggia, 2004, Brakenridge, 1994, 2001, Brakenridge and Kirby, 1997, Brakenridge and Rhind, 2010 Brakenridge et al, 2012, Burke Draucker and Martsof, 2008, Cense and Brackenridge, 2001, Hartill, 2009, Messner and Sabo, 1994, Parton, 1985, Perry, 1999, Rhind, 2010, Rhind et al, 2012, Toftegaard Nielsen, 2001, Volkwein et al, 1997, Weber, 2009) and this abundance allows us to identify a relevant influence over the discussion of excessive regulation. Using this work we can explore the creation of an orthodox discourse of abuse (and allegation), and the extent to which research that attempts to challenge such established thought is undermined by convention. Indeed the above contributions represent only a selection of the writing which has surrounded sexual abuse in sport, and we could continue to delve into the literature which approaches its existence and subsequent prevention, yet there is arguably greater value in drawing attention to the prevalence of problematic discourse, as we attempt a more critical deconstruction of prevalent thought. Boocock, (2002) has directly investigated the steps taken by sports and sports providers to prevent abusive behaviour in sporting contexts, and explores the initiation of the Child Protection in Sport Unit (CPSU) (Sport England, 2000). Although the article is clear in its intentions, and succeeds in drawing attention to the hitherto lack of formalised measures which specifically combat abuse in sport, the way that troublesome complexity automatically arises when such approaches are taken is conclusively recognised. As Boocock (2002, p. 105-106) states:

The development of work in this field has also opened (or re-opened) a major debate about ethical practice in all levels of sport. If, as would be now widely accepted, children have the right to be safe, why not other vulnerable groups involved in sport? And if it is right for these groups, then is it not right for all athletes of any age, to be protected from abuse and harassment?
This is a particularly valid point and remains relatively underexplored. The significant imbalances we have seen are largely a result of the precedence which has been given to child protection in the years leading up to and following these comments, although it is difficult to bemoan a lack of variation in procedure and attitude when specific interrogative traditions have been so categorically adhered to. All the time there remains academic and political value in preventing, or exposing abuse, there will be little obvious incentive in exploring the tensions that a largely static narrative has encouraged.

The manner in which policy has been influenced by a rhetorically enacted disparity has been clear. The Association for Physical Education (AfPE), an organisation which provides support and guidance for schools and is reliant on membership and inter professional collaboration, have produced literature (Whitlam, 2012) which accepts and promotes a preventative stance. Encouraging readers to ‘protect yourself, your pupils and your school’ (p.3) the publication positions safe practice firmly within the boundaries of a discourse which reveres and appropriates adult/child fear. The AfPE have in addition formed a Policy Advisory Group in an effort to influence governmental intervention, although the way that their manifesto (AfPE, 2008) identifies disproportion between policy driven expectation and the realities of delivery suggests that there are areas of practice, including intergenerational discomfort, which have simply been overlooked. That the guidance on safe practice was published some time after the manifesto indicates that a difficulty with teacher/pupil interaction, whether overtly or tacitly enacted, remains unexplored.

An orthodoxy which has responded to public concern in such a way has proved dangerous. The significance of accusation increases with a reaction to emotional pressure, distortive practice becomes more commonplace and a subsequent realisation that excessive regulation is responsible for this has engendered an
existential discomfort which continues to dictate investigation. Harthill (2013, p. 251) recognises the difficulty with which attitudes are adjusted in a context of child welfare and sport. He suggests that: 'Producing empowering sports climates (work that has certainly already begun) is about generating new narratives, not simply new regulation. The latter is relatively straightforward and (therefore) will secure many advocates, the former much more challenging and with many powerful adversaries.' His paper as a whole explores the concealment of child sexual abuse in sport and although this represents an important investigation, it is another example of the (re)production of a conventional (so in some senses legitimate) system of thought. The reality is that the concealment of child sexual abuse in sport is more likely to continue when a rhetorically punitive landscape is able to flourish. This has been tacitly alluded to in the statement above, yet there remains clear value in pursuing ideas which attempt to realign thought through the exposure of interrogation that capitalises upon subjective manipulation.

**A distinctive moral panic?**

It is relatively difficult to call upon a wealth of literature that has attended to the marginalisation of the adult within intergenerational contexts, although it is possible to examine work which has both contributed to and accounted for the development of an increasingly uneasy social world. Stanley Cohen’s insights are hard to ignore in the initial stages, as he has been responsible for the establishment of a dialogue that has continued since he first explored the notion of moral panic (1967). The situation which we are faced with in contemporary educational contexts bears the hallmarks of a traditional moral panic, on the surface at least, and should be dealt with in a way which has been enabled by Cohen’s systematic interpretations of the rise and consolidation of panic driven social convention. Cohen’s discussions (later developed by Goode and Ben-Yehuda (2009)) have enabled the identification of five key phases that
collectively constitute a moral panic. These include (i) concern (ii) hostility (iii) consensus (iv) disproportionality and (v) volatility. These have all been apparent in the recent preoccupation with narratives of child abuse, although it is perhaps possible to look beyond these five categories when adult/child interaction is approached. Indeed Cohen has stated, in relation to a particular and now typical example of an allegation of impropriety, (2002, p.xv) that ‘The resulting moral panic became a pitched battle of claims and counter claims. So busy were the key players in fingerling each other – social workers, police, paediatricians, doctors, lawyers, parents, local and national politicians, then a judicial inquiry – that there was not even minimal consensus about what the whole episode was about’. Cohen refers here to a sex abuse scandal which occurred in 1987, perhaps some two decades before interrogation of this kind reached its peak, although his comments imply that the established model of moral panic potentially underestimates the intensity and confusion which sex abuse scandals can encourage.

The model is illustrative and indeed useful when we discuss the manner in which the ‘scandal’ behind adult/child contact is spread throughout social bodies, yet the complexity of adult/child tension in contemporary contexts is such that it is possible to begin to apply Cohen’s model interchangeably. That said his work remains invaluable when we are required to deal with the development of public concern in ways which critically evaluate its motives and meanings. His analyses of deviance (1972, 1988, 2002) have successfully crystallized the ideas of exaggeration and distortion. Using the Mods and Rockers as early exemplars we have seen similar phenomena grip the public consciousness ever since. With this in mind it is possible to view the difficulty with adult/child interaction as both equivalent to and distinct from this. The manner in which it is the focus of outrage is reminiscent of a difficulty with youth expression, yet somehow devoid of the debate which characterised this generational discomfort. There was an evident schism within the population
when the discussion of disturbances between Mods and Rockers in British Seaside resorts were deconstructed by Cohen (1967, 1972), though there is no such partition when the subject of child abuse is mentioned. The combination of exaggeration and distortion with new levels of prevention and risk aversion has served to manipulate populations almost without exception to join some kind of ‘fight against child abuse’ the actual prevalence of which is often immaterial, or at best misrepresented.

Cohen, along with Young (1981) has also discussed deviance in relation to news media, drawing attention to the construction and ultimate manufacture of unconventional, dubious or dangerous behaviour by politically driven and self-interested news outlets. Although as above this work was arguably written before the subject of child welfare became an established fixture of public attention, the agendas of sensationalism which Cohen and Young explore have been succinctly realised in the adult/child context. Making further reference to the Mods and Rockers, Cohen interrogates the media manipulation of a series of events and describes the dangerous consequences of media exaggeration and the ease with which an impressionable public can begin to construct perception. Cohen (1981, p.228) states: ‘The regular use of phrases such as ‘riot’, ‘orgy of destruction’, ‘battle’, ‘attack’, ‘siege’, ‘beat up the town’ and ‘screaming mob’ left an image of a besieged town from which innocent holidaymakers were fleeing to escape a marauding mob’. In an interesting and ironic turn, when Cohen (2002, p.xvi) refers to the media treatment of child abuse narratives this marauding mob becomes the mainstream, encouraged as it has been by media language which now appears to mobilise rather than merely coerce. In discussing the tabloid coverage of the abduction and murder of 8-year old Sarah Payne in July 2000, he described the manner in which headlines took on levels of invective previously unseen, with particularly damaging consequences. He writes:
The 23 July front page (of the *News of the World*) reads: ‘NAMED AND SHAMED. There are 110,000 child sex offenders in Britain ... one for every square mile. The murder of Sarah Payne has proved police monitoring of these perverts is not enough. So we are revealing WHO they are and WHERE they are ... starting today.’ The lists of names and the rows of photos reflect what the paper assumes and constructs as the primeval public anxiety: ‘DOES A MONSTER LIVE NEAR YOU?’ Check the list then read on: ‘WHAT TO DO IF THERE’S A PERVERT ON YOUR DOORSTEP’.

Newspaper coverage of this kind actually led to the formation of ‘posses’ intent on bringing these PERVERTS to justice (Cohen, 2002, Goode and Ben-Yehuda, 2009), in a scenario which saw media manipulation become responsible for a societal regression the likes of which was bemoaned just a generation earlier. The preoccupation with child sex offence can undoubtedly be discussed in terms of a conventional moral panic, although the vitriol with which it has been taken up by media outlets and the public suggests a level of difficulty with the subject that has not been reached with the phenomena which have comprised previous sites for populist concern (see Bell, 2002).

It is also possible to draw attention to the way in which various media outlets have, regardless of political leaning or levels of ‘quality’, been generally united in their call for swift and exacting justice against child abusers and perhaps more significantly, potential child abusers. Piper and Stronach (2008, p.11) state: ‘The media when reporting ‘stranger’ abuse also manages to adopt this same condemnatory tone whilst simultaneously elaborating a pornographic account. It promotes a titillation of the self-same story which serves as pornographic refuelling that both cancels out and yet makes possible the moral condemnatory tone’. We are able to apply this to the large majority of media reportage, as the emergence of stories of adult/child abuse or impropriety will generate publicity for the outlet in ways which can consolidate reputation whilst potentially reaching new readership. Stories that concern adult/child tension are of public interest from the outset and the subsequent manipulation of these
tales either sensationalises or condemns, encouraging intense ‘debate’ and perpetuating scandal. There is clearly a more efficiently embedded system of public concern within adult/child contexts that is automatically cultivated by simultaneously exploiting general worry and affecting an image of prevention. Child abuse is distinct in its representation of a danger the ill-definition of which engenders significant discomfort (Furedi and Bristow, 2008).

Kidd-Hewitt and Osborne (1995) have discussed the notion of media plurality and the levels to which coverage of child sexual abuse is regulated in accordance with other news stories. It seems that the representation of child sexual abuse in all its guises is not afforded the same divergence as alternative lines of investigation. It is difficult to disrupt the hegemonic depiction of abusers and the abused that has been constructed over two decades of intense, highly lucrative media exposure. That the subject of child sexual abuse is broadly speaking in the ‘public interest’ enables the circumvention of many of the ideas that surround press freedom or accurate representation. This has of course come into sharp focus over the last two years, as the levels of decency displayed by various journalists has created tension when we discuss censorship, freedom and their role in the British media. The point of interest here lies in the way in which many individuals have spoken of their suffering at the hands of the media although those accused of sexual abuse remain open to sustained, often dehumanising interrogation, aside from the dialogue which surrounds the complaints of those who hold some marketable capital (Burke Draucker and Martsolf, 2008). We are again reminded here of the significance of and tensions within the notion of consensus in the moral panic model, as we see sympathy for celebrities and other valued public figures when the issue of their privacy is raised and simultaneous revulsion for the accused, many of whom would have previously held currency over a public which consistently re-appropriates notions of value and integrity.
Kidd-Hewitt and Osborne (1995, p. 81) state: ‘a reciprocal relationship between the media and powerful state institutions produces clear definitions of what is acceptable or deviant behaviour and therefore creates a “consensus” over social problems’. Whilst the idea of consensus has been questioned above when dealing with the complexity of child abuse and its constituent issues, there is little doubt that there remains widespread public agreement when the interrogation of those suspected to have committed an intergenerational or indeed generally sexual, impropriety is concerned. Human decency is often overlooked as we attempt to allay our fears around a subject that we still know relatively little about.

Reactionary narratives are commonplace when dealing with the subject of adult/child tension, although what they are a reaction to is often ambiguous (Clapton et al, 2012). More ‘traditional’ moral panics including the youthful rebellion of the Mods and Rockers, the difficulty of a Thatcherite Britain to come to terms with or attempt to understand rave culture, and the on-going tension which surrounds immigration debates, all have identifiable and largely cyclical narratives of establishment, fervour, peak and then decline, although we can regard the public difficulty with the notion of child abuse as a more belligerent, self-sustaining source of discomfort (Cohen, 2002). This could be a result of our collective refusal to confront the subject in a way which deals with its manifest social influences rationally, favouring instead an inherently preventative system which bypasses any attempt to actually deconstruct the problems which we remain so afraid of. Whereas the moral panic which surrounded recreational drug use in the early 1990s was largely extinguished upon the simultaneous release of counteractive scientific evidence and a new preoccupation with the apparent dangers of computer gaming (Redhead, 1995, 1997), there is relatively little that can be done to categorically mollify our fears that children will be exposed to sexual abuse. It appears in fact that topical worries including terrorism and racial profiling are being increasingly linked with the narratives of
child abuse, combining prejudice and fear in a way which contributes to a truly late-modern culmination of existential distress. What we can say with confidence is that the public concern over child abuse and child abusers is a result of ignorance in the first instance, and the subsequent tensions which this invokes has engendered a complex, residual failure to confront such discomfort.

**Late-modernity (and its complex outcomes)**

Turning to Ulrich Beck’s work it is possible to begin to explain how the issue of child sexual abuse has become so contemprarily resonant. Beck’s risk society (1992) approaches the study of the present in ways which emphasise the separation of ‘this period’ from the generations which preceded it. Using Beck’s concept it is possible to draw a distinction, both empirical and theoretical, between the common practices of the second half of the Twentieth century and its latter years, in a way which looks beyond the obvious identification of technological advancement and draws attention to the societal angst which consumes those who simultaneously embrace and suspect new developments. Beck talks of the struggles inherent in the ‘late modern’ (1992) consciousness, that have been encouraged by a failure to come to terms with the human responsibility for the very dangers we have become concerned with and preoccupied by. There is an irony with this which marks out contemporary social systems as unique. The coalescence of inexorable infrastructural development and a recognition of the harm of hyper-industrialisation gives modern constructs a tragic self-awareness that seems almost idiosyncratic, an unfortunate characteristic itself dependant on circumstance. Baert and Carreira da Silva (2010, p. 256-57) have discussed Beck’s impact, and with relation to his interpretation of modernity state that:

> Modernity is characterised by the optimistic view that, with the help of technology and science, people will be able to control their natural surroundings effectively. This modern attitude has led to various
negative, unintended effects, such as air and water pollution, toxins and global warming. Beck insists that these problems are new. Previous societies were confronted with various calamities and misfortunes, such as earthquakes, floods or droughts. But distinctive about these new quandaries is, first that they are ‘man-made’: they are brought about by peoples own attempts to control nature and pursue profit (1992: 20-2).

Human reflexivity was perhaps not as evident in previous generations, as it was not ultimately required. Society had no need to draw attention to and deconstruct its own involvement in the macro-threats of the age and therefore continued to operate with relative stability (Beck, 1994, 1995). Although it may appear fatuous to refer to a period which was punctuated by global conflict as stable, the categorical division which war creates perhaps maintained an (ultimately questionable) idea that the spectre of conflict lay beyond the control of the social body. Roles were obvious and requirements were largely fulfilled in much the same way as a family would prepare for an oncoming storm. War was inevitable and was subsequently left unquestioned. This passive consensus was due in part to the manner in which the majority of the populace accepted the political motives upon which wars were enacted, however the same cannot be said for the relentless march towards mass industrialisation. Propaganda cannot necessarily be as easily employed when the destruction of the environment becomes as tangible as it has been in certain cases. The greatest human difficulty is evident in the way in which we consistently contribute to this despite possessing the knowledge which identifies the problematic nature of such behaviour. This relates to a context of intergenerational tension in a manner which, although not immediately apparent, is indeed convincing.

The underlying theme of Beck’s contributions positions risk at the very forefront of human and societal organisation. It is possible to contend that our treatment of adult/child narratives within the last three decades has been almost wholly influenced by an attempt to manage or even avoid risk entirely, in a way which
has fundamentally realigned behavioural imperatives. The risk that Beck refers to emerges from scientific discovery, as he (2004, p.34) comments on here:

Scientists can determine ever more precisely the risks posed by genetically modified foods, mobile telephones and the everyday use of chemicals at best within a range of probabilities; but that tells us nothing about whether they are genuine risks or how a consumer can make a ‘rational’ choice in a particular situation. How worried should we be? Where is the boundary line between prudent concern and crippling fear and hysteria?

However, the risk and subsequent public concerns which surround child sexual abuse cannot (easily or legitimately) be accounted for scientifically. The risk which Beck discusses has had a significant influence on the way that child abuse is processed and its threat is dealt with. Contemporary populations in what is often referred to as the ‘developed’ world have been inherently affected by such an all-encompassing system. They must constantly decide which advice to follow and which to ignore in an environment that unintentionally unsettles. The benevolent motives of the distribution of scientific knowledge have been irrevocably distorted by a public inability to act independently in a world which Beck (2004) describes as being ‘interdependently cosmopolitan’. This simply serves to exacerbate and establish risks and fears which were perhaps previously less obtrusive, more benign concerns.

It is possible then to discuss these developments as an extension of the moral panics mentioned above. Moral panic, as exemplified by Cohen (1967, 1972, etc.) is in its traditional sense, largely dependant upon a particular social context alongside the construction of identifiable cultural markers. The concern which surrounds child sexual abuse has however emerged in tandem with the increase in global exchange and a more homogenous cultural model. The way in which the rhetorical difficulty with intergenerational contact has been markedly Anglo-American in focus supports this. Joel Best (1990) has
approached the subject of hyper-sensitivity displayed by American parents, politicians and policy makers in a way which bears striking resemblance to the British models of concern that came soon after. Having analysed the public perception of the threat to children in America in the late 1980s he states (1990, p. 154): ‘In sum, large proportions of survey respondents were ready to agree that threats to children were serious problems, and they had some sense that those problems were getting worse. Much of this concern seems altruistic rather than self-interested. For most respondents these were distant threats that did not intrude much into their lives or communities’. This exemplifies the ambiguous discomfort that has come to characterise narratives of public concern throughout great swathes of the Western world. Best speaks of the general identification on behalf of the American public that child abuse was becoming a problem of increasing significance, and the simultaneous revelation that it was seen as an indirect threat can help to account for the way in which attitudes have been subsequently influenced.

The intangibility that Best has discussed has been overwhelmed by the perception that this is a problem on the rise, a development perhaps in keeping with our inability to articulate fears which have spread so rampantly. Identifying that a problem exists and at the same time ontologically distancing oneself from it, is representative of the embryonic formation of a culture of blame which maliciously attempts to implicate others in the name of self-protection. Whilst Best refers above to the altruistic motives of this movement, the development of adult/child tension has been such that altruism soon gave way to a far more insidious and self-sustaining system of suspicion. Fundamentally ‘man-made’, this system is wholly characteristic of the risk society, as abhorrence at narratives of child abuse occurs alongside an unintentional yet firmly established perpetuation of the subject as a resonant cultural ‘theme’.
Change and transition – social and educational

As referred to above, Beck (2004) has discussed the idea of cosmopolitanism and its influence over an increasingly interconnected social body. Staying with the idea that much of the ‘developed’ world has undergone a cosmopolitan shift, or been encouraged to regulate behaviour alongside an ethos which purports to be beneficially cohesive, it is possible to explore this within a British context as we attempt to piece together the contributing factors which have facilitated a climate of intergenerational suspicion.

New interpretations of citizenship have emerged in a late modern Britain (see Lash, 1999, McGhee, 2005, p.165). During the early Twenty-First century and under the Premiership of Tony Blair, the British populace were increasingly encouraged to adopt a newly cosmopolitan interpretation of citizenship. The motivations behind this shift were rooted in a ‘new vision’ for the U.K., a vision that called for a rejection of the insularity that is maintained with an attachment to cultural traditions that are not open to significant change or social flexibility. Although the notion is one of universalism and indeed generally admirable, it unfortunately remains somewhat utopian. This cosmopolitanisation and the according rise of participatory democracy (McGhee, 2005, p.164) served to denounce racism, Islamaphobia, homophobia and other prejudices, however the idea also encouraged the dissolution of the groups and ‘families’ in which the victims of such abuse could seek solace and understanding. Contradictions such as this notwithstanding, the vision for a ‘new Britain’ effectively sanitised any affirmation of identity and enforced an insipid drive towards an accountable homogeneity in which culture itself becomes largely obsolete. It is very easy to level criticism at Tony Blair though it is perhaps more useful to question the neo-liberal agendas to which he was firmly adherent. The influences of such a shift on UK education have been far reaching (see Davies, 2002, Mccafferty, 2010, Mooney and Poole, 2006), although exploring the wider landscape in
which this now dominant ideological system operates will be particularly informative.

The way in which cosmopolitanism was so readily promoted, without an accommodation of reaction or non-cooperation, was indicative of the sweeping societal presumption that came to define the era. What appears to be a relatively short sighted call for some ‘new’ form of collectivism has however been particularly effective in recent years. Many have taken on board the imperatives of neo-liberalism, participatory democracy and universal differentiation (Lister, 1997) without the contestation that could be expected. This is perhaps in part due to the subtlety of the implications that these ideas facilitate, as cultural identity and individuality are indirectly challenged here rather than overtly. It is however, possible to attribute the passively enacted take-up of this modern collectivism to the increasing uncertainty that modernity and its consequences have engendered. The interrogation of neo-liberalism has often centred around various economic motivations rather than the ontological. Is it possible to contend here that politicians and opinion formers were simply responding to their own sense of displacement as the world inexorably changed? Whereas a superficial interpretation of diversity is fostered under the auspices of such a movement, genuine alternatives or threats to the somewhat artificial societal solution to a landscape of change are seen as manifestly problematic. Young (1999, P.390, cited in McGhee, 2005, p.175) describes the situation in a way that clearly identifies the intolerant consequences of neo-liberal citizenship:

The modern world is intolerant of diversity which it attempts to absorb and assimilate and is relatively tolerant of difficulty, of obdurate people and recalcitrant rebels which it sees as more of a challenge to rehabilitate and reform. The late modern world celebrates diversity and difference which it readily absorbs and sanitises; what it cannot abide is difficult people and dangerous classes which it seeks to build the most elaborate defences against,
not just in terms of insiders and outsiders, but throughout the population.

We can apply this sentiment to an intergenerational context directly, as we witness a narrative of marginalisation emerging. Adults who make contact with children both professionally and relationally are markedly dangerous entities in modern organisation, and diversity of approach in terms of adult/child interaction is categorically implausible, as rules and regulation are made explicit and untenable.

There is a clear connection here between the imperatives of the New Labour government, their neo-liberal foregrounding, and a more general push towards essentialism. The characteristics of ‘new Britain’, which themselves attempted to overlook previously held manifestations of individual identity, served to construct an automated citizen whose necessary devotion to and connection with modern, pseudo-cosmopolitan traits left little room for fluctuation. Societal conditions such as these make it far easier for deviance to be both committed and identified. Young (1999, P.117) has stated that ‘essentialism greatly facilitates the process of social exclusion. It furnishes the targets, it provides the stereotypes, it allows the marshalling of aggression, it reaffirms the identity of the in-group – but we can go a little further than this, because social exclusion confirms and realises essentialism’. This again goes some way towards explaining how a narrative of mistrust has been developed and pernicious accusation has been so consistently levelled at adults who work with children. There has emerged a distinctly hierarchical system within a society that has paradoxically been motivated by equality. Those that work and operate in positions that offer care and support to the rhetorically ‘vulnerable’ are given far more scope to exercise individual freedom than those viewed to be in occupations which supposedly cultivate structures of exploitative abuse. This may seem appropriate on first reading of the situation; most would naturally
favour an overt devotee of child protection over an individual that works with children ‘by default’. However, this inequity is based on a discursive appropriation of the situation that relies heavily upon conjecture and stereotype. A stage has been reached in which accusation and suspicion carry far more weight than a position which assumes innocence. It is deemed morally negligent not to suspect potential abusers, a societal duty being to vigilantly look for signs and ‘evidence’ of intergenerational impropriety (Best, 1998, 1999).

Further evidence of the problematic landscape that has characterised our discussion of child welfare and development has been seen in the increasing commodification of childhood and education. Kenway and Bullen (2001) have approached this, arguing that a ‘market identity’ has emerged in schools and by extension the pupils who attend them. Although they have used Australian education as an exemplar, the way in which schools have become subject to the vagaries of commercialisation alongside equivalent movements in Britain, the USA and elsewhere reminds us of the reach of market forces in contemporary, post or late modern constructs, and moreover the realignment of teaching practice in a new climate of corporate accountability. Indeed Kenway and Bullen (2001, p.122-23) state:

Like many of their counterparts in the UK, Canada, New Zealand and the USA, Australian governments have spent the last decade redesigning educational institutions along market lines. As a result, the everyday life of education systems and schools have been altered in very deep but apparently unspectacular ways ... school systems are primarily investments in human and political capital and national and state identity.

We can attribute, in part, the behavioural shift evident in teaching practice that has become apparent over the last two decades to this corporate focus, as teacher’s actions carry with them a representative significance that has been
previously absent. Intergenerational ‘wrongdoing’ damages the school *brand* in this climate, and this carries considerable weight in an atmosphere which encourages competition amongst schools in a manner which looks beyond simple geographical convenience. Schools in the UK have increasingly taken on ‘specialism’ status, marking themselves out as distinct in an attempt to raise their profile, although alongside this is the additional pressure to maintain exemplary standards. This does not limit itself to the conduct of teaching staff who are themselves placed under greater scrutiny when their school makes promises to reach certain levels, undertaken largely in the name of publicity (see Mccafferty, 2010). Education takes something of a back seat in this instance, as it is tangible categorical evidence that a school is ‘successful’ which is necessarily favoured in an environment that unintentionally panders to superficiality.

It is possible now to begin to align the above contributions with certain themes, as we attempt to categorise the literature in a way which foregrounds the empirical deconstruction.

**Touch – and its interpretation in a changing world**

Beginning with the notion of touch, the subject, itself now far more than just an action, has undergone a significant shift in recent years. There has been work which has emphasised the need for intergenerational touch (see Caulfield, 2000; Field, 2002; Furedi and Bristow, 2008; Johnson, 2000; Tobin, 1997; Ward, 1990), promoting its necessity with a rational, developmental focus, yet as referred to above the narratives which directly discuss child abuse and the associated moral concern have been given far greater attention. Our interpretation of touch and contact between adult and child has been coloured by a two stage formation of discourse. The work on moral panic and then risk in the first instance makes us aware of our fears, encouraging a reflexivity which
instead of placating our discomfort serves to initiate a dialogue which provokes a largely reactionary attempt to address these existential concerns (Furedi, 1992). Stage two has incited a strongly preventative focus, itself a distortion of the knowledge that our treatment of contact between adult and child has been increasingly irrational. There has perhaps been a more focussed construction of an abuse ‘epidemic’ in order to justify the ways in which we have attempted to deal with the associated narratives (Duggan and Piper, 2013). Methods which have been ‘knee-jerk’ in their immediacy have not benefitted from the measurement which comes with time and distance, although they must be justified in an age where ‘civilised’ society claims to have answers to the questions which are consistently asked of it.

Relationships between adult and child have become particularly strained over recent years, and the notion of childhood and indeed the child has subsequently been subject to a reassessment. The idea that childhood is in ‘crisis’ (Kehily, 2010, Scraton, 1997) or has disappeared altogether (Postman, 1994) is indicative of adult difficulty with the complexities which intergenerational narratives now engender. It is possible to view the increasing theorising of childhood and attempts to account for its status in late modern constructs (see Chisholm et al, 1990, Darbyshire, 2007, Hultqvist and Dahlberg, 2001, James, 2002, James et al, 1998, Power, 2000, 2004, Prout, 2005) as evidence of the marginalisation of the adult. Whilst this may seem subversive it is in fact worthy of interrogation.

The idea of childhood has fluctuated considerably over recent generations. This in itself raises questions, as the children that have been discussed and assessed have gone on to form opinions about a subject which must accommodate this natural revolution. The fact that comment relating to childhood invariably overlooks this is revealing. Childhood studies and the implementation that they foreground are rooted in the fear that has become indicative of the late modern
adult (see Cotterill, 1988, Gillham and Thomson, 1996, Oliver, 1983). Has this distorted a great many deconstructive attempts by failing or refusing to connect with a positive simplicity? Do adults involve themselves too much and expect too little of children? It is possible to introduce a gendered approach in this instance, as it seems that the contradictions present in a paternalistic society that attempts to control maternal traditions have caused considerable complexity. This complexity is broadly apparent yet easily addressed, however a refusal or inability to remove oneself from a discourse of role appropriation (Berger and Luckmann, 1966) has enabled it to stagnate. Based on Berger and Luckmann’s model (1966, p.79): ‘Society is a human project. Society is an objective reality. Man (sic) is a social project.’ The pair begin to discuss generational connection, going on to state that ‘only with the appearance of a new generation can one properly speak of a social world’ (1966, p.79). The contention that adults and children should be reciprocally linked remains salient; however this seems to be an inherently difficult concept to promote.

In response to a broadly traditionalist view of social order, and one that has been used to account for post-war social movement, it is possible to draw attention to the systematic dissolution of interrelation and ‘conventional communality’ in modern Britain. A form of collectivism does exist in neo-liberal organisation, it is however a largely superficial, ideologically charged interpretation of group cohesion. There is considerable evidence to suggest that current systems have undergone a process of depersonalisation (Furedi, 2004) and this has been particularly visible in intergenerational contexts. Furedi (2004, p.98) states that ‘The conduct of routine forms of social interaction are frequently represented as difficult or complicated (in modern times)’, a consequence of what he has deemed the professionalization of everyday life. Under this model, contact and connection have been reduced to circumscribed, predetermined exchanges that lack the cohesive imperatives that existed in previous equivalents. Bauman (2000) has also referred to the increasing
individuation of society, as modernity appears to isolate its members alongside the waning relevance of traditional institutions. Indeed, it can be argued that marriage and family are themselves far more concerned with aspiration or personal development than in previous generations. The family was once a necessity although it seems now to have become a lifestyle choice. Isolation is not only far more achievable, it is also now socially accepted in ways that transcend conventional, ‘nuclear’ interpretations. With this comes the reinforcement of role in adult/child contexts. The traditional and perhaps no longer appropriate societal categorisation of the adult is given sharper focus by its increasing absence.

Maternal and paternal narratives remain the ultimate aspirational motivation for many, but must accommodate the diversification of choice that has become an important characteristic of modernity. This has produced a natural tension between the imagined and still largely promoted vision of a ‘conventional’ nuclear family and the reality in which alternatives are readily taken to. Positioning adults in roles that they are expected to fulfil yet are increasingly unable to, given the shift towards individuality, presents problems when adult/child interaction is encountered (Power, 2004). The frames of reference become distorted for both adult and child here, as the child must make sense of a non-parental adult, and the adult must interact with the child in a non-parental way. The intergenerational relationship has not been accounted for in contemporary discourse (Prout, 2005) and this is unfortunate, as modern contexts are where a friendship or connection of this kind is conditionally most likely to emerge.

There have been a number of key contributions which specifically explore the difficulty encountered by adult practitioners when they are required to interact with children on a regular basis. Through the exploration of the public and private conflicts which have been resident in sports coaching and teaching
(Piper and Smith, 2003, Piper and Stronach, 2008, Piper et al, 2005, Stronach and Piper, 2008, Piper et al, 2011), the problematic realities for adults who are in positions of contemporary delicacy can be discussed directly. Most of the concern which the proximity of these adult workers to children provokes is based around touching practice. Touch between adult and child has changed dramatically in focus, going from an unspoken necessity or affirmation of trust to an act that is representative of our deepest discomforts. Piper et al (2011, p. 11-12) state that:

A moral panic has amplified within a risk society and has contributed to the production of guidelines focused on the protection of children from abuse, and adults from false allegations. The needs of children and young people and the primary purposes of sport and coaching are lost in these essentially defensive responses. The context of fear and risk aversion, and the failure to confront the complex issues involved, merely contributes to a general impoverishment of experience and practice for young people and coaches.

One of the most significant barriers to a cooperative and constructive experience of sport is the inherent tension between the necessary interaction between adult and child which sport engenders, and the public unease that this has underlined. The way in which protection has been prioritised serves to exemplify the consolidation of a system that attempts in the first instance to prevent, rather than enable the organic development of interconnection.

**Scrutiny and surveillance – professional pressure**

The difficulty with adult/child interaction has been empirically realised in the increasing requirement for British professionals who work with children and minors to undergo extensive checking from the Criminal Records Bureau (known as Disclosure and Barring Service from 2013). This process has been indiscriminately applied to all coaching and educational contexts and prohibits those who have 'blemishes' on their records from working with children and
indeed many other occupations. This measure has been brought in to protect children and offer peace of mind to those concerned with child welfare, though results have served to highlight minor offences and make youthful indiscretion publically deplorable, dismissing individuals who would perhaps be exemplary workers to a lifetime of under or unemployment.

Such a blanket approach overlooks child safety on a number of levels, as those who have no link with, intention of or proclivity towards child abuse are punished and the focus of discipline is counterproductively orchestrated. Piper and Stronach (2008, p. 26) state that:

There are many concerns in relation to excessive vetting that deserves to be explored, including the way it undermines civil liberties. A number of adults have been unsuccessful in job applications because checks also revealed spent convictions for offences which had nothing to do with children – such as pub fights. Another direct result is a reported decline in the number of volunteers in organisations such as the Girl Guides, Scouts, and also on football coaching and other amateur sports.

This is evidence of an additional tendency in modern intergenerational constructs for the consistent and increasingly formalised recording of incident. Not only have overt disciplinarily intrusive measures such as constant CRB/DBS checking become standard practice, more subtle forms of regulation have also emerged. The way in which injury is dealt with in schooling and equivalent contexts is, in addition strongly indicative of a culture of prevention (Piper et al, 2011). It is expected that an extensive account of any injury which a child sustains is duly compiled, naming the adult who attended to the child’s needs in a way that can be revisited indefinitely. Although this is not a direct accusation, the presence of a dossier of intergenerational contact has encouraged members of staff to avoid contact in many cases, asking the child to apply plasters themselves (Piper et al, 2011, p. 9-10) so no touch can be recorded. Not only does this potentially endanger the child, who is unlikely to be proficient in the
self-administration of first aid, it also provokes a more widespread culture in which touch between an adult and child becomes gradually eradicated.

The reluctance to make contact with children, based on a concern for who will see and how the action will be interpreted, simply serves to mark out intergenerational touch as abnormal. This has consequences for the public treatment of sexual abuse, as the subject becomes sensationally separated as a result of the systematic ‘othering’ of adult/child contact. Genuine sexual offence becomes almost sacrosanct in a society which has in a sense facilitated its occurrence. This subverted reverence of intergenerational sex offence essentially prevents interrogation of the subject, as the public shy away from a deconstruction that will evoke disconcerting revelation (Soothill and Francis, 2002). It has become apparent that paedophilia should be explored with greater nuance and sensitivity than these quasi-religious, morally hysterical approaches have afforded, yet contemporary priorities have essentially prohibited this.

There is then, tension between the increasing call for a measured understanding of paedophilia and the existential discomfort that the issue continues to provoke. The work of Beck (1992) and Bauman (2000) becomes strongly applicable here as both have used the notion of contemporary unsettlement in their respective deconstruction of modernity. There is value in dispassionately approaching the cultural motivation and meaning behind child abuse and child abusers, although this is unfeasible in a climate which enables salacious hysteria to such a degree. Risk society has highlighted the problems associated with contemporary attempts to overcome the dangers that have been instigated by human intervention. The concept critically exemplifies the dawning realisation that the late-modern individual is often running from a problem of her/his own creation and the intergenerational tension that we currently see is a coherent example of this. Public concern has accused, vilified, marginalised and disengaged those who do not adhere to the moralistic crusade
against child abuse, whilst ignoring the fact that these groups represent the minority who do not directly contribute to an atmosphere of suspicious accusation. Kincaid (1998, p.108) has drawn attention to this protective distortion with a call for safeguarding to be more concerned with children, rather than the adult threat that has apparently become so virulent. In relation to ‘no touch’ practice, he states:

(no-touch day care) gives us, we might say, our protection story in its purest form and in action – nobody touches, no one sits on a lap, no comforts, no hugs. I think the first expert was justified in saying that no touching is ‘really too bad’. I think it should make us wonder who we care about and want to protect. We are anxious to have desirable children but seem reluctant to tend to them.

There is an evident difficulty in modern intergenerational contexts with the public perception of internalisation. It is clear that by employing no touch measures, arguably the most demonstrative marker of a culture of concern, mistrust and reciprocal doubt can constructively flourish, becoming central features in a society in which individual thought is routinely discouraged. Personal interpretation is given little room to develop here as adults must collectively subscribe to a system that divorces them from their own liability. The marginalising emasculation that this causes is overshadowed by a removal of opportunity for error. It is a situation so far removed from child protection and so ingrained in the avoidance of accusation, that its masquerading as a child centric exercise is nothing short of delusional. This is again indicative of a reverence of the unknown (Bauman, 1992, 1997, 2001). These methods attempt to clumsily control the liminal spaces of those who in this environment have the capacity to exploit or abuse. Whilst it is impossible to remotely manage individual cognition, by implementing systems in which this thought is rendered irrelevant or impotent, it is far easier to safeguard a sense of appropriate accountability. No touch cultures enable a removal of immediate discomfort, however the more durable consequences are entirely overlooked,
thereby disenfranchising the innocent majority of adults and children alike, who are deemed abusive and vulnerable without any contextual opportunity for a disruption of this narrative.

Furedi’s contributions (1992, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2004, 2013, 2014a, 2014b) enable a reinterpretation of the traditional panic narrative and also deconstruct the late modern preoccupation with fear, litigation, paranoia and vulnerability in a way which resonates strongly with the situation evident in modern PE teaching. Arguing that modern constructs have ‘cultivated’ fear amongst those who operate within contexts which are deemed risky or problematic, Furedi has called into question the largely preventative techniques employed by contemporary Western organisations in a bid to explore the origins and motivators of the fears which constrict large portions of the ‘Euro-American’ social body. Ontological and existential fear, litigation and indeed therapy have been confronted by Furedi in an indictment of the tendency in ‘developed’ world contexts for an over accommodation of reflexive analysis, leading in part to a landscape of self-sustaining doubt. In his (2002) book *Paranoid Parenting* Furedi interrogates the shift that is evident in approaches to parenting, as dangers and hazards have become prioritised in ways that are more far reaching and more behaviourally influential than ever before. He states (2002, p. 24-25):

> The internet has remarkable potential to enhance young people’s lives by providing educational opportunities. Yet it is widely seen as yet another new technology that poses danger to children. Much of the discussion about the World Wide Web has focused on how to protect young people from it’s perils, to prevent innocents from stumbling across adult sites or into the clutches of paedophiles.

A combination of the difficulty with technological change which has constricted social expression on a general scale and the increasing complexity of childhood and its appropriate manifestation in modern settings, this comment represents
the fear and unsettlement which contemporary motives encourage. Referring to the way in which preventative imperatives are favoured without question when the alternatives remain ambiguous or unknown, he questions the rationality of such approaches (2002, p. 24-25):

Since children are often more adept at negotiating the Net, parental control is forced to confront uncomfortable new challenges. “You don’t know what’s out there”, a group of fathers confided in me. One raised the spectre of paedophile rings lurking in the shadows online ready to pounce on his unsuspecting teenagers by e-mail. Nobody I talked to had actually heard of any children being damaged, but nevertheless they regarded the internet as a really big problem.

Not only does this point to the problematic formation of discourse, occurring to such an extent that empirical truths are consistently overlooked, it also comments on the evolution of systems of scrutiny in modern constructs. As the methods of surveillance in relation to the adult/child dilemma have advanced beyond our ability to account for them, attempts to allay the discomfort which has been incited by rapid socio-cultural/technological change take on more reactionary, problematic guises. It should also be noted that Furedi discussed use of the internet in 2002, some years before the prevalence of social networking. The ease with which children and especially adolescents can now communicate online adds further dimension to parental fear.

The ubiquity of communication for people of all ages, and the relative transparency of action which this has invoked, encourages a system of mutual checking to emerge. As we build up a more visual presence online we are more likely to regulate our behaviour so we fulfil some acceptable social norm, or at least appear to do so. As social networking remains in its embryonic stages however, there are still ways round its representational characteristics and manipulation or distortion becomes much easier for those who wish to attack, accuse, vilify, or disguise.
There are genuine dangers inherent in social networking which speak of a tangible development and realisation of the speculative fears discussed by the fathers spoken to by Furedi in the early part of the Twenty First Century. These dangers have been largely facilitated by the fears that clearly influenced thought in what was a pivotal era for communication and the eventual exploitation of youth (Burrows, 2011). Social networking has consolidated our discomfort and made real a great many of the concerns which were voiced as the internet first arrived, though the possibilities for a more dynamic and interactive interpretation of education have simultaneously risen. In spite of this however there is a self-fulfilling tendency to focus on the dangers of such innovation in ways which negate the genuine progress which these systems have invoked (Orchard, Fullwood, Morris, Galbraith, 2014).

We have been shown the way in which scrutiny has changed in relation to our own self-identity, and ideas surrounding censorship and revelation are realigned alongside various communicative shifts. There has also emerged greater desire to account for behaviour by attempting to define categorical ‘truths’ in an era where distortion is so readily available. In what can be described as a societal ‘return to order’ the areas in which scrutiny can be increased, including intergenerational contexts, have been inherently affected by a reaction to the discomfort that a culture of (mis)representation has encouraged. What we are seeing here is the oppositional culmination of the consequences of late-modernity and the disciplinary measures which have continued to evolve in addition to this. Rather than remain benign, methods of scrutiny have become active in their influence over contemporary Western populations and this has been evidenced succinctly in environments in which adults and children must interact. It is here that we begin to see the connection between the social world which Beck (1992) has described, and the functioning of modern discipline which Michel Foucault has analysed (1977, 1980, 1988).
Scrutiny and surveillance of the adult in intergenerational contexts is a theme of particular interest here, as the methods by which they are exacted speak to us about the public perception of intergenerational contact, both physical and non-physical, offering insight into the extent to which such models have become established.

It is possible to directly apply Foucault’s interpretation of panopticism, as introduced in *Discipline and Punish* (1977) to a PE teaching context. Foucault’s appropriation of the panopticon reinterprets Utilitarian philosopher Jeremy Bentham’s design of a circular prison with an ‘inspection house’ at the centre, allowing the guards to monitor the inmates at their discretion. The model is an appropriate realization of the continuous appearance yet intermittent reality of surveillance and therefore power in contemporary constructs, demonstrating the extent to which action is controlled by the simultaneous artifice and substance of discourse. Describing its operation (1977, p.201) Foucault states:

> Hence the major effect of the panopticon: to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power. So to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action; that the perfection of power should render its actual exercise unnecessary; that this architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it; in short, that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers.

Foucauldian panopticism is consistent with, and perhaps responsible for, a generally held interpretation of power that accommodates the distortion and pacification with which everyone must to some degree comply, in order to perpetuate both individual sensibilities and a wider, more abstract body. Power distorts and pacifies effectively within this mechanism as it operates subtly and often concurrently with discursive prevalence. As referred to above, modern power is an organism that adapts itself efficiently in order to maximize its
manipulative output. With this comes the development of misrepresentation and a perversion of intrinsic affirmation as the irregularity of scrutiny in the panopticon, and by extension society, instils within its occupants an organizational arrangement built upon a continuous and manufactured self-regulation.

The intense public attention focused on intergenerational touch, and associated risks, has directed the public gaze towards those who are, by professional association, proponents and dependents of the idea and its application. This has effectively positioned practitioners such as teachers (and particularly PE teachers) in the role of inmate, as public discourse wields an investigative capability, the threat of which is simultaneously inconsistent and unremitting.

**Future of PE teaching – room for improvement?**

Given the assumption that PE teaching is relatively bound by a combination of the constraints that arise within the cosmopolitan reticence of risk society, and the self-sustaining discipline of modern power constructs, what is there to expect from the future of physical education? Will the gulf between adult and child be ever widening? Will this climate of fear, mistrust and invasive checking face a backlash? Will an alternative voice be categorically silenced under the auspices of the increasing marketisation of child welfare? These questions are indeed far more complex than they appear, as it seems that our interpretation of childhood, child welfare and the intervention of the adult in these matters are subject to considerable change. Just as change has redefined contemporary public feeling towards adults who work with children, it remains important to assess the possibility of this occurring again.

PE has changed immeasurably over recent years. What was once a site in which overt masculinity and disciplinarian objectives governed sports instruction, is
one that now actively attempts to accommodate inclusion and participation. The archetypal PE teacher or ‘games master’ who presided during the first three quarters of the twentieth century can evoke an image of a track-suited dictator. Indeed, popular culture has reflected this with Brian Glover’s portrayal of one such practitioner in Ken Loach’s (1969) film Kes being an enduring example. It is possible to contend that PE provided the opportunity for militaristic affirmation during a period in which conflict was an inescapable influence. The way in which schoolchildren (predominantly boys) were conditioned through sport was sharply reminiscent of the repetition and resolution expected of soldiers preparing for battle. PE was a question of fortitude, an extension of ‘British’ values perpetuated in order to reinvigorate the dying embers of Empire and the tendency to apply stereotypical perceptions such as these has been brought into sharp focus when the contemporary ‘non-tactile’ scenario is referred to.

Although not always a reliable marker of trend, the way in which we informally process a particular era will often influence contemporary behaviour (Parton, 1996). The elder representatives of an age in which modern standards would not be met are tacitly and in some cases overtly punished, as we retroactively attempt to atone for previous ignorance. This is approached in Chapter VIII, as the second narrative addresses the problematic realities that face cross-generational connection. The story attempts to draw attention to the hypocrisy of a society (see Furedi, 1999) which enforces such rigid, categorically enforced lines of conduct that are themselves based around an indistinct and largely imagined discomfort, as a very ‘real’ friendship is affected by the artifice of fear based conjecture.

PE was and to an extent remains, a markedly gendered environment. The separation of girl from boy in physical education has been constant and sport has subsequently been appropriated alongside this division (see White and
Brackenridge, 1985). ‘Football for the boys and netball for the girls’ is a far from simplistic phrase in this instance. It represents the rigidity of the gender division in PE and by extension an unwavering fidelity to contexts of athletic convention. This has not been broadly addressed as PE has undergone wholesale changes during the contemporary era. The integration of boys and girls in sports contexts has still not occurred in Britain despite such practices emerging throughout mainland Europe and particularly Scandinavia (Guldberg, 2009). It seems incongruous that modern imperatives encourage inclusion and participation whilst still adhering to relatively immovable patterns of organisation. Given that touch between teacher and pupil has taken on far greater significance now, can we perhaps assert that gendered traditions have been maintained in an attempt to de-problematise this interaction? Generally speaking, common practice still necessitates that female teachers instruct girls and male teachers instruct boys in an arrangement that diminishes the opportunity for a (heterosexually) sexualised and romanticised narrative to emerge, as the concerns that surround this have been given particularly sharp focus. Had this aspect of PE teaching emerged alongside a landscape in which accusation and suspicion had not become such considerable motivators, the discipline could perhaps now be as diverse as it is consistently expected to be. The capacity to foster a genuine sense of integrated conviviality has unfortunately been undermined by an inherently preventative, resolutely familiar landscape.

What we have in essence seen, is a distinctive and perhaps unintentional process of exclusion, in which PE teachers and other equivalents have been identified as dangerous elements within a society of multiple hazards. Zygmunt Bauman’s work (1992, 1997, 2000) becomes relevant here, as there is a certain requirement to position the adult within a narrative of marginalisation in a way which remains in keeping with contemporary constructs. His discussion of liquid modernity, a system in which contemporary social movement is marked by a
characteristic breakdown of traditional networks, and their indiscriminate fluctuating realignment, is particularly fitting. Uncertainty becomes significant here as the individual is no longer governed by the rigidity of convention and this self-sustaining freedom becomes, just as in risk society, a paradoxical limitation.

Using Bauman’s interpretation of social transition, it is perhaps appropriate to contend that PE teaching as a discipline is somewhat negated or indeed undermined by constant, radicalised fluctuation. PE teaching is broadly reliant on reciprocity, as teacher and pupil use sport in a way that is mutually beneficial. This relationship was cultivated throughout the mid and latter parts of the Twentieth Century (see Bale and Christensen, 2004), as the ethos behind sports instruction has remained one that broadly invokes social and moral responsibility. However, the recent problematisation of adult/child contact, a result of a shifting social landscape, has questioned this moral efficacy, charging teaching with a doubt that fundamentally disrupts its relational potential. It should be mentioned here that this debate is not centred around an ‘aversion’ to moderate change within PE teaching, but the wholesale, far reaching nature of transition that is a defining characteristic of late modernity. As positions over intergenerational contact have become so indicative of contemporary convention, any system that can be perceived as a challenge to this is faced with considerable existential difficulty. PE teaching, and many other intergenerational occupations, have essentially been rendered incongruous in current settings, as the spontaneity engendered in sports instruction and participation causes great tension in a world which strives for order. Bauman’s treatment of bureaucracy (1986, 1989) is also relevant here, as we can begin to see the link between modernity, the increasing desire for control and demarcation and the subsequent problems created by the organisations that fall outside of this.
Bauman has deconstructed the bureaucracy of modernity by discussing the Holocaust. He proposed, in a removal from convention, that rather than an emotionally charged, pre-modern reaction to bureaucracy, the Holocaust represented the most efficient solution to the ‘Jewish problem’ and was carried out in ways that mechanistically removed many of its contributors from any moral burden. It represented an amoral system that was enacted with the calculated organisation of a factory production line (Baert and Carreira da Silva, 2010) which the ‘workers’ passively and necessarily complied with, having been conditioned to meet the demands of a system that had the targets of late modern prudence in mind. The slaughter of innocent people was the obvious product of this, however the methods employed to reach this goal were highly effective in normalising murder and in some way re-appropriated the act, positioning it as a means of progression. Bauman’s aim here is to draw attention to the problematic consequences of the hierarchical nature of instrumental rationality, a defining characteristic of his notion of late modernity. This has been achieved by demonstrating the way in which atrocity can be justified under the auspices of a rational and orchestrated interpretation of contemporary organisation.

It is neither appropriate nor possible to compare the Holocaust with the situation evident in contemporary PE teaching; there is though great use in exploring the way in which touching practices have been consistently discouraged in a culture that has irrationalised the relational aspects of PE teaching. We can in addition regard the overt hierarchy seen in previous teaching contexts as one of relative isolation. The headmaster, games master, science teacher, and caretaker all functioned within the boundaries of their own occupation, fulfilling the requirements that came with this, alongside a position of rigidity. There is now however, far more evidence in contemporary schooling to suggest that a system of institutional interrelation has emerged (Cale and Harris, 2003; Capel, Hayes, Katene and Velija, 2011), in which the school (and
increasingly groups of schools) functions as a single autonomous unit, thereby regulating pedagogical and interpersonal behaviour with the efficiency expected of a contemporary organisation. The teachers themselves are caught up in a model that intensifies its hold on the respective social actors through a simultaneous process of normalisation and distortion of consequence. Making contact with a pupil in any context is now seemingly irrational and both discourse and empirical evidence would support this. However this ‘irrationality’ has been enacted and interpreted as a constituent of late modern bureaucracy. What is significant here is that the term has been accordingly manipulated. It is rational under a climate of intergenerational mistrust to avoid any touch categorically, however it is also rational in the same climate to leave an injured child alone, with verbal reassurance the only potential remedy.

By charging intergenerational touch with considerable and problematic significance, a climate has arisen in which accusation becomes more potent and more dangerous than tangible injury. This is an indictment of the disproportionate relationship that has developed between human aspiration for improvement and the conceptual and practical limitations of environment. As humanity strives for perfection in modernity this often occurs alongside a disregard for those who do not or cannot comply, serving to question fundamentally the very imperatives to which we are encouraged to adhere.
Chapter III
Methods of Enquiry
Methods of enquiry

The decision to use semi-structured interviews in the data collection was a relatively straightforward one. Not only does the process involve an in depth connection to the participant/s, with whom conversation is undertaken at length, but it is also indirectly ethnographic, as the researcher is often required to enter and engage with the environment which is under scrutiny. Indeed Fontana and Frey (1998, p.56) have commented ‘Many qualitative researchers differentiate between in-depth (or ethnographic) interviewing and participant observation. Yet as Lofland (1971) points out, the two go hand in hand, and many of the data gathered in participant observation come from informal interviewing in the field.’ Or vice versa as has been the case in this instance. During the interviewing process I have visited schools in areas which I had no previous knowledge of, encountered some systems of protocol that offered insight into the intensity of contemporary security measures in state schools, and been forced to walk through a busy corridor over ten years since I was myself a pupil at a (now demolished) comprehensive.

Sampling processes

From early 2012 to early 2013 I visited a total of eight different schools. These schools, all situated in the North-West of England, were selected with a broadly purposive agenda, as the intention was to speak with teachers from a diverse institutional range. Touch is clearly an issue of some plurality and it is hoped that the range of schools visited reflects and facilitates this. Among the criticisms levelled at the use of purposive sampling, including what Berg (2009, p.51) has termed ‘the lack of wide generalizability’ when the intention is to attempt to explore ‘lived experience’, employing a more ‘randomised’ selection may ultimately produce problematic irrelevances. Depth is somewhat safeguarded using purposive sampling as the subject matter under investigation
becomes prioritised, and a theme can be directly confronted without some perfunctory pledge towards generalizability, a notion which remains problematic. Using the term ‘generalizability’ implies some kind of reducible trend, which itself sharply contradicts the interpretivist imperatives of this study. Although we have discussed purposive sampling here, it is as appropriate to describe the approach utilised as one of organic development. This study will draw upon aspects of both narrative study and ethnographic methodologies, however the sampling procedures (see Creswell, 2013, p.155) seen in both paradigms have not been utilised here. The only stipulation that was enforced was that the participants were practising PE teachers, their availability is an obvious aspect of their participation although it did not explicitly guide the selection itself. What has in fact taken place is a strategic selection of the schools visited. Some have been rural, some suburban, and some in inner cities, in an attempt to gauge the reach of the problematisation of touch and the extent to which it has, if at all, been culturally modified. The table below features a detailed list of the participants. The names are pseudonyms however the ages and genders offer some indication of context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Name’</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Group 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzie</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Group 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brianna</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gareth</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Group 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jevon</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrine</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Group 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gus</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryn</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The schools themselves differed greatly in social setting, yet the teachers within them were in fact relatively similar. This is itself perhaps representative of an interesting and illustrative homogenisation of the profession which is directly in keeping with contemporary educational imperatives. The fact that a school, which has a student body made up largely of pupils from a South-Asian and Afro-Caribbean background, has an all-white PE department is worth some investigation. Although ethnicity is not the primary focus of this study we should be mindful here of the tendency to ignore cultural difference when approaching the subject of touch. I would tentatively argue that a problematisation of adult/child contact is culturally transcendental; however a white researcher talking to white PE staff about their experiences with children from ethnic minorities cannot necessarily make such an assumption. As Stanfield (1998, p.349) has commented in relation to the relative hypocrisy of a ‘liberation narrative’: 'Besides a reified fixation on textual discourse analysis, a serious flaw
in cultural studies logic of inquiry is the dependence on European theorists’. In addition to this is the widely accepted notion that intergenerational hypersensitivity is an almost exclusively Anglo-American construct, offering the debate an interesting contextual significance.

The interviews

The make-up of the interviews took on a pleasing symmetry, as four were individual discussions with a single member of staff and four were group. The group discussions can perhaps be regarded as focus groups, as the semi, and in some cases unstructured nature of the questioning encouraged debate to emerge organically. Focus groups have been praised for their interactive capacity for the generation of interesting and informative discussion in ways that are exclusive to those within a particular group or sub-culture. They have however also been criticised for their apparent inability to provide a sufficient depth of information as more structured interviews or indeed observational techniques (Berg, 2009). What this perhaps overlooks is the way in which focus groups provide a unique, otherwise unparalleled insight into the communicational workings of an environment on a practically microcosmic level. It is possible through the use of focus groups to enter, in this instance, the staff room and see first-hand how current teachers deal with various issues as they share ideas and experiences. This process gives an arguably more genuine insight into teaching practice as the staff are given license to freely discuss amongst themselves, and the interviewer takes a somewhat more passive role. The reciprocal pressure of an in depth, one to one interview is therefore avoided as room for emotive engagement greatly increases.

That said, individual interviews were also utilised, offering the sustained exploration of the issue in a way that was occasionally absent in the group scenarios. Given that the focus groups were conducted with entire PE
departments, the participants within them covered a range of ages and differing levels of experience. This was highly useful in terms of the study itself, as it offered the opportunity to map the progression and development of a climate of intergenerational fear, although this can present problems in terms of the group dynamic and issues of dominance. This was taken into account when the discussions took place and I was keen to give a platform to anyone that I felt was being overlooked within the dialogue. Drawing attention to the rhetorical disparities displayed in the comparison between an established male teacher and an early career female member of staff may appear to be unnecessary stereotyping, yet dominance of the discussion by one particular individual was often the case and the potential of this to dictate the direction of the conversation was duly acknowledged.

Indeed the subject of age is a significant one. The ages of all interviewees are shown in order to emphasise the extent to which this climate has influenced teaching staff at different stages of their career. Given that the contemporary atmosphere is one which immediately asserts preventative intention and message, a teacher having just entered the profession would regard such practice as the norm, whereas an older staff member is able to compare current standards with previous pedagogical landscapes. This is a potential source of tension and represents the divisive capabilities which an environment that prioritises accusation can wield. This is reflected upon throughout the analysis section and indeed provides the catalyst for the second fictional narrative, as we witness and explore a further divergence within a profession which is in danger of becoming problematically fragmented.

It is important to regard this approach to interviewing as one which goes beyond a simple conversation. Much has been made within critical methodological study of the mutuality of interview and observation (Ely et al, 1991, Lofland and Lofland, 1984), as the interview takes on the characteristics
of an embedded, ethnographic immersion in ways that parallel or indeed prove more effective than deliberate, observational fieldwork. The interpersonal connection that interviewing encourages represents an opportunity to engage with a participant in both an official and informal capacity. The traditional legitimacy of the researcher/respondent dynamic can often productively react with the humanistic connection that prolonged, unremitting conversation between two people can provoke. It is possible to discover far more when these seemingly paradoxical elements are combined, as the professional and personal boundary becomes less well defined. Although I found this to be largely evident in the interviewing process there have been doubts raised about the capacity of interviewing for a collaborative formation of meaning. Scheurich (1997, cited in Alvesson, 2002, p. 110) has stated that 'Interview interactions do not have some essential, teleological tendency toward an ideal of ‘joint construction of meaning’, irrespective of the intentions and skills of the researcher'. This is worthy of some note given the unpredictable and wholly unaccountable nature of the potential for a ‘relationship’ between interviewer and interviewee, though it does somewhat underestimate the manner in which sustained conversation within and about a particular context is inherently (de)constructive. Indeed Alvesson (2002, p.111) has called for a greater focus upon the dynamics of interaction in interviewing processes as he comments:

My approach differs from the preoccupation with the researcher’s subjectivity, and ways of dealing with this, that dominates efforts to reflect upon the complexities of the research interview and its outcomes. I emphasise the research interview and the multitude of forces acting upon it and the interviewee, competing with ‘reality out there’ and ‘genuine experiences’ in influencing talk.

There is evidently some call for utilisation of the co-operative elements of interviewing in a way that reflects both post-modern and more traditional influences. We are aware of the requirement to construct some form of ‘truth’ through interviewing, and we strive for this in our conscious attempts to
conduct the discussions in the identifiable role of researcher, even though we are simultaneously affected by a range of external aspects over which we have little perceived control. Being able to recognise this and then perhaps incorporate it in to our eventual analysis gives the process an exploratory originality that significantly aids investigation. Ultimately, it will be the interactive aspects of individual interviews, and the subsequent dissection of the process as a whole, combined with the productive, lively, even argumentative elements of the group discussions that will potentially elicit a robust empirical foundation from which to work.

We should at least make some attempt to approach the ethical issues inherent here, as the subject under scrutiny is of a sensitive nature. Not just a simple discussion of conduct with the practitioners, the way in which contact with children is specifically focussed upon in a sense charges the research with a revelatory potential. In accordance with University ethics procedures, the relevant clearance was obtained and forms were signed, although it is important to remain mindful of the way in which informed consent, right to privacy and protection from harm only constitute a starting point in terms of ethical protection and should perhaps therefore be developed in line with the specificities of the project itself. Fontana and Frey (1998) have discussed the need for recognition of the alternative problems which the researcher encounters when interviewing participants. These include the notion of overt/covert data collection, the degree of involvement of the researcher in the group under scrutiny and the overall veracity of reporting from researcher. These all have implications for this study as the use of both traditional and less conventional methods will influence ideas of truth, knowledge and dissemination. Although full disclosure has been given to the participants, the manner in which the subject will be reflexively revisited perhaps leaves their contributions more open to re-appropriation and deconstruction than they would if they were recorded and then left alone. It is likely, without
underestimating the participants that they would not anticipate such an intensive interrogation of statements that they may well have made ‘unconsciously’.

‘Field’ selection and its re-appropriation

Using the North-West (of England) as a base for locations was a consequence of both accessibility, the University is situated in Crewe, a town often described as a ‘railway hub’, and also one of representation. The North-West is home to two of the most significant and culturally diverse cities in the U.K., Manchester and Liverpool, and also rolling, picturesque countryside, seemingly unchanged for hundreds of years. British and indeed Western history can be explored in the development of England’s North-West in a way that explains how the apparently micro-cosmic can be projected into national and then international phenomenon. The region has been, by both accident and design an independent leader, and the nation as a whole has taken considerable notice of this, tacitly aligning itself with a cultural shift that has become far less London centric. Although we are speaking very broadly here, the city of Manchester and its consistent, often unprecedented reinvention gives us an insight into the kind of distinction that has made England’s North-West into the ‘poster-child’ for British and perhaps European aspirations concerning assimilation, co-operation, urban dynamism and rural preservation (Banks, 2006, Julier, 2005, Myles, 2004, Young et al, 2006).

As a result, the areas selected, rural and suburban Cheshire and inner city Manchester, became representative of an enlarged ‘field’ in which the research took place. Although ‘fields’ are often conventionally discussed within ethnographic contexts, there is little distinction here between the use of interviews and more traditional ethnographic investigation. We have alluded above to this connection between interviewer and interviewee as one which
goes beyond a simple categorisation. As the process informs the researcher in ways which constructively fragment what was previously assumed to be a simple, balanced exchange, it is possible to ‘discover’ far more during an extended conversation than the method is perhaps given credit for. In addition there is a requirement to visit the schools in order to talk to the staff, giving the process a further ethnographic dimension. This was largely undertaken in the interests of participant convenience, but the physical act of visiting the schools, travelling through the respective catchment areas, walking through corridors and signing in at reception all offered an unparalleled insight into the environment which was under indirect scrutiny. I was carrying out interviews, yet this became an ethnographic endeavour in and of itself, and one which was not overlooked when it came time to go through the transcriptions. Indeed as Werner and Schoepfle (1987, cited in Berg 2009, p.198) have stated; ‘ethnography, becomes a process of gathering systematic observations partly through participation and partly through various types of conversational interviews’.

There should then be no particular issue with identifying and deconstructing the fields utilised in this instance with an approach similar to that of conventional ethnography or observation. The interviews offer official, academically legitimate documentation to my experiences, and a subsequent combination with the actual process of interviewing proved highly illustrative. That said we can return to the utilisation of North-West England as an area indicative of a further nationwide trajectory in both educational and more general terms. Out of the eight schools visited, four had taken on some degree of academy status, very roughly equivalent to the ratio in the country as a whole (Curtis, 2009, Higham and Earley, 2013). Although the academy debate has generated a great deal of controversy, it is perhaps not appropriate to delve into such an argument in this instance. It is however interesting to compare the findings from academies and conventional state schools in an attempt to map the
imperatives of educational policy intervention, as the way in which the current government strongly supports the academy movement, and the role of touch within this, should not be overlooked. It was ultimately hoped that a mix of this nature, four individual, four group interviews and four academies and four conventional state schools, would be achieved so the process proved in this respect successful.

Having not come from a background in educational research the notion of gatekeepers was difficult to address. I knew no one in the profession so I had to approach potential participants ‘cold’. This however did not necessarily hinder the recruitment, as I was able to formulate an experiential portfolio without the burden of prior knowledge. My naivety was in fact productive, as I was guided into the realm of the PE teacher and exposed to the milieu in a way that was intellectually developmental, and not necessarily coloured by expectation. This simultaneous removal and immersion also allowed a reflexive position to be adopted, an important aspect of the ethnographic ‘toolkit’. Berg has commented (2009, p.198) that; ‘ethnographers today must do more than simply describe the populations they investigate; they must strive to understand them and, if possible, to explain their activities.’ By taking on the role of PE teacher for an afternoon, sitting in a bustling entrance hall then entering the musty smelling often untidy PE office I was given the chance to interpretatively empathise with the staff in a way that would have been impossible had I simply ‘interviewed’. The schools were contacted by email in the first instance and a dialogue began with those willing to participate. Given this relatively anonymous method of initial contact, an email is easily ignored, an encouraging number of teachers co-operated in spite of the significant time constraints exacted by the profession.

Taking influence from a critical ethnographic approach (Anderson, 1989, Ely et al, 1991) which positions the researcher within an emancipatory or contrarian
role, we can attempt to explore the contemporary PE teacher with a view to exposing the shortcomings of the profession in a climate of intergenerational mistrust. There is an implication resident within a great deal of qualitative research that encourages narratives of social justice to emerge, and this study is no exception. We are trying to offer PE teachers an opportunity to discuss the problematic aspects of the occupation without the constraints and pressures of a preventative conformity hanging over them. This however requires a cultivation of some kind of ‘free space’ in which their comments are left alone to simply float into the ether away from the disapproving eye of parents, OFSTED, and child protection officers. Indeed, such is the visibility and communicative accessibility of such parties, the teacher will be understandably guarded, perhaps even misleading, reinforcing the need to maintain a reflexive approach and also supporting the requirement to explore the issue with a critical lens, questioning the forces at play that cause a teacher to adapt discursive communication in an attempt to override ‘inappropriate’ sentiment.

It is possible to discuss the use of critical ethnography within a context of adult/child tension as subversive, given the attention paid to ‘victim and survivor’ narratives in contemporary circles (Mawby and Walklate, 1994). Berg has referred to critical ethnography (2009, p.199) as ‘an orientation where the researcher has a concern about social inequalities and directs his or her efforts towards positive change’, though alongside this we must be mindful of the general societal view that social justice is served purely and exclusively in the fight against child abuse. This notion has become so well established and remains so unremitting, that to begin to refer to the rights of the adults who are affected by this culture of suspicion and often arbitrary accusation, is dismissed as being contrary to an idea of social progression. This subsequently places an ethnographic attempt to attend to the marginalising influences of such a climate within an alternative and, for many, problematic realm.
This study will hopefully present an argument that demonstrates the good intentions behind offering voice to a section of society which has become largely disenfranchised, although the fact that the research discusses child abuse without placing the ‘sick’ and ‘deviant’ motivations of those who commit such offences at the centre of the debate will superficially temper any claim that the work is concerned with ‘positive change’. With this in mind it is hoped that an adaptation of critical ethnography, one which recognises the difficulty many have with the debate placing adults within a legitimately vulnerable role, can not only draw attention to a significant disparity, but also begin to assess and question difficult patterns of thought which have themselves been considered forward thinking.

One potential problem with the use of a critical ethnography is the tendency to regard the environments or participants under scrutiny as isolated phenomena that benefit from an investigation that will ultimately prove transformative. This cannot however be guaranteed and it overlooks the complexity resident in the study of socio-educational movement. In a bid to attend to this we can refer to Denzin and Lincoln (1998a, p.296) who have commented on the need to remain specifically reflexive when undertaking ethnographic study:

Our experience suggests that the subjects of ethnographic studies are invariably temporally and spatially bounded. That the range of activities under investigation occurs in time and space (which becomes a space when given meaning) provides one anchorage, among many others for penetrating the hermeneutic circle. A key feature of this knowledge of course, is its incompleteness, its implicit and tacit dimensions.

This reflexivity, clearly an important aspect of contemporary qualitative research, and furthermore recognition of the need for reflexivity within critical ethnography, enables an issue to be explored in a way which establishes a link between the environment in question and the wider forces at work. In addition, when examining a climate such as intergenerational mistrust, in which current
trends will be significantly questioned, it becomes necessary to explicitly refer to external prevalence in a bid to critically compare, and suggest a workable alternative. This is particularly resonant here, again reinforcing the way in which interviews and ethnographic study can be regarded as interchangeable and mutually informative. Indeed Denzin and Lincoln (1998a, p.297) have gone on to say: ‘Capturing members’ words alone is not enough for ethnography. If it were, ethnographies would be replaced by interviews. Good ethnographies reflect tacit knowledge, the largely unarticulated, contextual understanding that is often manifested in nods, silences, humour, and naughty nuances.’ While it may appear that this study, only utilising interviews, does not fulfil ethnographic criteria, all of the elements discussed above have been encountered and processed in the exploration of an issue often influenced by misappropriation and deceit, where what is not said is often far more potent than what is. In this case ethnography has not been replaced by interviews, it has been created by them.

**The schools and their locations**

The eight schools visited were:

- Kings Grove School, Crewe, Cheshire East
- Knutsford High School (now Knutsford academy), Knutsford, Cheshire East
- Westhill School, Stalybridge, Tameside, Manchester
- Copley High School, Stalybridge, Tameside, Manchester
- Whalley Range 11-18 High School, Whalley Range, Manchester
- Painsley Catholic College, Cheadle, Staffordshire
- Wilmslow High School, Wilmslow, Cheshire East
- Fallibroome Academy, Macclesfield, Cheshire East
All are representative of differing interpretations of the British state system. Fallibroome and Copley are mixed sex academies, Westhill is an all-boys school which has adopted aspects of the academy model, with a speculative view to moving fully towards academy status. Painsley is a faith based school which operates under a wider ‘academy’ of equivalent Catholic colleges and the remainder are more conventional examples of state comprehensives. Whalley Range is an all-girls school which specialises in business enterprise and sport, Wilmslow High school is sports specialist college, Kings Grove has been awarded specialist business and enterprise status and Knutsford is a mixed sex secondary school with specialist status in English and Humanities, which has since my visit converted to an academy.

As mentioned above, ethical clearance was appropriately received and the schools were made aware that they would be named in the thesis. The members of staff have been given pseudonyms although age and gender remain visible, providing potential for a possible deduction of identity if re-read by the interviewees. This has however been explained to the participants and they remained happy to proceed.

There are on the surface, significant differences between schools that all developed from the ‘secondary modern’ model, as *specialism* and further distinction are seemingly promoted as a matter of course. It is clear that schools now need to celebrate their own individuality in a way that will entice students with aspirations in keeping with a perceived standard of success, though there has been evidence that points to the stratified incubation that this approach seems to engender. Dorling (2005, p.46) states, ‘the basic purpose of the education system is still to put children in their place. The key selection point has moved from age 11 in the 1960s to age 17 now. University admissions officers and those who control them are the gatekeepers to middle class entry.’ Attending a ‘specialist business and enterprise college’ begins an association
with a form of linguistic justification that the student will be expected to continue throughout university and into an eventual career. This is a prime example of discursive conditioning, although the temptation to digress becomes far too great here. It was telling however, that in amongst this ‘smorgasbord’ of educational choice, perceptions of touch and child safety remained fairly static.

There were indeed more genuine differences between the schools which should be referred to. Area has been mentioned above; however a more in depth look at the dynamics of location here may prove explanatory. An immediate and interesting contrast is evident in the first two schools visited. Separated by just 19 miles, Crewe and Knutsford differ significantly in socio-economic terms. Crewe’s post-industrial decline is a palpable aspect of any visit to the town, whereas Knutsford is a leafy commuter haven, specialising in that quaint cobbled aesthetic that northern towns on the outskirts of conurbations seem to deliberately maintain. Tea rooms were as strongly apparent here as kebab shops were in Crewe. Then to Stalybridge, twice consecutively to visit schools which flirted with the inner city. Westhill more so; in close proximity to a sixties tower block and with a notably South Asian student body, the school was a throwback in part to the clichés that Grange Hill has contributed to, sharply contradicted by a brand new PE complex. Copley represented a more remote Manchester, nestled in the hills fringing the Peak District just off the Huddersfield Road, its Nineties architecture and conjunction with a leisure centre seemed to betray an unrealised aspiration. Perhaps its new guise as an academy will satisfy those hungry for some kind of ‘progress’.

The next school warranted a journey deeper into the heart of Manchester. Whalley Range was the next destination and the urban agenda was set as I alighted at Mauldeth Road station. Parks, tree lined avenues and semi-detached houses that had seen better days were apparent with a uniformity that reinforced the homogeneity and bucolic pretensions of twentieth-century town
planning. This could have been South London, Southampton, Bristol or Leeds; the accents audible in Tesco express were the only Mancunian indicator. The ethnic make-up of Whalley Range (girls) school was predominantly South-Asian and to a lesser extent Afro-Caribbean. While this was no surprise, the school is within walking distance of the Windrush Millennium Centre and the British Muslim Heritage Centre; alongside this diversity was a largely white teaching staff. Whilst this could be representative of any number of societal manifestations it is most likely a reflection of the distance covered by staff members in their commute to work and the relative proximity of the students homes to the schools they eventually select. Although purely speculative, there is perhaps some truth in the general belief that teachers do not come from the areas in which they work and the students conversely are likely to attend schools that are, in spite of their differing specialisms or statuses, nearest to them.

The next school, Painsley Catholic College, the only faith based school visited, was situated in rural Staffordshire. This setting was the polar opposite to Whalley Range, as Cheadle, on the outskirts of Stoke on Trent was far more representative of middle England, in all its whiteness and predictability. The imminence of the inner city had been replaced in this instance by hedgerows and dog walkers in a landscape of inoffensive convention, although this is perhaps a somewhat cynical rendering of an area which was in reality very pleasant. The genuinely pastoral surroundings made it particularly hard to imagine the pupils being exposed to the same difficulties as those that attend Whalley Range, as space and greenery affords the developing mind a visible, tangible release. The influence that such a contrast has on perceptions and interpretations of touch will be discussed in more detail below, although the complexities of intercultural interaction or indeed their absence are significant.
Touch for teachers in all schools is a professional necessity, but is the considerable difference in the make-up of the student body a defining marker of conduct? It is of great interest to explore the dynamics of touching practice within different contexts which are themselves enacted under the more general educational ‘umbrella’, and whether or not intervention and policy has been in any way mindful of the challenges that face both adult and child in an arena of such complex ambiguity. The penultimate school visit took place at Wilmslow School, which was as mentioned above a specialist sports college. Wilmslow was similar to Knutsford in its aspirational, conspicuously moneyed characteristics. Evidently a bolthole for Mancunian professionals the school had none of the imposing menace that traditional comprehensives so often evoke; it was architecturally reminiscent of a suburban doctors surgery, all on one clinical level. Sporting success was clearly a celebrated aspect of the student experience here and this was reinforced by a ‘hall of fame’ in the main foyer. The photographs of students who had predominantly represented Manchester United at some level were given pride of place, greeting every visitor to the school in what could be described as a statement of intent. The PE department was naturally large here, and an interesting and at times animated group discussion took place. Fallibroome Academy in Macclesfield was the final school to be visited. The school itself lay on the perimeter of the Cheshire town. To the back of the campus lay rolling countryside as both snow topped hills and the vestiges of an industrial past were visible on arrival. Just like Crewe the town had had its heyday and now bore the hallmarks of the growth of the service industry, as call centre workers stood outside functional buildings smoking conciliatory cigarettes.

This may appear a simple description of the areas I visited on the way to the ‘real’ business of interviewing participants, I would however contend that these experiences and my reflections upon them were deeply revealing. An initial recognition of and then further exploration into the various settings that I have
entered combine to contribute to the *bricolage* that the multiple methodologies of qualitative research encourage (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998a). The ultimate aim here is to apply the dialogue gleaned from the research interviews to a holistic societal view that is mindful of the shifting interpretations that differing contexts will naturally provoke. When deconstructing ‘what has been said’ and attempting to make sense of this within a wider climate already heralded as one of inherent fear, it would be sociologically prudent to maintain a connection to the ‘birthplace’ of the data, be that inner city Manchester, post-industrial Cheshire or rural Staffordshire.

An extra dimension is added when the discussion of tensions and contradictions, a crucial aspect of post-modern qualitative agendas, begins. The multifaceted schooling models and socio-economic/socio-cultural disparities that have been apparent during the deconstruction of the interview locations give rise to some of the very difficulties that ‘the crisis of representation’ or fifth moment of qualitative research (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998a, 1998b) attempts to deal with. The institutional and indeed societal hypocrisy that has been associated with the issue of intergenerational touch, and the ramifications of this for teachers who operate in schools that increasingly realign intentions and targets, represents the interminable complexity that has surrounded this subject. This complexity can be best and perhaps most fully understood with the adoption of an analysis which remains both reflexively available and subject to the shifting interpretations evoked by the dynamism of discursive thought.
Chapter IV
Methods of Analysis
**Empirical investigation and narrative analysis**

Analysis and subsequent presentation of the findings from the interviews have been undertaken with a view to utilise two contrasting, though potentially illuminating approaches. In the first instance, the findings were processed in a ‘conventional’ sense, broadly informed by the grounded theory movement (see Glaser, 1978, Glaser and Strauss, 1967, Strauss and Corbin, 1994). From here however, they were converted into a fictional narrative, reinforcing and in some cases reinterpreting the ideas established in the primary stages, producing a productive and diverse response to the questions which have arisen during the research. It should be noted that although grounded theory is adopted as a means of guiding the procedural analysis which arises from the empirical investigation, the thesis is not an example of grounded theory research in a conventional sense. Using aspects of grounded theory has in this instance allowed a definable interpretation of the interview data to take place, alongside a wider connection between methodology and theory. The process has provided an appropriate bridge between ‘traditional’ data collection, thematic categorisation and subsequent reinterpretation in the form of a fictional narrative, and the characteristics of (constructivist) grounded theory which interrogate the connection between researcher and research were usefully recognised rather than catalysts of position.

An initial reading of the interview transcripts enabled the notation of interesting or relevant items within the text, ranging from single words to extended paragraphs. These items began to form general trends, largely centring around the subjects of: touch in its necessary form, self-protection, reticence and the problems with/realities of touch. Also the compromising of motivation, the problems that contemporary changes have evoked and negative trajectories in spite of progressive potential. And in addition, professional pressure in its preventative and interrogative forms, scrutiny and surveillance and self-scrutiny.
These fell naturally into corresponding groups and have enabled the systematic fragmentation of the interview findings along specific lines. Developing these groupings and coding the dialogue accordingly has subsequently resulted in the identification of five key areas: (i) Interpretation of touch and contact; (ii) Professional pressure – external/internal scrutiny – consequences of this; (iii) Transitions that have occurred – problems with contemporary education; (iv) Motivation for teaching – how this has been compromised; and (v) Potential for progression – future for PE teaching. Using these thematic bases has facilitated an analysis which is both thorough and critical, asking questions of the contemporary educational landscape in a methodical, strongly evidenced way. In addition to this systematic interrogation of the teachers’ dialogue there is a conscious attempt to retain reflexivity within the on-going critique. This may appear at odds with the categorical, highly procedural system of coding and theme selection mentioned above, although the utilisation of the fictional narrative in the presentation and analysis of the findings reinforces the requirement for the investigation to remain intrinsically adaptable. Indeed Denzin and Lincoln (1998a, p. 69) have commented; ‘Many studies using unstructured interviews are not reflexive enough about the interpreting process; common platitudes proclaim that data speak for themselves, that the researcher is neutral, unbiased, and “invisible”’. Although this project has utilised a form of semi-structured interview, the principles referred to here remain wholly applicable.

In addition, the sensitive nature of the subject matter under investigation reinforces the requirement to remain analytically reflexive. It is often difficult to speak openly about an issue that has such contemporary potency and personal revelation; we should therefore be mindful of the potential reticence on behalf of the teachers to discuss their position on intergenerational touch in front of a stranger who has arrived uninvited from a university with whom the institution has no connection. There has perhaps been an accusatory implication in the
desire to speak to members of a profession who have been increasingly influenced by a climate of suspicion, which although unintentional, has notably elicited a guarded response from a number of participants. Flatly denying that intergenerational problems exist in contemporary education, when colleagues from the same school have spoken at length about the tensions and issues that they face on a daily basis, indicates a detachment that can perhaps best be explored through the utilisation of reflexive appropriation.

**Marrying grounded theory and ethnographic fiction**

Although the ‘data’ has been coded and thematically grouped in such a way as to suggest a direct adoption of grounded theory techniques, the increasing contestation of the approach in recent years, indeed largely stemming from its misuse (Charmaz, 2011), and the notionally controversial use of ‘alternative’ techniques in addition to this, has encouraged a somewhat tentative association to take place in this instance. Through collecting data, coding and thematically analysing in a way which implies a connection to grounded theory, it becomes possible to benefit from the iteratively inductive characteristics of the approach without necessarily adhering to the paradigmatic categorisation which the development of grounded theory as a qualitative exemplar has provoked. There is a certain expectation to align oneself with a constructivist, objectivist or post-positivist approach when using an *evolved* methodological interpretation of grounded theory (Bryant and Charmaz, 2007), and whilst this can be useful as a means of definition, the way in which this study is informed by two analytical techniques makes a categorical position such as this problematic. It does however remain difficult to ignore the fact that constructivist grounded theory has encouraged a move away from the rigid application of technical procedure (Charmaz, 2006, Corbin and Strauss, 2008) in ways very similar to the break with orthodoxy called for above. Indeed, the approach itself is a useful reference point given the way in which reflexivity is recognised as a
fundamental aspect of process. Significance is given to the intricacy of circumstance, as location, time and other specifics are evaluated alongside their influence on knowledge formation, and the researcher forms abstractions that look beyond such normative foundations (Glaser, 1998).

Although there certainly will be aspects of (constructivist) grounded theory which will be called upon here, the manner in which fictional writing achieves impact may appear to undermine the subtleties and nuances of method which grounded techniques have encompassed. This is in reality open to contention, as it has become increasingly apparent that a sensitive utilisation of both methods can be greatly revealing. The combination of two seemingly disparate approaches will be troubling for many, motivating a reluctance to overtly adopt grounded theory, however there are many parallels here which support the use of both methods in a way that proves reciprocal and innovative. Not only does constructivist grounded theory facilitate a redefinition of the traditional alongside the benefit of a sound procedural method of investigation, the fictional narrative can further inform through an extrapolation of what is left unsaid. As Charmaz (2011, p. 365) comments: ‘I have long argued that we cannot assume that participants overt statements represent the most significant data. Instead their statements may take for granted fundamental processes that shape their lives or provide a strategic rhetoric to manage an impression.’ By using elements of constructivist grounded theory, including a recognition of specific situation and the reflexively informed creation of a fictional narrative, the dialogue collected in the interviews, whilst perhaps previously distorted by environmental influence, can be given new depth with its meaning reassessed.

This ‘strategic rhetoric’ can be approached in the initial analysis using a critique which remains aware of the pressures and intensity that a climate of fear can evoke, mindful of the extent to which conduct becomes internalised when transgression carries such grave consequences. Being able to position this
concern within a wider, more general model, contrasting the behavioural idiosyncrasies of PE with education and then society as a whole, gives an indication of the scope of such an environment and also sets the tone for the subsequent fictional composition. Asking how the situation resident in PE teaching is reflective of contemporary social trends enables the fictional narrative to gauge the enormity of the situation in ways that could perhaps only be alluded to if a less reflexive, more objectively focussed method were adopted.

Whilst fictional methods allow an interpretative development of the tacit implications and nuanced messages which inhabit the interview dialogue, the way in which fairly complex or at least traditionally distorted social realities can also be transmitted to diverse audiences provides a clear rationale for their use. The accessibility of academic work which concerns populations outside of such a context has been keenly debated (see Tracy, 2010), and a certain hypocrisy can be identified when we discuss marginalisation through texts written solely for an academic audience. By presenting work with evocative literary focus there is an opportunity to converse with the very subjects of such work in a way which both engages and provokes a reciprocal exchange. Given that adult/child tension is an issue of such urgency, in both real and imagined senses, there is an obvious requirement to discuss the consequences of a public difficulty within a public realm, and fictional methods provide the opportunity to interrogate a narrative, which has been previously suppressed, in a way which invigorates empirical data and begins to address a disproportionate discursive landscape.

Using ethnographic fiction, and techniques that utilise similar approaches, allows the researcher to delve into a subject with a connection that capitalises upon the evocative and illustrative nature of ‘storytelling’, simultaneously protecting the notion of truth by deliberately subverting it. The proposition will remain distinctly troubling for some, as the striking incongruity of the discussion
of truth alongside an adoption of intentionally creative explication upsets and disrupts, yet a dismissal of such an approach fails to recognise the redeeming, sharply catalytic qualities of fictionalisation in social research. When we construct research it begins to take on the form of a narrative in most instances. The entire process can be legitimately defined as one that is inherently ‘storied’. We create when we write regardless of the material on the page and fictionalised methods/methodologies simply facilitate an extension of this, subsequently allowing a collaborative relationship to emerge between writer and audience that charges deconstruction with an instant vitality. Rather than simply digest findings that have been presented in a conventional way, a fictional narrative encourages the audience to empathise with the protagonists in the tales or vignettes as the story progresses, capturing those who anticipate progression, when they may have previously looked forward to a neat, traditional conclusion.

Regarding the contention that such approaches are simply ‘relativism gone mad’, offering little in the way of valid social exploration but more an indulgent form of individual expression, Rhodes and Brown (2005) argue that a recognition of the fictionality of research texts implies a heightened sense of researcher-author responsibility. Fiction enables a prioritisation of the debate which has interrogated the notion of authorial subjectivity, confronting the idea that all research is inherently ‘storied’ and essentially fictional in its persuasive focus. In addition, Butler (1997) has claimed: ‘Stories (as familiar to literature) and experiments (as familiar to science) are quite similar in that they each work to create inter-subjectivity in the joint enterprise between the inquirer, the actors and the audience.’ It is true that all research is in some way constructed. This however, only becomes problematic when a devotion is made to impartiality or moreover objectivity, which itself cannot be maintained. To claim that a piece of research is an honest appraisal, unfettered by the influence of academic intention, or some other subconscious motive, is a very difficult
assertion to uphold. As Denzin (1996, p.231) comments: ‘Facts are objective. They are different from interpretations, which are subjective and hence cannot be proven but only made more or less credible, if the author got the facts straight.’

There is an evident danger with a commitment to positivistic truth, as such categorical, definitive resolution must be legitimated by the accuracy that it purports to guarantee. The room for error with such an unshakeably single minded approach to methodological reasoning therefore becomes significant. Indeed not only is this focus on objective truth one of scientific obduracy, it can now be regarded as an inherently retrograde even negligent position to adopt. By ignoring the way in which we all construct, in an environment where narrative thrust has led discussion, the researcher is forced to present a contribution that will, regardless of its contemporary relevance, remain predominantly static. Literary evocation, or moreover a post-modern acceptance of the instinctively creative focus of thematic presentation, is left open to interpretation and a subsequent dissection, re-affirmation or converse rejection indefinitely following its dispersal. As Tyler (1986, p. 123) states: ‘the discourses of the postmodern world involve the constant comingling of literary, journalistic, fictional, factual and ethnographic writing. No form is privileged over another.’

By using a methodological approach which is open to considerable individual interpretation there is a need to discuss the criteria by which the methodology, and by extension the thesis, should be judged. As mentioned above ideas surrounding reliability and validity are subject to redefinition in qualitative research which encourages the emergence of multiple realities (see Smith and Caddick, 2012), and this should be recognised in the evaluative intentions. Rather than produce a list of fixed criteria, it could prove more productive in this instance to pose the following questions: (i) Are the emotive themes portrayed of contemporary relevance to practising PE staff? (ii) Does the research draw
attention to a problematic discursive reality with appropriate sensitivity? (iii) Is there a means by which policy and practice can be challenged by the projection of an alternative narrative? (iv) Does the thesis represent a coherent synthesis of ideas (see Lieblich et al, 1998), i.e. is there a meaningful connection between situation, researcher, method and theory? By remaining within the parameters of these questions it is hoped that the project will encourage and perpetuate a dialogue surrounding the marginalisation of the PE teacher. Given the importance of discourse in this context, the efficacy of the research can be gauged against its capacity to provoke challenging, previously underexplored and catalytically controversial debate.

**Narratives of marginalisation**

By discussing subjects which include self-protection, environmental pressure and the damaging nature of false accusation, attention is drawn to the plight of many teaching staff forced to operate within the boundaries of a fear based system. That this has been previously underexplored engenders a sense of urgency and vitality that fits with notions of social justice and attempts to address such a problematic manifestation. In addition to this, the efficacy of creative representation and indeed ethnographic fictions has perhaps been most convincingly exemplified in the manner in which they are able to empower. Giving voice to the marginalised has long been an objective of traditional sociology and anthropological observation, although the assumptions that surround positivistic truth have since come to question this legitimacy. There has, perhaps in response to this, been a notable interest in creatively constructive methodologies from a number of both gender studies and feminist writers.

Inckle (2010 p. 30-31), taking influence from Queer and gendered interpretations of the structural privilege given to conventional paradigms
states: 'I was determined to avoid the traditional hierarchies of knowledge which privilege hyper-rational, exclusively cognitive, and disembodied ways of knowing – i.e. objectivity – which Susan Bordo (1986) and later Williams and Bendelow (1998) describe as ‘the Cartesian masculinisation of thought’. ‘This is particularly important, as adult PE teachers find themselves increasingly alienated, disenfranchised by a disproportionate preoccupation with the imperatives of child safety, however there is a focus on embodiment here that should perhaps be approached slightly differently under current circumstances. Inkle (2010) and others (see Smith and Sparkes, 2002, 2004, 2005, 2008, 2011 Sparkes, 1996, 2003a, 2003b, 2007, Sparkes and Smith, 2002, 2003, 2008, 2011a, 2011b) have employed ethnographic fiction and narrative inquiry as a means of ‘conveying the embodied tale’, making use of the evocative and expressive capacity of literary approaches for an engagement with the sensory and tactile aspects of environment.

The way in which physical interaction has been so intensively driven out of intergenerational contexts suggests that there may be difficulty in displaying this removal with a technique that lends itself so well to vicarious involvement. Although this is a notable point, it is not necessarily reflective of the all-encompassing reach of fictional methods. Disembodiment can be just as effectively explored here as we can position the notion within a challenging conflict between instinctive spontaneity and enforced distance. The complexity of restriction in contemporary schooling can be addressed with a penetrative depiction of the frustrations evident in a climate that has served to inexorably separate adult from child. We should then not necessarily focus purely on the notion of embodiment or disembodiment, but rather explore both through an evocatively investigative process of interrogation. The opportunity has arisen here to present a range of emotions in a way that looks beyond a mere dichotomy of interest. Conventional ‘results’ can and often have been presented in a way that attempts to demonstrate a neatly reducible ‘trend’. This is
contrary to the very essence of using fictionalised, creative methods which themselves promote the assertion that this is no longer the most effective way in which to research social lives.

**Multiple realities and post-modernity**

It is clear that the generation and discussion of multiple realities is an important focus here. The way in which we are able to interpret social change with an opportunity to develop new ways of knowing (Frank, 2000) enhances the research process for author and audience in an environment which has been difficult to challenge under more orthodox analytic circumstances. Constructivist grounded theory accommodates this plurality of ‘truth’ as Charmaz (2011, p.374) comments: ‘constructivist grounded theory acknowledges multiple perspectives and multiple forms of knowledge. Its practitioners become attuned to nuances on empirical worlds that elude researchers who assume a unitary method and unitary knowledge and thus are ill-equipped to grasp such nuances as the voice of dissent and the silence of suffering.’ This is both encouraging and useful, as we are given opportunity to bring together the systems of method which constructivist grounded theory comprises and the highly illustrative qualities of a fictional narrative, in a collaborative effort which enables the difficulties of adult/child interaction to be demonstrated comprehensively and succinctly.

Utilising aspects of grounded theory in the initial stages essentially lays the foundation for further deconstruction which compliments and builds upon what has come before. It would be both possible and productive to simply interview, code, analyse and debate without calling upon the fictional narrative, though the study would ultimately lack the impetus that fictional interpretation offers a discussion. If executed with appropriate literary acumen the fictional narrative can provide an arena for debate which would only be hinted at during the
preceding stages. It is the natural progression from thematic and theoretical processing of interview material as it mediates between the questions that discussion has provoked and the embryonic constructions that emerge in the minds of both audience and author. As Frank (2000, p. 486) states: ‘In attempting to render a character reliable and believable, I can also learn a great deal about the systems and environment in which this fictive person’s actions become meaningful as well as about my own questions, assumptions and emotions.’ The investment which creative approaches such as this can encourage is an additional testament to their strength as research methods. The author is essentially forced to engage with a subject on a personal level, thereby charging the composition with a robust, often emotionally affected sense of embedded ‘reality’. There is as ever potential for critique here, by making reference to the dangers of ‘going native’ and being swayed by an introspective perception of environment, yet the remaining attachment to the techniques inherent in constructivist grounded theory goes some way towards safeguarding a recognition of context.

As social research becomes increasingly adaptive to post-modern influence there is far more call to question the universalism to which many continue to cling. Jones (2011) has discussed the difficulty present in current systems which, particularly in academia, are denying the interrogation of complex, sometimes unanswerable questions and instead favouring the accountable and estimable aspects of institutional promotion. Jones successfully questions this problematic new focus by positioning such issues within a narrative setting, attending to the concern both literally and conceptually. To begin a journal article, PhD thesis, or book chapter with a piece of fiction remains deeply troubling for some as it provokes an immeasurable outcome, disrupting an equilibrium that appears, according to Jones, to govern the imperatives of contemporary higher education.
A deliberate subversion of this is perhaps the most effective response in the crusade against hegemonic dominance, as this method welcomes and fully legitimates alternative voice without resorting to the coercive techniques that are often apparent in the formation of pervasive discourse. As Jones (2011, p.634) comments: ‘Appearance has come to rival substance, competency has come to replace quality, an audit driven phenomenon that can be taken as reflective of an even more general social trend’. Of course this statement has many parallels with the situation resident in the intergenerational context, but its resonance here also speaks of a call for more creatively investigative research to not only take place, but also be facilitated by an exploratory landscape that places value upon pedagogical experimentation. In addition to this aim, storied representation is also a potent reminder of the existential difficulty that can stem from opposition, and the ultimate redundancy of dissidence when attempted within an environment that is controlled by a particularly well established socio-cultural norm. Jones (2011, p.635) has also stated; ‘similar to other post-modern means of representation then, the primary purpose of such a method lies in awakening and illustrating our collective involvement in social processes we often take for granted.’ It is then relatively clear that we should engage with a method that places significance upon emotional stimulation, as we are in grave danger of sleepwalking into a society which checks, vets and interrogates before it assesses the individual, if indeed we have not already done so.

When discussing post-modernism and indeed applying its principles to the study it is important to be mindful of the tensions that this can present. Such approaches are useful to us in their rejection of a single ‘truth’, and subsequent fragmentation of interpretation thereby sits well with the plurality invoked by a fictional narrative. Yet problems occur when the attribution of stable ‘meaning’ is attempted. Given that the coding and then thematic analysis of the interview findings has appeared to have been undertaken with a view to finding a sense
of ‘meaning’ behind the text, this represents a somewhat difficult analytical terrain. There are however ways of dealing with this. Alvesson (2002, p.131) states: ‘Pomo [post-modernism] expresses the orientation that there is no ‘depth’ behind the ‘surface’ to be located through hermeneutic or phenomenological procedures. Some pomos (sic) prefer to talk about readings rather than interpretation. The researcher can thus contribute with more or less interesting readings, rather than more or less true or more or less insightful interpretations of the empirical material studied.’ With this in mind it becomes possible to attend to the initial analysis using a more organic approach, itself not necessarily influenced by the pressure that finding meaning or significance can place upon the investigation. Instead, by exploring the dialogue with a more suggestive resolution we allow, with the benefit of theoretical attachment, the audience to process this treatment in a way which leaves room for continued, rather than definitive, debate.

There is perhaps an additional argument against the use of social theory in this stage of analysis given the post-modern aversion to the attachment of meaning. Responding to this we can discuss the way in which the works employed in this instance, from Foucault, Beck and Baumann, are individually concerned with the overall dissolution of rhetorical and ideological stability in contemporary social settings, implying that the utilisation of these approaches in an attempt to establish an unconditional, static set of conclusions would itself be hypocritical. There is, in addition, a difficulty with traditional notions of interpretation in post-modernist approaches, which can be circumvented with an accommodation of voice. In relation to this Alvesson (2002, p.132) has also commented: ‘Interpretation means going beyond what is expressed. A sensitive way of dealing with the voices of those being studied will call for some caution about the researcher imposing his or her meaning upon them, about the voice of the researcher taking over the voice of the subjects.’
The constructive ‘manipulation’ of voice

We are, by adopting an approach which combines the verbatim voice of the teacher with a fictionalised reimagining of their dialogue, allowing voice to develop in a way which is far more naturalistic than appearances may imply. Given that I, the author of the study and indeed fictional narrative, am deliberately manipulating the interview transcripts in an attempt to create a storied, evocative representation of the staff member’s comments, any claim towards naturalism will be automatically contested. However, the manner in which the original dialogue is utilised and indeed prioritised, acting as a guide for the construction of a tale that remains fundamentally imbued within a contemporary teaching environment, offers a rejoinder to any critique which questions my involvement in and motives behind the ‘evocative’ depiction of the realities of PE teaching. The voice of the teacher is celebrated in this instance, rather than overshadowed by authorial emphasis, as the fictional narrative acts as an appropriate and often effective medium between the teacher’s comments and their realisation within an emotive and expressive context.

This points to an initially acceptable explanation of the ‘conversion process’, yet there remains problematic potential for the writer to construct a fantastic, wildly exaggerated version of events in addition to the public critique of what is often perceived as a somewhat ‘self-indulgent’ methodological approach. Sikes and Piper (2010, p. 52) have addressed the former by stating:

On the basis of the accounts we’d collected it would have been very easy to write sensational, lurid, shock-horror narratives that would have, nonetheless corresponded with some of the events and stories we were told about. However we chose not to go down this route, preferring instead to write stories that, our evidence suggested, were more representative and characteristic of the sort of things that tend to happen in the majority of allegation experiences.
With this in mind, it is important to identify a distinction between the salacious and the expressively accurate, as the ease with which this line can be transgressed is self-evident. It is by staying within the thematic parameters which we have set up here that we have at our disposal a 'safety net' which to some extent protects the integrity of the narrative. There is in this instance some licence to create a tale which transmits an environment in a striking, resonant and perhaps thought provoking way as it is linked to and subsequently legitimated by a system which has arisen out of methodical, even conventional data analysis techniques.

**Education and social change – thematic breakdown**

Sociological investigation offers the possibility to identify and anticipate transition within cultural settings and this is brought into sharp focus when we explore an environment as ‘turbulent’ as education. Moreover, the sociologist can account for the influences that have contributed to such change, through the continual study of human interaction, behavioural patterns and socio-political movement. These aspects are, broadly speaking and amongst numerous others, responsible for the systems of change or indeed stasis which we all attempt to informally explain on a daily basis. It is this informality that has perhaps been overlooked in previous analyses. It is indeed important to regard the way in which sociology has become a publically accessible tool as a significant marker of the ubiquity of interactional investigation in contemporary settings. Various new technologies are increasingly geared towards sociological mapping in ways that represent an unprecedented interest in social transition (Beer and Burrows, 2010, Burrows, 2011); that these innovations lie outside of academia and are placed firmly within the public realm indicates a recognition at least of the public desire and newly realised capacity for sociological interrogation. This of course has a connection to the use of illustrative and creative representational techniques as these approaches redefine the
traditional binaries of teacher and student, or expert and layperson, by offering
the reader an opportunity to re-imagine and contribute.

Although change, and the difficulty that this has presented to the adult
practitioner, is under observation in the thematic criteria, it becomes possible in
addition to explore the dissolution of traditionalisms within a system that seems
paradoxically retrospective. Notions of independence, leadership, authoritarian
discipline and perhaps professionalism have been similarly redefined under the
auspices of a newly preventative imperative in adult/child contexts, and
discussing the themes mentioned at the beginning of the chapter will enable a
further interrogation of this, set up as they are to account for a shifting dynamic
within contemporary teaching. A deconstruction of the efficacy of these themes,
and by extension the richness and scope of the data through which they have
been identified, takes place below.

Beginning with *Interpretation of touch and contact* we are able to investigate
the way in which teaching staff negotiate instances of contact and their
respective perceptions of this. In addition we are able to assess the extent to
which they themselves have been influenced by the requirement in
contemporary intergenerational settings to indirectly desexualise contact.
Alongside this, this thematic base enables an insight into the levels of
institutionalisation which intergenerational mistrust has engendered. Discussing
touch with a practising teacher is likely to be coloured by their own recognition
that this is indeed a problematic notion and should therefore be accommodated
when addressing this context. With *Professional pressure – external/internal
scrutiny – consequences of this* it is possible to begin to map the more
constraining, invasive aspects that are seemingly now resident in PE teaching
and pinpoint exactly how a new pedagogical understanding of distance between
adult and child is implemented and maintained. *Transitions that have occurred –
Problems with contemporary education* is fairly self-evident, although it implies
that change has been counterproductive in this instance, allowing the identification of a correlation between increasing regulation, scrutiny and checking and intergenerational mistrust in a way that confirms our original concerns. With *Motivation for teaching – how this has been compromised*, we are given the opportunity to gauge the influence of what is essentially a transition within a transition, as the personal adaptive changes that an individual must make when embarking on ‘a career’ are intersected by increasing upheaval within the professional space which they enter.

The final theme *Potential for progression – future for PE teaching* facilitates an insight into the trajectory of the profession under the current circumstances. By attempting to look forward, informatively speculating on the development of teaching practice within a context of problematised adult/child interaction, it is possible to interpret the contemporary revealingly. Bleak predictions are strongly indicative of current discontent, expressing a requirement to attend to problems with an immediacy which gloomy forecasting implies and demands. There is also opportunity to discuss the more positive aspects of PE teaching with the inclusion of progression. Focussing upon the collaborative and innovative teaching approaches in current schooling enables the deconstruction of any reactionary presence within an occupation that has seemingly been externally, and perhaps problematically governed for some time now. It is important to concern ourselves with the existence of reflexive autonomy in teaching in much the same way as we focus upon professional disconnection, as it is the reaction of teaching staff to a system of suspicion which illustrates the development and scope of the system itself.

**Creation of the ‘story’ – Foucauldian influence**

As the interview transcriptions have been processed and the notable, thought provoking passages of dialogue have been assigned to the relevant thematic
section, the construction of the story can begin in earnest. When attempting this it is important to be mindful of the temptation that lies in producing such scripts to get carried away, creating as alluded to above, a simple exercise in hyperbole. Although it is only possible to assess the impact and competency of such attempts by deconstructing the writing itself, rather than critically problematising the style before it has been undertaken. There is then, perhaps more value in exploring the theoretical motivations behind adopting such an approach.

By engaging with creative methods of representation we are able to question the dualities and established binaries that have emerged in the discussion and treatment of touch. In an extension of the dissolution of traditional roles within lay/expert, normative/abnormal systems, the notion of touch as a standalone subject is one that has been particularly influenced, and indeed constructed by morally and historically contingent categorisation. There remain interpretations in Western societies that position touch within a strictly demarcated set of criteria. We have seen evidence of this in the development of ideas of ‘good’ touch and ‘bad’ touch, ideas which have been brought into sharp focus in intergenerational contexts, the intention being to leave little room for ambiguity in such environments. Unfortunately this has only been intensified, confusing and displacing adults who work with children who are unable to keep track of a normative convention that constantly shifts in keeping with public concern. O’Malley Halley (2007, p.17) has, using Foucault, attended to this: ‘The slippery boundaries surrounding touch are especially important to explore if we view the dualisms as constructed, not natural. By examining the binary nature of ideologies of adult-child touch, my study challenges the power of dualisms to govern our lives.’ She goes on to say, ‘This does not mean that mainstream ideologies of touch are merely ‘bad’ or that the ideologies expressed, for example, in contemporary child rearing literature have nothing to offer. Rather we must be vigilant as to the multiple and problematic meanings that the
ideologies contain, and wary as to the normalizing ways they shape us as human subjects in our social world.’ There is an evident and problematic tension here between the realities of touching practice, in their spontaneous, relational, communicative form and the creation of regulatory response within contexts that have been (now traditionally) associated with abuse. There is without doubt a misappropriation of concern being played out in this instance.

We know that touch is often an instinctive, perfectly legitimate means of instruction, affection, consolidation or leadership, enacted subconsciously without a connection to any notion of dubious intention. By attempting to police this, or indeed concerning ourselves with the ethical significance of policing this, we often bypass the actual purpose of this haphazard regulation: prevention of child abuse. That adults want to protect children from the dangers of abuse remains admirable and important although it is deemed unintentionally irrelevant by a system which has seemingly facilitated the cultivation of a simplistic and perfunctory method of measurement. The subsequent outcomes merely serve to disenfranchise the innocent and dangerously underestimate the guilty, as potential offenders will inevitably find ways round such scanty preventative dichotomies of conduct (Furedi, 2002, Piper and Smith, 2003). Spontaneity and autonomy are as a consequence extinguished, representative as they are of an anachronism not in keeping with the intricacy of modern power structures.

The importance of the contemporary

Ultimately there is a need to situate the approaches described above in contemporary terms. Constructivist grounded theory and an ethnographic fictional narrative may be coherent and appropriate tools in the debate which centres around adult/child tension, yet a failure to at least acknowledge the realities of current systems of communication and interconnection will present a
number of problems. Although post-modernity is useful to us in its acceptance of multiple meanings, it remains very difficult to overlook the influences of postmodern technologies, or contextual apparatus, when they themselves comprise such a significant portion of the identities and lifestyles which we help to construct. The main paradox of postmodernity lies in its apparent rejection of systematically produced convention whilst an adoption of postmodern characteristics by the mainstream, itself facilitated by the outcomes of postmodern development, continues to occur.

Postmodernity is overtly and tacitly becoming a normalised, definable entity and whilst we can continue to benefit from its fragmentation of truth and constructively polarising influence, it is impossible to overlook the way in which this has become a fundamental, largely unchallenged aspect of contemporary organisation. As postmodernity becomes the default setting in today’s social organisation the devolution of grand narratives and the multifaceted discourse which it purports to invoke are regulated under the umbrella of an all-encompassing system of communication and knowledge exchange, or as we know it, the World Wide Web. The internet, arguably a realisation of postmodern plurality, in which views, opinions and orthodoxy are open to continuous inspection by an unaccountable populace, and debate and virtual dissidence is made available to everyone, has become the definitive grand narrative. Whist the original potential of the internet heralded an unprecedented opportunity to redefine the way we process information, we cannot ignore the way in which consensus and majority rule have become more robustly established under the auspices of this techno-social movement. Whilst alternative argument is available to internet users, we have largely witnessed a simple consolidation of the previous orthodoxies take place. The internet is in essence, superficially divergent in its recognition of fragmented realities, although its everyday function merely perpetuates the prevalence of normative, often tacitly authoritarian discourse.
In discussing Lyotard, Hollinger (1994, p. 129) states; ‘For Lyotard, a community based on consensus and unity would be totalitarian precisely because it would ignore differences. Lyotard wants community and agreement to be based upon, even constituted by difference, particularly heterogeneity, indeed, fragmentation.’ The manner in which we are all passively coerced into sharing details and information over the internet masquerades as an affirmation of individuality although it is in fact a far more consensual process. In order to avoid offending others or indeed facing criminal prosecution we are reduced to sharing information so trivial that it barely registers as a conscious act. A tool that has the potential to mobilise and resist in ways which have hitherto been unparalleled has rendered reactive phenomena such as the Arab Spring highly exceptional and normalised the instinctive celebration of inconsequential distraction.

This of course has ramifications for the use of fictional work in this instance, and indeed the adult/child narrative which informs the research. Postman (1994, p. 99) has relevantly discussed an interesting development in the perception of role in an increasingly ‘electronic’ social world. He states;

As electric media move literacy to the periphery of culture and take its place at the center (sic), different attitudes and character traits come to be valued and a new diminished definition of adulthood begins to emerge. It is a definition which does not exclude children, and therefore what results is a new configuration of the stages of life. In the television age there are three. At one end infancy, at the other senility, in between there is what we might call the adult-child.

Postman is essentially implying that a distortion of the distinction between adult and child has been encouraged by an increasingly homogenous approach to the dispersal and consumption of information. Whilst he uses television as an example, we can perhaps develop his argument by discussing the internet and
indeed using this example in a fictional form. This may be referred to in the narrative in a metaphorical or overt sense, with the ultimate intention being to draw attention to the hypocrisy resident in our perception of adult and child in contemporary social settings and the way in which we continue to contribute to this. Using a method which retains postmodern characteristics throughout its constructive process, to refer to the paradox of postmodern thought and its distortion in a contemporary which it claims to be responsible for, is itself fundamentally postmodern, and the tension which this provokes will hopefully make for varied and extensive debate.
Chapter V
Theory and Methodology, an explanation of synthesis
Theoretical significance

This section is of particular importance as the theory which will be discussed below will ultimately inform the analysis and discussion in ways which attempt to engender a more provocotive approach to understanding. The work which is discussed here is of considerable relevance to the landscape of adult/child anxiety and there should be a subsequent recognition of this on behalf of both author and audience. This chapter is therefore pivotal, as we begin to engage, in detail, with the ideas which guide the interrogation of this climate.

Referencing

The thesis as a whole is informed and generated by the use of the concepts discussed below. As a result, there are sections in which the discussion flows for relatively long periods without appearing to draw on support from existing literature, such as the sociological tradition expects. This may be problematic for some, however the theoretical synthesis which has been discussed here has led to an amalgamation of thought rather than a direct, replicated application of concept. The analysis and discussion sections derive from an understanding of the work that combines the relevant characteristics in a way which deliberately attempts to generate a free flowing construction. Reading the collective work of the four writers mentioned here and throughout has emphasised the potential for a collaborative narrative and the following sections will stand to benefit from this.

In addition, the anti-positivist approach which the thesis has generally adopted makes an exhaustive referencing process and ultimate search for categorical ‘truth’ a source of some discomfort. The complexity of the issues under scrutiny is such that any attempt to verify and triangulate will fall some way short of its intended target. It is particularly difficult to coherently deconstruct the
existential turbulence of the adult/child dilemma, and our subsequent need to approach what is left unsaid in the dialogue and otherwise, contradicts a traditional analysis. The literature is ultimately used ‘where potent’ and in this respect more broadly resembles a philosophical text with strong sociological underpinnings.

**Combining theory and method**

Given that the subject matter we are dealing with here is of such topical resonance it would be easy and perhaps expected to use theoretical approaches which themselves reflect contemporary, nominally ‘avant-garde’ trends. This will remain true to a certain degree, although the theory and method/ology selected throughout the course of this investigation will focus primarily on the movement and evolution of a developmental phenomenon, taking a range of analyses into account. We are referring here to the proliferation of child abuse narratives and by extension their influence over British and indeed Western populations. This divergence in approach is itself a highly deliberate attempt to benefit from a range of cultural and structural deconstruction without the difficulty associated with an optimistic pledge to maintain theoretical fidelity.

Taking the above into account, the selection of theory and methods was ultimately guided by the question of relevance, and whether the theory could legitimately shed light upon a problem which has influenced and moreover realigned some of the binaries which we previously regarded as well established. It is by assessing what has been a seismic change in the rhetoric and intervention, which surrounds the subject of child welfare (and its apparent dissolution), that we can begin to account for this shift and potentially explore its future projection.
This section will attempt to justify the marriage of informative theory and a methodology which has also taken on a ‘compound’ approach. Introducing and exploring the work of Michel Foucault, Ulrich Beck, Zygmunt Bauman and Anthony Giddens and then applying their various concepts to the empirically grounded and fictionally evocative methodological position, this chapter will provide the paradigmatic thrust for the thesis as whole.

**Michel Foucault – discipline and surveillance in contemporary PE**

The scope of Foucauldian theory is difficult to overstate, although his concepts become especially pertinent when attempting to deconstruct an educational context. Foucault’s style of sociologically grounded philosophy (or vice versa) saw him gain distinction as a unique thinker during the second half of the twentieth century. The manner in which he interrogated and adapted previously well established systems of thought was a testament to his remarkable sense of progressive perception, and startlingly observant critical concision.

The significant and far reaching cultural and political instability of the late sixties and seventies provided Foucault with an ideal backdrop from which to reinterpret the myriad writings on power and discipline. Scholars of social science had been wrestling with these topics since their Marxist introduction, Gramscian progression and structuralist categorisation. Foucault took influence from, and subsequently looked beyond these positions, reluctant as he was to be theoretically stratified. His epistemological approach eschewed the relative rigidity of sociological terminology as he routinely utilised contrasting, often contradictory bases in a successful attempt to redefine academic convention for the sake of novel revelation. The controversy that his radical approaches provoked was perhaps something of a catalyst for his interest in the topic of contemporary discipline. The contextual circumstances in which he operated certainly point to a situation in which one would strive for a deeper
understanding of the pressures and tensions that constitute such an environment. As alluded to above, there were pronounced post-war divisions in the French and European socio-political terrain. This era was punctuated by further conflict and dissolution as a fragile continent attempted to find its collective purpose. Capitalist interests, communist imperatives, technocracy, democracy and dictatorship all vied for supremacy in a disparate landscape. The eventual victor in this struggle is in essence immaterial; it is the battle itself, the battle to determine which particular belief system will ultimately govern vast populations and the techniques with which this is achieved that perhaps most inspired Foucault to concern himself with the notion of power (Sheridan, 1980).

Foucault’s concepts can also be effectively utilised when we attempt to contextualise. His work is not only demonstrably indicative of post war Europe; it can be applied to locales as diverse as the very methods of control that he commented upon. Taking a holistic view, it is possible to assert that Foucauldian theory is strongly consistent with, and perhaps responsible for, a generally held interpretation of power that accommodates the distortion and pacification with which we must all, to some degree comply. Whilst this notion is broadly applicable to contemporary organisation, it is important to remember that the power that we refer to here is by no means a fixed entity. The concept of power is itself transferable and multi-faceted, with the capacity to both liberate and suppress in equal measure (Foucault, 1977 etc.).

The insidious and polarising nature of the climate in which adults are expected to operate speaks to us about the very dangers which Foucault has discussed. Not only has surveillance become an overtly exercised occupational hazard for those who work in intergenerational contexts, the manner in which it has been perpetuated by those at its mercy is strikingly relevant. Whereas power is able to liberate, the intensity with which it can restrain and control is also sharply focussed. It becomes a living element, with the capacity to evolve and
reproduce in conjunction with and in contrast to contemporary social movement. Education is one of the most visible contexts in which Foucault’s notions of power and discipline are enacted. Not only are schools, to a large extent microcosmic representations of a societal whole, they also operate with a regimentally produced yet largely familial structure, the continuity of which is indirectly enforced by subtle persuasion, coercion and eventual adherence. The school has its strictly demarcated boundaries of status in just about every context. The teachers, students, admin staff, caretakers, caterers, bus drivers and lollipop operatives must all negotiate a complex system of socially embedded ruling, which is far more pronounced and carries far more significance than in many other professional settings. The intergenerational underpinnings of this are clear to see, although the notion of parental substitution which presided for a long time has been fundamentally distorted by the reticence inherent in contemporary imperatives.

Indeed such an influence has led to a relative exhaustion of Foucault’s work in educational contexts, as countless scholars, researchers and students have identified the control which they themselves perhaps contributed to during their respective school years. With this in mind where does this leave our use of Foucault’s concepts? The one thing we can call upon is the manner in which intergenerational discomfort has been so readily avoided in previous educational and indeed broadly sociological work. Its simultaneous absence and very visible presence speaks to us of an interesting allocation of power narratives and systems of control. Whilst there has been a gradual rise in the public fear of and visible aversion to the dangers of child sexual abuse, a line of questioning which bemoans the intensity and prejudices with which these thought patterns are delivered has been readily suppressed. Using Foucault’s work enables a response to the apparent contradiction of context which we discuss here, as it becomes possible to accept our own inherent connection to and involvement in the construction of discursive tendency. Whereas ‘conventional’ approaches to
social study have been guided by relatively immovable boundaries between observer and the observed, a Foucauldian approach realigns this, directly confronting the biases and cultural proclivities which the researcher is forced to negotiate. As Baert and Carreira da Silva state (2010, p.188) in relation to Foucault’s work:

(Foucault) Presents a form of knowledge about the social world which is first and foremost ‘self-referential’. That is, it is not primarily (and certainly not merely) directed towards reconstructing a world out there, but rather ultimately directed at revealing our own previous assumptions … rather than drawing upon analogies with the familiar to explain the unfamiliar, his writings aim at creating distance, revealing and threatening what was hitherto taken for granted.

This coherently relates to the discussion of intergenerational tension, as we have been shown time and again that its very treatment has been largely enacted under the auspices of our own discomfort, subject to our self-perpetuating sense of revulsion when the notion of intergenerational contact is approached. A Foucauldian admission of the unavoidable influence of socially embedded sensitivity, would indeed allow us to begin to challenge the two dimensional discussion which has previously guided exploration into adult/child interaction. The conventional narratives of investigation have cultivated a ‘them and us’ idea, in which child sexual abuse is very categorically denounced in the absence of extraneous factors, mitigating circumstances or troubling contradiction. Through Foucault’s work on discipline, social control and the transferable nature of modern power (1977, 1980) it becomes possible to fully acknowledge this, allowing for an alternative in what has thus far been a one-dimensional preservation of moralistically based denunciation.

Referring again to the quote above, distance is sorely required when intergenerational contact is mentioned. We have seen, especially in Western contexts, a remarkable inability to extricate hysterical and reactionary responses
from the adult/child debate, as almost every discussion becomes personalised. ‘What if it was your children’ has become a question of significance in an era which has seen attempts to prevent ‘abuse’ take place with an almost reckless disregard for human rights. Whilst the origins of this are far from malevolent, Anglo-American and European societies appear to have lost sight of the rational when the question of child protection is broached. Not only has rationality eluded adult/child contexts, as we constantly and largely unnecessarily search for potential abusers, the manipulative imperatives which have often blighted the strive towards communal cohesion become readily employed. The finger of blame is often pointed in a problematic distortion of Darwinian system. Whereas a conventional interpretation would witness an evolutionary development of an approach to adult/child tension, implementing a range of different methods until the most efficient one emerged, the situation we are faced with in reality has seemingly bypassed the rationality discussed here. The ‘fittest’ are now those who are least likely to exploit children and the defamation of those who ‘can’, regardless of accuracy or truth, becomes a highly necessary by-product.

This of course stems in part from a perpetuation of the idea that power structures remain hierarchically operational, as social position is still rigorously adhered to in spite of its illusionary relevance in contemporary contexts. Foucault advocates an approach which regards power as an entirely different entity to its previous incarnations. Rather than function simplistically and one dimensionally from top to bottom, it is now far more likely to manifest itself in a fluctuating, subversive, and ultimately less predictable or definable way. This reflects a divergence and complexity in modern social operation which is left unaccounted for in more conventional investigation. We know now that power can be ascribed with far greater ease, rapidity and intensity than ever before, although its simultaneously swift removal makes this no less potent. Power has changed fundamentally and it is the new intricacies of distribution which are particularly well represented in intergenerational discussion.
Foucault’s ‘biopolitical’ approach (1979) is of central importance to the institutional stratification of adult workers as we begin to identify a preoccupation with bodily disruption which is closely aligned with intergenerational tension. Foucault has contended that (1979, p. 143) ‘politics become ‘biopolitics’ as political power begins to regulate the life of populations’, and we should attempt to situate adult/child discomfort within this model. Is the fear of touch between an adult and child an extension of the biopolitical tendency of modern social systems, in which embodiment becomes an affirmation of ideology or societal standing, itself problematic in many contexts? Or has this fear developed elsewhere and subsequently bolstered a new obsession with tactile, biological politics, which are now indistinct from conventional manifestations of emotion? It is however with relative confidence that we are able to discuss the way in which our behaviour has been very efficiently regulated within intergenerational contexts. Although not one of his most explored themes, Foucault’s biopolitical model and further interest in the bodily turn in Western social movement offers a useful point of reference here.

It is of little doubt that contemporary practice has witnessed an increasing preoccupation with bodily projects, at times changing the very dynamics of societal structure as populations become far less representative of context, individually diversifying in a literal removal from the homogeneity invoked by a paternalistic welfare system (see Rose, 2006). The body has become charged with (superficial) meaning in modern settings, as tattoos, piercings, gymnastic obsession and also destruction become interesting and important ‘post’ signifiers. The body is essential now, and is no longer a simple vessel. It is almost an accessory which appropriates place, denoting the ideological and spiritual bent of the owner in a display of affirmation not possible a generation earlier. Although this may appear a progressive consequence of a more liberal, less rigid enactment of hierarchical control, regulation remains robust, as this
freedom to (re)present merely detracts attention from the subtlety of behavioural coercion which takes place alongside this. Whilst the body is able to be overtly sculpted, manipulated and appropriated on an individually consensual level, the extent to which bodily action is still controlled is highly significant.

Taking bodybuilding, we are given the ultimate example of bodily cultivation for means which can only be purely aesthetic, engaging with a definition of masculinity in a way which renders the participant inert in the pageantry and procedure of an ever growing subculture. Whilst physical strength is assumed, it is never tested, as we rely on the image as a sufficient indicator. The masculine ideal is upheld simply and easily as substance is ultimately bypassed. This speaks of the relative ease with which it is possible for a deceptive and distractive narrative to emerge with regards to touch, arguably the most ‘genuine’ affirmation of human interconnection. Touch is not required or discussed when embodiment becomes so preoccupied with external appearance. Piercings, tattoos and muscular definition all demand touch, sexualising, valorising and glamorising flesh, yet they are processed and made sacred to such an extent that touching becomes destructive. All we can do is admire in this instance, as the reality is often painful or uncomfortable, shattering the illusion that these bodies are beyond humanity or indeed other worldly.

Of course the question of where this leaves the adult/child experience should be addressed. It is no coincidence that we can directly connect this concept of populist distraction with Foucault’s work on governmentality (1977, 1980), a notion which has also addressed contemporary techniques of control and their subtle, often invisible emergence and establishment. Governmentality has developed the processes of biopower and biopolitics and offers a highly applicable interpretation of modern control. The idea has drawn attention to the increasingly prevalent systems of governance which invoke docility in
populations *en masse*. There have been numerous empirical examples of this in a range of social contexts, as a notional individual freedom is used to safeguard a wider, often indirectly disciplinary end. The efficiency of the system lies in the way in which participants are convinced, by various methods, that their actions and behaviour contribute to a positive, mutually beneficial perpetuation of a hegemonic norm. However the manner in which this is encouraged is often overlooked, as a nominal conception of liberty is frequently used to distort the problematic or ethically dubious consequences which are naturally and systematically produced.

The adult/child context has exemplified this in a number of ways, although the most striking example lies in the conditioning of adults to avoid touch with children. They do so in order to guarantee a completion of ‘safe’ or ‘good’ practice models, as they are professionally rewarded for distance and reticence. Though rather than contributing to child welfare or safety this merely enforces the continuity of preventative and reactionary systems of intervention in intergenerational settings. This is beneficial in both institutional and individual senses, as we see a simultaneous removal of culpability from educational authorities, and a placating of the doubt that appears to consume the parent and the appropriately minded adult in a mainstream social setting. This is succinctly representative of the modern disciplinary turn, as we witness a number of parties collaboratively contributing to their own submission at the hands of a new conception of power. As Foucault states (cited in Rainbow, 1984, p. 263);

> It (bio-power) had to have methods of power capable of optimising forces, aptitudes and life in general, without at the same time making them more difficult to govern. If the development of the great instruments of the state, as *institutions* of power, ensured the maintenance of production relations, the rudiments of anatomo- and bio- politics, created in the eighteenth century as *techniques* of power present at every level of the social body and utilised by very diverse
institutions (the family and the army, schools and the police, individual medicine and the administration of collective bodies), operated in the sphere of economic processes, their development and the forces working to sustain them.

This speaks of a firmly established and relatively immovable system of power and discipline which has come to prominence within Western hegemonic contexts. We can perhaps regard this as the definitive interpretation of the way in which we are as populations and individuals, controlled, as these intricate methods of manipulation and distortion are played out in the most diverse settings.

**Ulrich Beck – the ubiquity of risk**

Risk, and its avoidance, has consumed contemporary populations to a considerable degree. We are so obsessed with safety and the elimination of danger that it is manifestly difficult to criticise or *problematis* an attitude which blindly attempts to prevent. Ulrich Beck (1992, 1995, 1996) has explored the necessity of risk practice in modern Western contexts with particular fluency and discusses the origins and re-appropriation of the term in alignment with the imperatives of global homogeneity, and a categorical removal from the generations which preceded this. Indeed it is this wildly different present in which we currently operate which has invoked a climate of such intense risk awareness, management and ultimate perpetuation. In his book *Risk Society* (1992) Beck has discussed the existential difficulty which has emerged in the paradoxical relationship between increasing human intervention in the hitherto natural world, and the dismay and discomfort which comes from the unintended, yet visibly detrimental, consequences of this desire to control. Risk subsequently becomes a prominent by-product of this cyclical model of interference and lament, as humanity attempts to simultaneously placate and prevent the effects of its own damaging conduct. Risk is in essence ‘any such
danger that humanity has brought upon itself’ (Beck, 1992, p. 12) and this relates to the intergenerational context in a number of revealing ways.

An increasing discussion and indeed fear of child sex abuse in contemporary Anglo-American contexts has vindicated Beck’s concept in a succinctly illustrative sense. We are inherently afraid of the dangers which adult/child contact appears to incite, although had we not encouraged a distinctly overzealous reaction to earlier interpretations of intergenerational ‘impropriety’, the threat which is apparently so prevalent would not be as sharply focussed. Another characteristic of the risk society is the unintentional exploitation of increased knowledge exchange in late or ‘high’ modern settings. It seems that as we find out more, we become more uncomfortable, as we are clearly ill-equipped to process revelation on the scale which we are expected to. Child sexual abuse was not a discursive topic until the latter third of the 20th Century and did not therefore elicit the extensive exploration and rationalisation which it does today. Although awareness of the dangers of child abuse has been a highly necessary learning process in contemporary environments, the lines between rational fact and hysterical hyperbole have been irrevocably distorted.

The consequences of this are naturally risk driven, as empirical intervention and our own existential discomfort combine to create a climate which prioritises an avoidance of the dangers, both real and imagined, which inhabit and threaten a diverse range of contexts. Beck has also argued that for risk society to be properly understood there should be a realignment of traditional lines of sociological inquiry (Baert and Carreira da Silva, 2010, p. 258) and a move away from conventional, dualistic binaries such as life and death, citizen or foreigner and culture and nature. Indeed such is the empirical level of human intervention in contemporary contexts these binaries are naturally eroded by an increasingly homogenised accommodation of risk based agendas and narratives. Risk covers all eventualities and helps safeguard the neutrality which we seek in a social
world which simultaneously encourages conflict whilst attempting to diminish it. Beck has developed his central thesis in the (2004) book *Cosmopolitan Vision*, as he applies the principles of late modernity to contemporary political upheaval. He discusses the distinctive characteristics of the Iraq war, positioning the conflict as the first major military action to be enacted wholly within an ultimate strategy of risk aversion. He comments (2004, p. 148) that:

> Just as the opponents of nuclear power regard even a 1 per cent danger of a nuclear disaster as utterly irresponsible, and consequently reject the peaceful use of nuclear energy in principle, many Americans regard even a 1 per cent probability of terrorists using weapons of mass destruction as utterly irresponsible and consequently invade Iraq (with a clear conscience).

What we are seeing here has been echoed time and again in intergenerational contexts, as the negligible threat which is posed by the majority of adult workers has itself led to drastic techniques of aversion. The mere fact that there is a chance that intergenerational abuse will take place, and that the act itself is not a statistical impossibility, has encouraged a fundamental re-evaluation of the principles of adult/child interaction to take place. Such re-evaluation is based almost entirely upon an unlikely and still aberrational eventuality. Beck (2004, p. 148-149) goes on to say:

> Anti-danger movements have one thing in common: in the eyes of Greenpeace and the Bush administration the aversion of the threat to humanity justifies the violation of international and national law ... Perception and reality are hard to separate in the case of danger ... The ‘objectivity’ of a threat derives essentially from belief in it.

This emphasises the way in which we have become selective in our recognition of the consequences of such far reaching, all-consuming methods of prevention. Of course these processes are naturally self-sustaining as we ‘make real’ a great many of the difficulties which are embedded within discursive and existential fears. Child sex abuse perhaps represents this conversion from gradual,
creeping discomfort into legitimate and immediate public problem, most convincingly. Facts, ‘truth’ and definable danger no longer apply to this narrative as Western populations have developed a hysterical appropriation of adult/child contact into an unavoidable and more importantly incontestable contemporary issue.

Beck’s risk society and his interpretations of a second modernity also allow us to explore the interrelation between physical and social change and its ultimate connection to the situation evident in contemporary intergenerational contexts. We have witnessed, within modern settings, an increasing shift towards virtual connection, as technological advancement has reinterpreted the notion of interactional fulfilment. Physical distance has been largely eradicated and with this comes a realignment of the way in which we connect and express. Touch perhaps becomes inadvertently challenged by the significance placed upon virtual communication. Its significance is consistently emphasised through a self-sustaining cycle of global consumerism in such a way that conventional methods of familial interconnection are rendered outmoded, even regressive in an era of instantaneous contact. Beck (2006, p.14) has stated:

Sociology often assumes that geographical proximity is essential to human interactions. However, because of recent developments in telecommunication, individuals are now able to interact in a meaningful way with others in far away places. Social proximity no longer rests on physical proximity.

Has this been reflected in the way in which we approach physical touch in professional settings? Whilst we should not ignore the cultural aversion to adult/child contact which has been developed as a result of growing existential anxiety, the influence of new systems of communication and the way in which touch has been unintentionally undermined, may contribute to the increasing distance between adult and child in schools and other equivalents. As the
reality’ of interconnection becomes less sharply defined we have found ourselves forming relationships, negotiating social interaction and regarding human contact in a myriad of different ways. A telling example of this comes in the form of social networking, a now ubiquitous method of communication especially prevalent amongst adolescents and ‘young adults’. Websites such as Facebook and Twitter represent a firmly established basis for connection between young people in a way that has come to legitimately rival ‘traditional’ social interaction. Conversation has become, if not itself conducted ‘virtually’, representative of a new mode of communication, replete with the immediacy and informality of online speech. Mass communication is now accessible for a truly global youth, as we witness a large scale shift in the politics of generational voice. Young people are offered an opportunity to dictate and affect in ways which carry far more weight than any previous manifestation, although this is largely overlooked as conversation and perhaps mobilisation remains largely intangible when enacted behind a computer screen.

This is both a coherent example of a fully functioning risk society and also a vital contributor to the public concern which has built up around intergenerational contact. Whilst social networking and its popularity amongst adolescents (a powerful market force) has been facilitated by a largely self-interested yet structurally aware entity, the fear which surrounds its use and subsequent potential for unwanted revelation can be identified as a fundamentally late modern paradox. Social networking invades large portions of life which would otherwise be kept private although our collective involvement has allowed this to pass by unnoticed or, perhaps more significantly, unchallenged. When our children participate in this, often with a naivety regarding self-censorship, images and opinions become public. This simultaneously legitimates a widespread proliferation of material which would be otherwise deemed deeply personal, and also realigns the notion of revelation for all of us. The availability of information on people of all ages and
backgrounds consequently distorts the idea that we are able to function privately and publically, and displaces a relative balance between the two. Anything uploaded to a reputable social networking site becomes ‘fair game’ for deconstruction on a wide variety of levels. At one end of this scale is the potential for abuse of the image or comment by a perpetrator who will largely retain anonymity and at the other is the scope for an official interrogation of material in a way that can inherently affect professional relations and even result in criminal charges. Whilst a great deal of the content uploaded by teenagers and younger children is safely routine, even banal, there are legitimate dangers to social networking use which we have, in our complicity with such systems, readily overlooked.

There is then, a tendency in this second modernity for a dismissal of the genuinely problematic in favour of an apparent solution to troubling or difficult ‘truths’. Whilst images and conversations of a personal nature are widely broadcast, yet remain behind a computer screen or in a mobile phone, our sensitivities are not directly challenged by this residual virtual presence. We have however been, in ways which echo Foucauldian concepts, conditioned in a non-invasive way to accept that huge inroads have been made into our personal and private lives. The methods by which this takes place masquerade as globally communal, progressive new means of information sharing and inter-communication. The system is a response to the ‘actual’ threats which we have become so preoccupied with, such as ‘stranger danger’ and equivalents; appearing to safeguard our young as they forego a windswept park in favour of a bedroom with a broadband connection. This response has in fact however, resulted in a far less accountable, far less controllable manifestation of social interaction. The virtual becomes as dangerous as the real in this instance, as we have imbued its manifest procedures with a contemporary significance, and our subsequent discomfort at unleashing this force is particularly evident within intergenerational contexts.
The holistic and self-sustaining nature of risk averse social structure within this second modernity has been reflected in the academic investigation into the prevention of child sex abuse. As Gillham and Thomson (1996, p. 138) have concluded:

The task of developing a positive approach to abuse prevention is not easy. Prevention is hindered by inhibition, ignorance and denial. The aim must be to help all parties concerned with safety education to feel more comfortable when addressing the issue of physical intimacy, and its misuse and abuse with children. Education authorities can help teaching staff by providing both training and support. Schools can also be encouraged towards an enlightened ‘whole school’ policy, involving parents, acknowledging the existence of the societal problem and wanting to make a positive contribution to its alleviation.

It will be of use to deconstruct this passage, as it offers an insight into the way in which thought and high level investigation have been influenced by the ideas which Beck has discussed. It is possible to draw attention in this instance to the manner in which physical intimacy is approached as, rather than promote touch in its care giving and relational capacity, the action is automatically and in some senses irreversibly associated with sexual abuse. This passage essentially explores a phenomenon which has developed alongside an interpretation of abuse which seeks to exaggerate and accuse, eradicating the potential for nurture, or even narratives of nurture, to emerge in this context. The ‘whole school policy’ which is encouraged in the paragraph is neatly and illustratively indicative of an absolutist approach to the management of danger which ignores the possible complexities and contradictions that are often provoked by existential unsettlement.

We know that human intervention is responsible for an increasingly alarmist approach to the subject of child abuse, although the issue has become so resonant in contemporary settings that we have been subsequently unable to
disrupt this. It is manifestly difficult to separate legitimate investigation and reactionary pressure as the two have become inextricably linked. The passage shows how an interpretation of Beck’s ‘reflexive modernisation’ (1992, 1994, p.23-24) in which ‘people no longer take for granted institutions, norms and practices, but they constantly reflect upon their validity and consider altering them or taking different options altogether’ has been enacted under the auspices of a climate of risk averse, even ‘knee-jerk’ prevention.

This is in fact not necessarily as contradictory as it may seem, as it fits with the movement away from a conventional treatment of social order in which setting or milieu is inherited from previous generations. There is an absence of an established formative influence upon narratives of intergenerational fear as the idea that the adult is a dangerous and predatory influence, rather than a traditional yet comparatively impotent disciplinarian, signifies an unprecedented turn for notions of adult/child interaction. Current discourse surrounding intergenerational contact represents both a reflexive removal from the relative constraints of the disciplinary ‘Victorian’ orthodoxy which presided in previous conceptions of education, and a consistent fidelity to the idea that risk is now so heavily embedded within our social characteristics. It remains however, particularly difficult to envisage those engaged within adult/child contexts to ‘take a different option altogether’ as the discussion, pressure and intervention which surrounds the issue is one of particular rigidity. It seems that the proliferation of child abuse narratives have themselves been reflexively encouraged, although this reflexivity is subsequently undermined by the sheer weight of the subject matter and its significance in contemporary circles. Intergenerational fear has become firmly institutionalised and whilst perhaps not taken for granted it is nevertheless an established force within our negotiation of a variety of social contexts.
The ways in which its emergence and perpetuation have been enacted tell us a great deal about the concepts of Ulrich Beck and the complexity of an alternative and distinctly ‘new’ modernity. Our notion of adult/child contact is inherently late modern and represents the realisation of a new framework of social organisation in ways which robustly reinforce a shifting conception of traditional hegemony. Both the ubiquity and distinctiveness of adult/child fear gives a striking indication of the potency and reach of what continues to be an intriguing present.

**Zygmunt Bauman – liquid discomfort**

Staying with an investigation into the condition of modernity, and our perception of its current state, Bauman offers a compelling insight into the challenges and structural fluctuation which inhabits the contemporary. Unlike Beck however, Bauman has studied the intricate and systematic emergence of a bureaucratic rationality which strives towards a homogenous and essential societal perfection (1989, 1991). The notion of instrumental rationality (Weber, 1921-1922) has been developed by Bauman (1989, 1992, 1997) as an appropriate indicator of the manner in which modern systems of social, political and economic structure are conditioned to run with absolute and at times all-consuming efficiency, without room for ethical or ideological dilemma. The bureaucrat has according to Bauman become the most recognisable worker or indeed social actor in modern settings, and an adherence to the tenets of this bureaucratised context is a prerequisite for the contemporary societal participant. The system is made foolproof by an inherent rationalisation of the constituent actions within this model, as the perpetuation of the system itself becomes sacrosanct.

As Baert and Carreira da Silva (2010, p. 263) have stated in relation to Bauman’s notion of a bureaucratised contemporary:
The shift towards modernity is also accompanied by increased instrumental rationality. This means that perfection, order and homogeneity can be accomplished with great efficiency ... With its hierarchical structure, modern bureaucracies are highly efficient organisations partly because bureaucrats are trained and expected to follow adequately rules and orders from above. Bureaucrats have a reduced notion of moral responsibility, first because they are not taught to reflect on the rationale of the rules or orders that they follow ... Second, because of the organisational structure in which they operate, bureaucrats are often a number of steps removed from the actual effects of their actions or decisions.

Whilst Bauman used the Holocaust as a compelling example of this distinctive style of organisation, and one that has been reflected upon in Chapter II, there are a number of parallels to be drawn between the idea of bureaucratisation and the everyday functioning of PE staff. There has been a telling acceptance by PE teachers and equivalent professionals, of the idea that touch between an adult and child should be avoided as intergenerational conduct in mainstream schooling becomes further influenced by systematic, precautionary procedure. In addition to this is the way in which morality has been manipulated to the extent that it becomes unquestioned, as there is no opportunity to challenge the established view that touching a child facilitates sexual abuse and any ethical argument is omitted from discussion on the subject. Teachers merely contribute to accepted societal opinions with machine-like operational regularity. Whist this may appear paradoxical when we bring in Foucault’s discussion of the dissolution of hierarchy, the machine like role appropriation, incontestable collective acceptance and the way in which discipline becomes so efficiently enacted in these interpretations, can be usefully linked with some of Foucault’s key concepts.

Bauman’s work has also been concerned with societal liquidity (1997, 2000, 2004), in which we have become empirically and figuratively more fluid,
movable and ethereal in our social interaction and the formation of social order in a time which has gone beyond the somewhat rigid boundaries of ‘post-modernity’. Much like Beck’s notion of late modernity, Bauman has encountered and elaborated upon the way in which a far less definable ‘solid’ interpretation of social movement is now required as we increasingly move away from the hardware which drove much of the twentieth century into the age of software and a considerable shift towards the ‘virtual’. As in Beck’s treatment of a modernity which has redefined conceptions surrounding actuality, space and distance, the subject of touch becomes intensively debated here. A more flexible societal environment may appear to offer license for a far more changeable production of regime, reinterpreting the idea of hegemonic dominance, yet we have in fact witnessed a subversion of this within the notion of liquid fear (Bauman, 2004) and its connection to the discomfort which narratives of child sex abuse so readily encourage. Such is the ambiguity and indistinctiveness of the threat of child sex abuse, we have been manifestly challenged in our attempts to deal with it. Bauman’s idea of liquid fear is apposite here as he discusses the pervasive anxiety which has become a key feature of contemporary society.

Whereas Beck talks about risk, and its subsequent manipulation of social organisation, Bauman interrogates its precursor, and moreover examines the potency and reach of fear and discomfort in an age where previous notions of good and bad, right and wrong have been undermined by the continuity of disruptive unrest. Traditional binaries have again been questioned here as we are forced to approach a variety of issues of societal influence without these conventional, often stabilising reference points. In the instance of paedophilia we are in no doubt that genuine acts of abuse are inherently ‘wrong’, however what we remain unsure of are the reasons why these behaviours are enacted. The unaccountability of child sex abuse is itself a considerable source of discomfort for many adults, as self-sustaining self-doubt becomes unavoidable.
The indirect yet broadly apparent implication that all adults are capable of sexual abuse has been robustly encouraged in recent years and this is in part due to the evolving, indefinable status of the subject and its discussion. Fears, especially those which have such a perennial hold on our conceptions of self and collective identity, are a more resolute, more visible part of the modernity which Bauman refers to. Though rather than regaining control over existential concern, as was predicted in many post-war Western contexts, we have instead become consumed by a roving, parasitic discomfort which has taken on the most insidious of forms. There is perhaps little wonder that such lengths have been taken to attempt to overcome the problem of child abuse in contemporary settings. Not only does the issue itself engender a particularly challenging deconstruction of the society which is deemed responsible for its production, but it also speaks into existence instances of abuse which have been facilitated by a heavily conservative and unnecessarily punitive climate of accusation.

Again calling upon a particularly striking example, and one which largely shaped Western sensibilities in the proceeding Twentieth century, Bauman has used the Titanic disaster as an appropriate and perhaps more than merely allegorical representation of liquid fear. He states (2004, p. 17):

The principle (though silent) *actor* in the Titanic story, as we know, was the iceberg. But it wasn’t the iceberg waiting ‘out there’ in ambush, that was the *horror* that made the story stand out among the multitude of similar horror/disaster stories. That horror was all that mayhem which happened ‘in here’, in the bowels of the luxurious liner ... Something for which the iceberg ‘out there’ ... served only as a catalyst and a litmus paper rolled into one ... That ‘something’ which *always* lies below’ but waits until we jump into the freezing sub-Arctic waters to be faced with it point blank. Something all the more horrifying for staying concealed most of the time and so taking its victims by surprise whenever it crawls out of its lair, always catching them unprepared and inept to respond.
It is possible, and indeed useful, to refer to a direct comparison with Bauman’s analogy and the public difficulty with child abuse, or moreover the threat of child abuse. The apparent combination of our collective inability to process and rationally respond to child sex abuse with the lingering yet poorly defined threat which lies ‘outside’ of our conventional jurisdiction is sharply reminiscent of the myriad frailties, both human and systematic, which the Titanic disaster uncovered. Whilst the iceberg remained a static, ultimately avoidable obstacle, the chaos which ensued when it was struck charged this previously passive object with a malevolent significance. It was always there and always dangerous, but it was the lack of preparation for and reaction to collision which imbued the iceberg with a ‘monstrous’ intention.

The conception of the ‘sex offender’ has been influenced by a similar development. Whilst paedophilia has always existed it has been the public response to the issue, and the subsequent failure to coherently attend to it, which in many ways contributes to the consolidation of the dangers which have remained so unsettling. That we are still unable to definitively distinguish innocent intentions from more dubious ones offers the notion of child sex abuse an anonymity which has caused far reaching discomfort in contemporary settings. We have essentially toyed with the idea of paedophilia through our collective obsession with the subject, teasing the issue until it has eventually and, for many, predictably provided the very backlash that we have all been so concerned about. Our fears have reified this problem in a way which speaks of a distinctly contemporary system of self-perpetuating realisation. That we are able to reflect upon this is in itself positive, although the difficulty in attempting to challenge these narratives represents a far more durable hurdle.
Anthony Giddens – structuration theory and a theoretical synthesis

The way in which Giddens’ work lends itself to a more positivistic interpretation of the contemporary situation should be recognised here, as the thesis has thus far put forward a treatment of current circumstances that broadly speaking applies ‘post’ analytical methods. There is subsequently some possibility of tension if we are to accept that intergenerational mistrust is influenced by relatively contradictory systems of thought. It is in addition Giddens’ use of and engagement with reflexivity which is of particular significance here, and given that there is a reflexive section at the beginning of Chapter IX it is important to address the potential for criticism and justify the decision to adopt such an approach. The reflexive appropriation of the research process, the teacher’s comments and their narrative reinterpretation was in the event relatively unavoidable. The way in which they discussed the contemporary challenges represented a ‘reflexively modern’ pragmatism that required some elaboration. We can attribute this to the nature of the issues under scrutiny, as they themselves become deeply personalised, individually pervasive, and motivate a self-analysis the influential subjectivity of which has been previously underexplored.

There is a need to accept the way in which adult/child interaction and the discomfort it engenders has been present throughout a number of societal ‘periods’. Modernity and then post-modernity has been superseded by late-modernity, and reflexive modernity has followed in an organisational route which is arguably influenced by conflicting theoretical paradigms. The tendency for contemporary systems of reflexive modernisation that Giddens (1991) and indeed Beck (1992, 1996) discuss to guide action and reaction in contemporary settings can also be inherently connected to the notions of discipline which Foucault has anticipated, and brought together under the auspices of a moveable or ‘liquid’ interpretation of environment, as envisaged by Bauman.
The point here is that although exploring and utilising reflexivity is a somewhat positivist stance to adopt (as evidenced in this thesis), it is a position which has been directly influenced by and indeed an influence over the post-structural characteristics of ‘no-touch’ cultures and existential adult angst. There are points of divergence, as mentioned below, although the way in which reflexivity has been adapted alongside both the heightened individuation of contemporary environments and the collectively enacted and accepted forces of discipline can help us to legitimate this combined approach.

Giddens’ work on structuration theory and the broader interrogation of social movement have been inherently concerned with an alternative representation of social structure. Whilst Foucault, Beck and Bauman have attended to the notion of structure without necessarily employing a systematic model, instead drawing attention to the forces that are at work which produce structure, Giddens examines contemporary Western contexts with a unique structural model, attempting to account for the intricacies of modern social movement within a particular conceptual system. His interpretation of societal movement is influenced by a continuous model which remains both ‘medium and outcome of the conduct it recursively organises’ (Bryant and Jary, 2001, p.12), and it is possible to see elements of this in both the work of the scholars mentioned above and the situation resident in contemporary PE teaching.

The term ‘self-sustaining’ has been used on numerous occasions throughout the section above, serving as a telling representation of the evolution evident in the theoretical approaches utilised, and the development of the situation under empirical scrutiny. Previous investigation into the issue of a social preoccupation with child sex abuse and its combination with sociological theory may have resulted in a cause, prevalence, solution model (Gillham and Thomson, 1996). This may appear over-concerned with a narrative which thoroughly explores the background and origins of sexual abuse with a view to providing a holistic and
definitive answer. Whilst not without merit, this kind of project will remain commonplace as long as a binary of victim and criminal remains discursively active.

Using the underlying idea that many adults are suffering at the hands of an over-zealous approach to child safety in a climate of intense suspicion and arbitrary accusation, combined with the theory discussed here and above, offers an opportunity to cleave open the existing dialogue on this subject whilst simultaneously updating narratives which have been relatively exhausted up until now. Giddens’ ideas, and the ideas of the scholars mentioned previously, allow an altogether more elaborative deconstruction of the public perception of child sex abuse to take place.

With this we can delve into the dispersal of power and systems of dominance evident in intergenerational contexts without remaining bound by a two dimensional, mutually exclusive conception of oppressor and oppressed. Just as Foucault has discussed the realignment of traditional power relations, and Beck and Bauman have referred to the contemporary difficulty which conventional notions of morality, and moreover the constraining binary of ‘right and wrong’, evoke, Giddens has also offered an approach to the idea of power which accommodates a critique of hierarchical stratification. By discussing the duality of structure and its fundamental residence within structuration theory, Giddens has been able to represent the recursive perpetuation of structure, through the utilisation of rules and resources, as a symbiotic producer and product of social order. The idea of conventional power is problematic here as we witness the automatic functioning of a model which is bolstered by reflexivity and agency, themselves often associated with dissidence and change. As Giddens states (1984, p.36): ‘Any transformation, however radical, can only take place by drawing upon (and reproducing) the structural properties which are available’. With this in mind we can attend to the issue of power in a way which speaks of
the subtle yet potent familiarisation of established social regimes, and our consistent and often passive subscription and contribution.

**Theoretical collaboration**

The ease with which structural and societal normalisation occurs and is then perpetuated has been firmly evident in intergenerational contexts. Drawing on Foucault’s bio-political approach, Beck’s discussion on the domination of risk driven narratives, the proliferation of fear which is engendered in Bauman’s description of a moveable and unsettling landscape, and Giddens’ interrogation of the productive and destructive duality of structure, we are able to attend to the issue of intergenerational mistrust with particular and hopefully revealing detail.

It is difficult to discuss child sex abuse without denouncing the issue from the outset. The majority of dialogue on the subject has subsequently been undertaken from the perspective of the abused, in an attempt to obtain some form of justice for those affected by the most despicable of human misdemeanours. This has contributed to a widespread ‘colouring’ of opinion before the subject is even interrogated in any depth, as the conventional and morally responsible position to adopt is one that automatically supports the rhetorical victim. It is possible to draw attention to the manner in which this processing of discussion, which has been underlined by a normative Western approach to social deconstruction, will be continually embedded within a cycle which valorises the ‘victim’ and blindly persecutes the ‘perpetrator’. We can escape this, representative as it is of the very organisation which Giddens refers to in structuration theory, by engaging with approaches which offer alternative, yet convincing and relevant, societal explanation. A constructive look beyond an approach which merely situates the ‘victim’ and ‘perpetrator’ in contrived, often predetermined roles, themselves reflective of an institutionalised understanding
of social movement and our ultimate failure to challenge or resist this, is the key to forging a different path of exploration here. The idea that there is a definitive way of dealing with child sex abuse, through a normative/deviant dualistic narrative is not compatible with the concepts that we have been dealing with above.

Beginning with Foucault’s approaches and in particular his idea that power is a multi-faceted, transferable entity, there is an immediate opposition to the previous assumptions that have encouraged a two-way perception to emerge. The notion implies that power is, in a broadly Marxist fashion, purely oppressive and open to abuse for the benefit of the hegemonic domineers. Indeed this has been echoed in intergenerational contexts in the way in which the adult has been cast as a predatory, manipulative actor, who will stop at nothing to achieve a dubious objective. Our conventional fears have been embedded within this pervasive approach, as we cling to an idea which continues to position the adult as a dangerous and moreover powerful individual, whilst reality would sharply contradict this.

If we look past the various stereotypes and hyperbole which surround this issue since its discursive establishment, it becomes apparent that power has fluctuated wildly, as adults have simultaneously held and lost the traditional seats of dominance in a complex shift towards a landscape now comprised of intrinsic plurality. Recognition of this fact continues to elude us however, as our ongoing and in many cases increasing concern with the ‘intentions’ of adults who work with children succinctly represents a conventional interpretation of power. It is this failure to recognise our perhaps deliberately cultivated ignorance which speaks of the passivity which Foucault attended to with his concepts of governmentality and bio-political organisation. We seem unable to subvert the discourse which surrounds intergenerational touch, and have been convinced that any alternative viewpoint remains outside of our best interests.
The combination of a predatory adult/vulnerable child narrative in which abuser and abused are sharply and definitively identified and the damaging prospect and increasing frequency of accusation has enforced a climate of disciplinary suspicion to emerge, conditioning its subjects, who are duty bound and indeed broadly willing to comply.

Beck’s development of the agendas of risk take place under the auspices of an unpredictable modernity and the problems which this poses for citizens who aspire towards control and knowledge. The willingness to subscribe to risk as an existential protocol reminds us of the passivity resident in Foucault’s interpretations, as we see the relief that collective ignorance, or in this case reticence, can provide. Alongside this, intergenerational contexts act as a conduit for a social subscription to a predictable and largely accountable perpetuation of a norm which has been used as a distraction or even replacement for the more dangerous realities of the situation. Realities are consistently undermined by a thoroughly enacted yet largely misguided narrative of prevention. Child sex abuse is not necessarily the widespread, endemic problem which we have prepared for but is instead an issue which remains streamlined and incalculable, often eluding an ‘accurate’ representation. To adhere to a process which although reactionary and misinformed simply reflects (i) our inability to overcome a system of self-sustaining conditioning and (ii) our subsequent desire to fulfil such requirements in the ultimate avoidance of a difficult reality, is a testament to the foresight of sociology which takes on an analysis of a turbulent and complex present.

**Methodological connection**

Using creative representation as a means of displaying the intergenerational difficulties evident in educational settings has been informative in various ways. Not only has it enabled the audience to approach the notion of adult/child
tension from a perspective which seeks to build upon and develop the themes which are alluded to through fictional explication, but the method also has a strong connection to the theoretical positions adopted by the study as a whole. Whilst it can be broadly assumed that post-structural, and indeed any, theory which deals with the dissolution of traditional boundaries of thought is intrinsically connected to qualitative inquiry, the combination of the intricacies of the context, the theory we discuss and the employment of fictionalised analysis will potentially allow a specific and reciprocal relationship to be uncovered here. Qualitative analysis, and moreover qualitative analysis which sits firmly within an interpretative paradigm, offers voice to aspects of cultural and societal manifestation which would otherwise be overlooked. When this is linked with concepts which actively seek an alternative deconstructive framework, the realignment of certain thought processes and hegemonies becomes sharply focussed. A fictional story which attempts to portray a particular environment, referring to the complexities inherent within such settings, can be used to shed light on existing conceptions in a way which benefits from and contributes to theoretical work which attempts to tackle the conditions of the present and near future. We are in addition able to explore the interconnection between a method which can illuminate and underline a discomfort which has become an endemic feature of intergenerational interaction and the societal rationale behind this, thereby bolstering an argument for the further interrogation of a system of cyclical mistrust.

What is particularly constructive about the theory employed in this study is the way in which the central themes of the work of each writer lend themselves well to a fictionalised reproduction. There is an argument which would contend that this is true of all sociological theory, much of which is inherently ‘storied’, in the way it stems from and then expands upon an original empirical catalyst. Yet theory which attempts, and succeeds, to engage with a more interrogative and
often more novel perception of both the immediate present and its preceding motivators engages more broadly through its inescapable relevance. It is therefore of value here to explore the connections which can be found and developed between a process of fictional representation and the theory we have discussed throughout.

Referring again to Foucault’s work, it is the very essence of a landscape of coercive subtlety which can be captured by this kind of fictionalised qualitative investigation, as we build up a representation of the passive adherence to prevention with a thought provoking, persuasive narrative, appealing to the capacity of the audience for an individual interpretation and subsequent development of the ideas which the tale encourages. Foucauldian power structures are replete with manipulative and insidious techniques of indoctrination and obedience, and the manner in which these elements are enacted can sometimes only be revealed with a reflective approach to the deconstruction of societal minutiae.

These methods are, by definition not immediately visible and so a fictional presentation of the difficulties inherent in teaching and how easily they are created and perpetuated begins to facilitate an insight into the gradual shifts which are taking place in a complex and unsettling reality. Using fictionalised representations also compliments Foucault’s treatment of genealogy (1977), as we approach the notion of a collective and passive adherence to a system of preventative risk aversion through a medium which has had a significant influence on the formation and critique of conventional behavioural traits. In this instance we are able to approach an issue which has been empirically produced through ‘objective’ fear, utilising the subjective characteristics of fictional representation to question the ultimate legitimacy of a prevalent and superficially incontestable ‘truth’. Foucault’s genealogy attacks the idea that ‘truth’ has been produced and guaranteed by an impartial and largely stable
historical reproduction. Indeed the problematic nature of this assumption has been revealed through prophetic literature (see Ballard, 1975, Burgess, 1962, Orwell, 1949), which refers, in ways both subtle and overt, to the underlying tendency of ruling elites and political powers to misinform and disguise in the interests of continuing dominance, thereby supporting the capacity of creative writing for an accuracy of representation alongside the identification of a previously hidden inequity.

Intergenerational fear has been encouraged by more broadly dominant entities, although it is the way in which this fear and discomfort is perpetuated by those at a ‘grass roots’ level which is of particular interest here. The steps many teachers now have to take in order to avoid being made a target of accusation have facilitated a new form of self-presentation, itself redefining the traditional relationship between teacher and pupil and teacher and community. ‘Truth’ again becomes a point of contention, as the teacher is routinely made to act within the boundaries of a particular and acceptable norm, distortion becomes an unavoidable professional trait and its subsequent portrayal can once more be coherently realised and indeed expanded upon through fictionalised work. It becomes possible here to reflect upon the shift which has characterised contemporary teaching and the social influences which have led to its proliferation, exploring and interrogating the way in which power structures have been developed in education and the ramifications for the situation under scrutiny.

Using a broadly genealogical interpretation of this environment we can attempt to examine the extent to which intergenerational fear has been deliberately cultivated and also the way in which it has organically emerged. It should be noted that the two are not necessarily paradoxical in this instance, as we are able to approach both the deliberative agendas of dominance and their unintentional effects, in the development of a storied narrative which reveals a
reciprocal relationship between instinctive parental fear and a self-congratulatory system of interrogative prevention. This distinction is in fact an important one, being symptomatic of the very essence of this climate of fear, tied up in the complexity of manipulative rhetoric. How much are we to blame for the continuity of a fear based, risk averse approach to adult/child contact, and how much stems from power structures which lie beyond our control?

Whereas Foucault may propose that we contentedly contribute to this despite it being against our better interests, Beck would contend that this system is entirely representative of our own fear, which we uncomfortably yet continually reinforce through a ubiquitous perception of risk. Through a storied account of the situation evident in contemporary PE teaching we are able to explore this friction, placing characters within differing approaches, themselves having various levels of interest in or access to the social constraints which Foucault and Beck allude to. The reality is that we are informed by the work of both writers. However this conflict can be fully investigated and in addition represented by utilising a fictional approach which both critiques and exemplifies in a way which makes use of a naturally methodical approach to argument. We ultimately employ a method which accepts aspects of both theories, as we seek to account for the complexities resident in contemporary PE teaching and furthermore push towards suggestions for change. The links between the work of Foucault and Beck are, in the context of intergenerational tension, far more useful than the differences are problematic, and it is through fiction that we are able to introduce and then explore this relationship by making reference to both divergence and overlap.

We have, in addition the opportunity to connect the work of Bauman and Giddens here, as a storied approach to investigation and presentation creates a ‘liquid’ analysis of adult/child tension, where interpretation remains a central consequence of adopting the approach, and the method also becomes
intrinsically attached to the subject matter which it represents. Bauman’s treatment of bureaucratisation is also conducive to fictional representation, as we become able to draw attention to this in a way which satirises the automated adherence which the system encourages. The manner in which we contribute to a wider structure of dominance, however problematic, without having the opportunity to reflect upon the consequences of our ‘blindly’ submissive action is by definition hidden from public view. According to Bauman we know little of our contributions to a system which operates on many levels and thus removes us from any notion of responsibility. By mapping this organisation within a fictional narrative we are able to bring these existential problems to the forefront of our personal analysis, offering the opportunity for a reflexive interpretation of our everyday behaviour with a holistic yet detailed overview.

With regards to Giddens’ approaches it is possible to examine how a culture of salacious sensationalism which masquerades as protection has emerged, and how the depiction of this climate using methods which exploit poetic licence can expose the often ignored reality of the situation. Giddens (1984, p.25) has referred to the way in which ‘structure is both medium and outcome of the conduct it recursively organises’, and is broadly speaking proved right by the perverse public obsession with narratives of child sex abuse which dominates contemporary agendas. We can explore the influence that fictionalisation and its manifestation through media exaggeration has had over the prevailing climate. It is also possible to explore the public potential to counteract the situation by utilising this sensationalism. The composition of a story which includes elements of the irrationality which now inhabits intergenerational professions, and in a wider sense the beginning of a dialogue which supports the realignment of preventative and interrogative adult/child policy, will affect structure through both its reflection of context and its status within it. Attempting to design a storied reinterpretation of a system which is as ubiquitous as this climate of
adult/child fear, will naturally be couched in the remnants and detritus of the situation itself, although by harnessing this rather than distancing oneself from it we can in fact pursue avenues of investigation which would otherwise have remained closed.

The ultimate intention here is to question and furthermore directly challenge the idea that adults who work alongside children should be suspected of an abusive capability by default. This should be relatively straightforward given the ubiquity of methods of restriction in this context and their widespread and often harmful influence. However it remains markedly dangerous to hold a viewpoint which contradicts the established narratives of suspicion that permeate intergenerational contexts and beyond. That these narratives operate under the guise of child safety and are largely put in place to alleviate blame rather than actually protect, has been overlooked entirely. We can address this by deliberately positioning ourselves outside of the traditional (Piper et al, 2011, 2013) trajectories which this cycle of blame, doubt and mistrust consistently target. How this is achieved remains however, a challenging question. We are all, to varying degrees, subject to the difficulties inherent in adult/child discussion. This is either manifested in the creeping, existential doubt that most adults in Western contexts have been exposed to and affected by, or a more overt direct realisation, influencing professional choice and in many cases emotional wellbeing. It therefore remains difficult to break away from a system which functions in two contrasting yet effective ways, both manipulating circumstance in a manner which intelligently and evolutionarily controls its according context. What we can do is account for this under the auspices of the theory we have discussed above and throughout. The way in which this climate has evolved and become established can be explained under a Foucauldian system of governmental discipline, the ubiquity of risk which Beck discusses, Bauman’s bureaucratisation and liquid fear, and Giddens’ model of structuration
(1984) in ways that not only provide adequate explanation for the emergence of this climate, but also begin to offer an indication of its future permutations.
Chapter VI
Analysis of Findings
Analysis of findings

Analysing the interview outcomes represents the opportunity to give shape and structure to the project in ways that have only been speculatively discussed until now. Using the themes established in the preceding chapters it is possible to explore the dialogue with an in depth, critical eye that benefits from a combination of specific contextualisation and a more holistic theoretical application. Using the work of Foucault (1977, 1982, 1988), Beck (1992, 1996) and Bauman (2000, 2001, 2006) we can begin to place the empirical realities evident in contemporary PE teaching alongside concepts which have insightfully approached the issues of individual docility, risk practice in modern constructs and an exclusionary modernity. These ideas, amongst others, have the potential to enlighten a debate which has previously been subject to a largely normative treatment, itself indicative of the preventative imperatives that have been increasingly engendered in discussions concerning child welfare and perceptions of threat.

As a result of the influence of the three writers mentioned above, their prophetic engagement with narratives of transition and the subsequent alignment with the environment in modern schooling, the thematic categories selected to interpret the teacher’s dialogue are reflective of some kind of constraining, circumstantial effect. Beginning with Interpretation of touch and contact we can delve into the subject which has driven this study. In addition by remarking upon the interpretation of touch it becomes possible to ascertain the levels to which contemporary thought processes have become embedded within an educational discourse, and indeed how this can be, if at all, challenged. Within this theme, the following sub-themes or codes have emerged: (i) Necessary Touch (ii) Self-Protection (iii) Reticence (iv) Problems with/realities of touch. These sub-themes represent the most dominant trends of discussion within the broader subject of touch, and allow a further categorisation of the
dialogue to take place with a view to both systematic and then evocative deconstruction.

Whilst these topics may seem inherently negative, they have been directly informed by the dialogue from the interviews, which largely centred around these issues when touch and its manifestation were discussed. This has not been motivated by a desire to deliberately paint a bleak picture of the profession when the focus is intergenerational touch; these sub-themes represent the organic results of sustained conversation with practising PE staff, and their veracity in this context can therefore be assured. Although discussing notions of reliability and validity is subject to considerable debate when qualitative methods, and perhaps even more so when fictional narratives are utilised, the clear-cut marriage of deconstructive apparatus and actual empirical content will help to solidify and legitimate this approach.

**Interpretations of touch and contact**

**Necessary touch**

Necessary touch is representative of a particularly resonant dilemma which faces the contemporary PE teacher. Touch is in many cases an unavoidable aspect of physical education although such contact has become increasingly problematic within contemporary rationalisation. This has occurred both discursively and practically, yet the requirement for proper support and the maintenance of safe practice also grows in intensity. There is an intricate balancing act in operation here, as the teacher must decide whether action offsets the risk involved. Matt (31) comments: ‘That’s why they say it’s a case of weighing up … you know outweighing the risks as to whether it’s a necessity or not’. An internal struggle is immediately visible, as contemporary teachers are forced to conduct themselves with a constant recognition of the dangers that are associated with intergenerational touch. It appears that even necessary
touch, contact that would have been previously deemed an unavoidable yet wholly acceptable aspect of physical education, can be potentially misconstrued in the current climate. There are of course obvious ambiguities with the perception of necessity, however the difficulty with intergenerational contact is such in modern constructs that necessity becomes increasingly streamlined.

Whereas it may have been necessary in previous generations to embrace or comfort a child who showed some emotional stress, this has since been fundamentally realigned. The occupation has undergone a shift from a culture of *loco-parental* nurture to one of professionalised prevention, in which health and safety dominates the teaching landscape. All necessary touch revolves around this and there is considerable evidence to support this. Nikki (28) stated: ‘I suppose what we’re really told in terms of touch is that unless touch is essential, you don’t really use it and you know in our subject I think we’d be supported by all the governing bodies that touch is sometimes essential and as long as we’ve used in those ways and that we’re happy it’s OK’. Perhaps an extension of the predominance of health and safety, the discussion surrounding necessary touch reflected the prevalence of litigation in current models and furthermore the behavioural influence that this has had over teaching staff.

John (36) referred to the notion of permission when touch becomes unavoidable, and he states: ‘I think it is again about, um, gaining not trust, but gaining permission, and then its sort of gaining permission on a need-to basis. So for example you wouldn’t have unnecessary contact with a student walking down the corridor. It’ll be in the context of right, we’re doing vaulting “I need to touch you there to get you over there” “we’re doing rugby, I want you to tackle in there, so move your arms there”. You’ll get permission on a need-to basis’. The fact that trust is overshadowed in this instance by permission is further evidence of the widening gulf between the characterisation of the teacher as an appropriate and relationally active role model and the contemporary status as a
sterile, dehumanised educational conduit. Permission, in its protective, accountable and categorical sense is a far more appropriate term given the landscape of ontological guilt and arbitrary accusation that now governs PE teaching. Trust is a seemingly extraneous factor, too variable to be encouraged in an environment where ‘labelling’ has become most feared. The incoherence of trust and relationships between adult and child under this regime of risk aversion has begun to re-categorise the teacher, who is no longer required to connect or identify with the pupil, but is rather expected to negotiate in the safest, most non-threatening and most perfunctory way possible.

One particular difficulty with a landscape that has so effectively cultivated a ‘no-touch’ culture is the contradictory position in which the teachers are routinely placed. Although touch is almost exclusively discouraged in contemporary environments there have been some examples within the dialogue of a willingness to comfort an upset child with a hug or conciliatory arm round a shoulder. As Sharon (25) states ‘I would cuddle them (if upset) or put my arm round them and its fine to do that. Um, that is fine to do that, and it does say in our school policy that you can do it’. However she somewhat paradoxically goes on to describe the way in which touch can be wholly avoided in a first aid situation; ‘If it’s a small minor cut you can just say right, here’s the wipe, you can wipe that yourself. So then you can say that you don’t have to touch them then, you’ve got no contact. Because there’s some things that they can deal with themselves’. What then is the difference between a comforting hug and the application of a plaster? Both actions are caring and have the best interests of the child at the forefront of intention, although one is seemingly acceptable and the other is not. These teachers are being pulled in two directions by the tension between their instinctive humanistic traits which are engendered in a natural predilection for nurture, and the conflicting reticence that is a product of a culturally constructed climate of fear. The unfortunate reality here is that this climate of fear and its accusatory and divisive characteristics will continue to
predominate, as altruistic nurture is undermined by a requirement for self-protection that was not previously evident.

It appears that this paradox is in keeping with the essence of Foucault’s concept of governmentality (1977, 1979), in which members of a social group are discursively conditioned to comply with the imperatives of power in such a way that any antagonistic dissidence is rendered unfeasible by a system that functions efficiently and subtly. Indeed this occurs to such an extent that the problematic or ethically dubious aspects of the system become unrecognisable to its members. The social mechanism is regarded by its participants as a necessary and subsequently unassailable force which binds together a social order that would otherwise be inherently fractious. The concept involves the analysis of widespread social control in a way that looks beyond state power, examining the techniques and dynamisms of organisation that traverse the line between individually constructed and inherently politicised systems of dominance and coercion.

This relates directly to the situation discussed above as we see the mechanistic differentiation of touching practice take place. Hugging an upset child is generally acceptable, yet not encouraged, as the concerned adult is duty bound to perform some form of loco-parental role which is sanitised and distorted under adult/child anxiety (see Piper et al, 2013, Piper, Stronach and MacLure, 2006). In addition, the application of a plaster brings with it a difficulty that is indicative of an identifiably contemporary bureaucratisation. The completion of accident sheets or some kind of categorical documentation is required when confronted with an incident such as this, regardless of its significance. It is far more prudent for the adult to avoid contact with the child in this instance as any contact made would necessarily need to be recorded and kept, available to be revisited at any stage during the teacher’s subsequent career. Although nothing ‘untoward’ would have occurred in such a case the mere fact that this can
contribute to a dossier of physical contact with children within a profession in which the adults are consistently required to justify their own individual ‘propriety’ serves to regulate behaviour to an extensive degree. Intergenerational discomfort has been proactively cultivated here as the preventative agenda which has established itself in modern schooling is automatically and in contextual terms, rationally maintained.

In addition to the expulsion of touch in first aid contexts, in which any touch must be written down and categorically recorded, supportive touch in gymnastic scenarios is now systematically articulated before it is enacted. Whilst this form of touch is essential and would have perhaps previously been implicitly accepted it now must be primarily verbalised. Examples of this are as follows; as Gary (43) comments, ‘Gymnastics is another one which is, I think, sort of um over generations, there’s certain lessons where there’s expected to be some contact. So if you’re doing vaulting in gymnastics, then there will be contact on the hip area to help them get over. Each time you do it you say to a student I’m going to do this I’m going to do that. So you’re sort of getting their approval or permission, um ... to sort of say is it okay me doing this?’ Brandon (30) has similarly stated, ‘I have to say to the kids ‘I’ll be putting my hand on your arm, as you do the rotation, if I need to, to get you right over, I’m gonna (sic) have to put my hand either on your backside or your hip, to push you so you don’t land on your head’’. Michelle (22) has also said: ‘Yeah we just explain what’s what. Because you know, when I teach shot put and javelin I’ll always say “right with your arm, can I just put my hand” ... and show them with the arm, and ... so it’s one of those where you just ask permission and then you use their fears’.

This ‘use of fear’ is an interesting notion as it demonstrates the prominence of a blame culture fairly succinctly. The utilisation of the children’s fears although in this instance a potentially ambiguous remark, is perhaps a product of the
contemporary requirement for an appropriation of action alongside strongly regimented rules of conduct. The manner in which this contact is, although made purely in the interests of the pupil’s wellbeing, articulated against a somewhat threatening evocation of consequence represents a climate that can be seen as both divisive and self-interested. Suzie (26) discussed unavoidable touch with: ‘There are sometimes when you can’t not touch, so like in gymnastics if you’re vaulting or in trampolining if you’re doing a flip, you’ve got to have hold of the child to a certain extent. I try and ask them if they’re OK, you know, if I hold onto your shoulder. So I will absolutely verbalise it first, saying if you want, I will hold on to your arm here and bring you across’.

Although the intention here is to placate the suspicions of both the child and adult, legitimising the action as a necessary product of safe practice, verbalising contact in such a contrived, procedural way further contributes to the inappropriate *charging* of the act, making a hitherto normal process inherently abnormal. This is of course in keeping with the fundamentals of governmentality as touching between adult and child is deemed problematic by a mechanistic cultural system which favours and indirectly demands risk aversion.

**Self-protection**

Self-protection has naturally featured heavily in the discussions surrounding touch. We have already been given examples of the prominence of tactile avoidance in contemporary settings, although the frequency with which strategic and necessary self-protection has been referred to is particularly worthy of note. Just as the reluctance to administer first aid has proven, an environment has emerged in which the safety of the child is being overshadowed by the reputational ‘wellbeing’ of the adult. Distance, reticence and procedural adherence have come to undermine the genuine experiences that have previously characterised PE teaching as the turn towards
hypersensitivity has encouraged a more dangerous atmosphere to emerge. The needs of the child are no longer a priority in a climate which punishes the constructed transgressions of the adult so heavily. One group discussion that took place at a suburban secondary school exemplified the contemporary mindset of the teacher, which seemingly displays an intrinsic and dictatorial concern with self-protection. Chris (34), Sharon (25), Lucy (30), Jasmine (32) and Byron (45) respectively stated:

‘You protect yourself you know’.

‘So in answer to your question, I suppose touch is to be avoided, in order to protect yourself as much as anything else’.

‘But it’s to protect yourself from any allegations really’.

‘Yes, yeah. And, er, if you like, they’re calculated, they’re carefully selected, um, you know, again to protect myself. And you know, in a way that’s almost subconscious. You don’t think about it, it just is there, I guess’.

‘We’re sort of told aren’t we that if you haven’t done this restraining stuff, that the best advice is to not get in between, because you could be the one that ends up in trouble’.

There has also been evidence of a (locally) governmental self-protection which has gone on to impact on the behaviour and conduct of the PE staff. The introduction of safe practice ‘guidelines’ was discussed by Alison (39): ‘No one has ever been prepared to say that its guidelines that are affecting the swimming that we mentioned earlier. It’s guidelines from Cheshire East, not from any other county in the country, not from the government but its certainly not a regulation. But the minute we don’t follow what Cheshire East has said and a child drowns in the pool we’re in trouble aren’t we’.

The difficulty with guidelines is that they only suggest the way in which conduct should be upheld. They are not regulations and therefore retain a superficial non-conformity, although if they are ignored it seems that the teacher will be selectively reprimanded for failing to adhere to procedure. This is advantageous
for local authorities as they are given the opportunity to draw attention to their own intervention when safety is ensured but are also free to distance themselves from cases where complaints have been made when guidelines are followed, as the teacher is not officially obligated to act within a conventional regulatory framework. This is manifestly detrimental to the individual teacher as they are in effect given no support by a body which they would have perhaps considered to have their best interests in mind. A cycle ensues in which the teacher must establish a balance between guideline adherence and discursively acceptable practice, leaving the genuine needs of the child a considerable way down the list of priorities for all involved. Superficiality appears to dominate here as the adults that are both directly and indirectly responsible for child welfare and the maintenance of intergenerational propriety, are constantly locked in a risk averse stalemate in an ironic bid to ‘safeguard’ reputation.

The discussion of risk in this instance can be significantly reinforced with a reference to the work of Ulrich Beck. Beck’s notion of risk society (1992) describes the direct correlation between greater knowledge exchange and increased ontological fear. As we discover more about the world in which we live, the more we are exposed to the dangers that this environment presents. Risk has evolved and been realigned under this model as it is now a calculable and necessary component of social structure. It is essentially a means of dealing with and reacting to the wholesale and radical nature of modern social change, as risk enables social actors to ‘rein in’ and navigate the tumultuous landscape of contemporary social movement in a manner which implies a maintenance of control over respective individual destiny. It seems, almost paradoxically, that social movement is inherently governed and to a certain degree restricted by the consistent and deliberate intervention of humankind, and the situation evident above coherently supports this.
Risk within risk society is a self-multiplying entity. We have been given examples of this time and again from the debate which surrounds health in the United Kingdom. As more is done to prevent premature death through the development of medical science, discoveries are consistently made contradicting established lifestyle or dietary advice. It therefore becomes prudent to adopt an approach which favours ‘damage limitation’ and negates any genuine positive lifestyle changes as individuals are encouraged to insipidly live as frugal, low risk lives as possible, in order not to burden the state with hitherto avoidable, self-inflicted diseases. Behaviour such as this, which serves to perpetuate counterproductive paradox, has been strikingly visible in intergenerational contexts, as the individual teacher and collective bodies responsible for teaching combine to distance themselves from the possibility of blame in contemporary environments. It has been our simultaneous ‘discovery’ of and failure to understand sexual abuse/abusers which has led to an inherent difficulty with and therefore fear of intergenerational contact. Ignorance, a result of the transient fluidity of ideology and knowledge exchange, has had a cyclically constraining effect upon the (re)production of social phenomena. Parents have been largely united in their resolute call for the protection of children above all else, but it is often very difficult to ascertain exactly what their children should be protected from. The frequent absence of any tangible factor to oppose has rendered protective measures reactionary, oppressive and crude.

The unfortunate irony here is that children have been endangered further by such misinformed attempts to safeguard them, representing a pertinent example of a phenomenon Beck termed ‘the boomerang effect’ (1992). This idea draws attention to the way in which the avoidance of risk can lead to the simultaneous creation of risk, a formula that has become increasingly apparent within a wide range of contemporary contexts. The idea very effectively identifies the problematic tendencies apparent in late modern social organisation, that bypass legitimate progression and development in favour of
'solutions’ that quickly and efficiently safeguard prevalent convention. This system once again contributes to the construction of uncertainty, as the respective consequences of such an unyielding preservation of ignorance are immeasurable. The emergence and subsequent predominance of systems of self-protection represents an appropriate manifestation of a contemporary risk driven society most succinctly. It also demonstrates the relatively immovable nature of a cycle of intergenerational reticence as risk creates risk, and avoidance and self-protection insidiously multiply in a similar manner. Indeed reticence comprises the next code, representing an equally significant point of departure for much of the discussion.

**Reticence**

The teachers involved in the interviews all expressed a reluctance to engage with children in a physical ‘non-accountable’ manner, describing their self-regulation with an almost regimented predictability. Chris (34) and Glenn (47) stated: ‘You have to be very, very careful of where you touch, who you touch and when you touch’. ‘As a male I would never ever do anything, unless it was kind of like me stood to the front of them, with clear, explicit actions’. Glenn’s tacit admission that his gender is significant is further evidence of the discursive emergence of this climate of fear and mistrust, as action is to a large degree governed by perception of consequence. Being wary of gender difference in intergenerational contexts is a further development of the more general anxiety that surrounds such interaction in contemporary settings.

As greater concern over contact between adult and child has emerged so has an unintentional sexualisation of these instances. That a heterosexual male teacher is forced to instruct post-pubescent female pupils is now a source of contention for many, as teachers are both implicated and conflicted by a maelstrom of indirectly salacious intervention. In addition to this has been a consistent refusal
to physically comfort upset pupils or indeed celebrate success with a hug or arm around the shoulder. Whilst Sharon (25) revealed a willingness to hug a crying child above, there were a notable number of staff members at her own school and others, who would not be as tactile.

Brianna (23) discussed her difficulty with this issue as follows: ‘I don’t think I personally would ever give any sort of congratulatory hug to any student. Occasionally students who feel they’ve got a strong relationship with you do come to you to do that don’t they? And I find that a little bit awkward actually. Even though you know that their intentions are completely normal. Um ... I feel a bit awkward about it, particularly if there are other people around. Just because of what they might think. That they might think I instigated it. And yet that’s a shame because there’s never anything really meant by it, but I would tend not to do that’. That Brianna demonstrates a strong sense of regret within this excerpt is indicative of the challenging dilemmas that this environment can present. The teacher is again conflicted, as rulings of various kinds, pressure to conform to preventative models and discursively embedded fear routinely undermine the caring, developmental even life-affirming aspects of the teaching profession. Others have been more categorical in their refusal to engage with their pupils in an emotionally tactile way. Gareth (36) exemplified this in the discussion that follows:

Q. Is relational/nurturing touch acceptable?
‘Hmm. I would ... in my experience, I have never ... despite someone, um, being upset and crying I’ve never thought of doing that. Also In my previous role as a learning mentor I never thought of hugging a kid or touching in that sort of way. High fives, you will do high fives in a lesson, but even for a kid that’s upset I’ll keep my distance. It’s never sort of one-to-one. But yeah regarding touching, just obviously it’s a no-no so you just don’t entertain it’.

Q. So touch is to be avoided at all costs?
‘Oh definitely, definitely’.
These sentiments, coming from the Head of PE at an inner-city comprehensive school, exemplify the extent to which a reticence to touch, and also to engage with and nurture pupils, has been established here. That this way of thinking has become so heavily embedded and so behaviourally normalised is cause for particular concern in an environment which had for many represented the antithesis of circumscription and categorical accountability. Exploring this notion of reticence has enabled us to reveal not just behavioural regulation but also a distortion of the boundaries between actual intervention and the vagaries of cultural influence. The following exchange saw an interesting and telling contradiction:

’Soo obviously I just don’t do it (touch) anymore because I know it’s the policy’.

’Soo I’ve stopped doing it because I’ve been told to stop doing it basically, that’s …’.

’Who’s told you to stop doing it?’

’Well just … no, the policies where you’re not supposed to touch and stuff like that. That’s why I wouldn’t … because’.

’But there isn’t any policy that says don’t support and don’t touch pupils?’

This conversation saw Shannon (24) and Linda (25) discussing touching practice, and whilst Shannon revealed that she didn’t use physical contact on the advice of an officially sanctioned policy decision, Linda challenged this by stating that no such policy exists. This is symptomatic of the misappropriation that a climate of such intense scrutiny can facilitate and also reflective of the (over)efficiency of the regulating forces that have become apparent in intergenerational contexts. Shannon’s reticence to touch pupils even in the absence of any formal discouragement is a salient example of risk society in action, as risk has in this instance become a self-sustaining, reflexively embedded component of practical and professional organisation. There is a noteworthy interplay between social actors in this instance, as it is clear that human inhibition has been directly invoked by human intervention.
This also fits well with Bauman’s concept of the ‘stranger’ (1991); itself an allegorical representation of the continuity of ignorance in modern social ordering, as the character lingers yet remains unfamiliar, just out of the reach of a conventional scrutiny. This alludes to an unknown undercurrent to contemporary organisation that has simultaneously frustrated and unsettled populations that appear unable to address such concerns. As the stranger in this instance is not an overt, categorically obvious threat, such a notion remains constant in its impact and influence. This can be coherently applied to the situation evident in intergenerational contexts, as we have witnessed an equivalent manifestation of fear emerge. The threat of child abuse and by extension, those who are in a position to commit such acts can be regarded as the ‘stranger’ here, as the aversion to adult/child exploitation represents a continual but simultaneously vague interpretation of concern. With this in mind, Shannon has self-regulated alongside a distortion of identity that has emerged as a by-product of the complexity that this ontological uncertainty has engendered. Shannon is, in this instance keen to distance herself from the perception of unfamiliarity that has been discursively resident in the role of the adult, although her methods of doing so have in fact contributed to the dissolution of relational potential. It seems that touching the pupil in this context implicates the practitioner, by fulfilling the characterisation of a ‘dubious unknown’. However, the decision to extricate oneself from contact is itself similarly alienating. This points to a marginalisation of (PE) staff that has undoubtedly been fostered under a prominent regime of intergenerational suspicion (see Best, 1990, 1998; Cohen and Young, 1981; Weisberg, 1984).

Problems with/realities of touch in contemporary teaching
Through this thematic code we are given the opportunity to explore the extent to which teachers are influenced by a ‘no-touch’ culture not only behaviourally, as we have seen above, but also internally and institutionally. Whereas
reticence, self-protection and necessary touch all offer an insight into the existential difficulties that this climate has provoked, by taking a more holistic and perhaps more simplistic approach to the interpretation of contemporary practice it becomes possible to draw attention to the numerous restrictions and professional hurdles that now encompass PE teaching. In exploring the contemporary perceptions of touch there was apparent division in the manner in which staff reacted to the situation. Some, often regardless of age, lamented the changes, wistfully longing for a return to the era in which they were able to teach with autonomy and freedom. Karen (29) has stated:

‘What would be interesting though within it would be to compare the number of injuries in PE and sport settings now, compared to 20 years ago, or the number of incidences where touch has had a negative impact on any child now, compared to twenty years ago. I would guess that there’s no fewer injuries now, with all the many guidelines we’ve got, than there used to be. I don’t remember kids being injured in school and we did play pirates in the gym’.

Ravi (32) discussed the disproportionate attention given to safety checking and the problems that this poses:

‘We probably build a sense of fear into the kids though don’t we, by the fact that we’re so cautious. You know, we set the gym up this morning with all the bars that were out, and you’re on edge the entire time, as opposed to letting the kids explore what it is you want them to do and really find out how to use their bodies’.

Becky (24) also recollected an incident in which contemporary attitudes towards touch have proved detrimental:

‘One girl kept going to the toilets to get changed, and she came back in we saw and like we couldn’t ask her what was wrong we just said, are you ok and what’s all this? You just want to sit down and give them a hug and just say what’s this and you can’t’.
Conversely, other staff accepted the changes, pragmatically adapting themselves in a bid to conform to newly established yet firmly normalised methods of practice.

Connor (31) stated that: ‘(The school) Find it difficult to support you because it would just be ‘don’t put your hand on them at all, don’t even put your hand on their back to say don’t, don’t touch them at all.” If they refuse to move, the bottom line is you ring the police, because they are the people that can put your hands on you and move you’.

Lindsay (27) accepts procedure regarding child safeguarding, implying that its extensive nature is something of a necessary evil: ‘You’ve got to be careful with um, safeguarding children policies, and we’ve had to sign them. If you sense there’s a problem you have to sign a form for it and then give it to the safeguarding officer at school, rather than speaking to the kid’.

She went on to say: ‘That’s something (child protection training) that you know, is mandatory. Um, and we’ve done it again, we’ve probably had to look ... maybe it’s every two years, a couple of years ago and then we did it last year. And it’s literally every single member of staff that could possibly come into contact with children which I absolutely agree with’.

‘That needs to be in place, the CRB checking and things like that. But then there’s still ... I guess you still hear of the odd ... there’s a very few minority who kind of get through the like ... are under the radar and they manage to pass CRB. And then it’s found that they’re abusing or there’s neglect, or whatever issue there is. And you think God, it can still happen, even with all these measures in place. So then they try and make measures even stricter’.

Whilst it is pragmatic for staff to adapt themselves in such a way it seems this pragmatism has been somewhat absent in the thinking and rhetoric which have encouraged these changes to occur.
Professional pressure

The second significant theme used in the analysis was **Professional pressure**. This theme enabled us to delve into the extent to which contemporary PE teachers are amongst other things, scrutinised, as they come to terms with the need to find a balance between internal and external supervision and the manifest consequences of this. The codes that emerged within this theme included (i) preventative pressure (ii) interrogative pressure (iii) scrutiny and surveillance and (iv) self-scrutiny.

Preventative pressure

Beginning with preventative pressure it appears that health and safety as both a practically implemented culture and as a more abstract notion is unquestionably dominant. There are examples in which health and safety provision has overshadowed participation and the following comments from Matt (31) reflect this: ‘Basically the profession at the moment, the morale of the teachers is at the lowest point since I started ten years ago. There are a lot more demands on the job and there’s a lot more pressure put on from that because they’re wanting more depth with risk assessments, because they have to be so detailed’. Not only does this point to the obvious difficulties which surround the undermining of free pedagogical expression, it also alludes to a more embedded fear of litigation and prosecution which itself renders any transition into a less rigid provisional curriculum increasingly unfeasible.

Such rigidity has served to significantly compromise perceptions of individual autonomy in contemporary teaching as Nikki (28) stated: ‘Some of the (health and safety) regulations have undermined our experience, our common sense, or just society’s acceptance of what’s reasonable I suppose, but the kind of people we are in the end, we tend to just say that’s what we’ve got to do and you
change the ways, or you adapt or you don’t. When it becomes regulation in force, whatever, for our own sakes, we’ve got to do that, rightly or wrongly’.

Any sense here that the teacher is able to exercise some semblance of individual expression or professional autonomy is notably absent, again reminding us of Foucault’s interpretation of governmentality (1977), in which populist dissent is rendered impossible by an efficient mechanism of modern power. Indeed the very term professional pressure is derivative of Foucault’s concept here. The pressure we refer to is legitimised under the conditions of professional context. Pressure is not necessarily perceived to be a negative influence in an environment such as this, as the avoidance of touch and problematic incident is in someway incentivised through the cultivation of professional intensity. Subsequently, there is little tangible resistance to the severe infringement of the balance between work and a personal life as Connor describes: ‘I haven’t got the time or energy when I get home for my family, a lot of the time weekends come, I should be doing things with them, and I’m ... it sounds like I’m moaning here but its just the reality of the job. It’s not just something where you can go in at nine o clock and finish at three o clock and think that that’s the job done. There’s no work life balance’. Under a system that prioritises a superficial perception of safety it becomes increasingly important to maintain this façade. This occurs however at the expense of the genuine connections that teachers may hold, as personal lives add unwanted complexity to the perpetuation of images that imply safety and propriety.

**Interrogative pressure**

The subject of Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checking also emerged within the discussion of interrogative pressure, with one staff member stating: ‘the badminton coach has got eight different CRBs at the moment, that’s red tape gone mad really ... why does it have to be like that?’ Although referring to an external coach it became apparent that peripatetic coaches must obtain
enhanced CRB clearance from each separate school or institution that they enter. This not only reinforces the perception that adults who work with children, or furthermore choose to work with children should be subjected to unreasonable levels of scrutiny, but it also displays how tenuously PE teachers are trusted to fulfil their roles with professional competence. That a badminton coach needs a CRB check to work in a school is perhaps not the point, the check would most likely be undertaken with the coach confident of the revelation of a clean record and only too happy to cooperate. It is the manner in which external coaches are quickly and easily deemed legitimate whilst remaining ‘unknown entities’ and the PE teacher despite having worked at a school for a considerable time is constantly questioned, suggests an extension of CRB checking, tacitly creeping into the PE teachers everyday existence. The CRB checking of coaches is simply a practical reduction of the sustained, interrogation which PE teachers must endure at all times.

These comments from Victor (41), Suzie (26) and Jevon (44) support this: ‘I think we’ve all been in situations or scenarios where I think the word of the student’s been taken first’.

‘It’s quite high pressure because you’re constantly kind of second guessing yourself, I think because you think well … ’.

‘What if I was to do this, what … you know, what would happen then. And if that was seen as inappropriate, what would come from that. And it’s your job on the line, at the end of the day. And it could only come from a false accusation and that’s your reputation, references, job gone’.

‘And you’re under this pressure every single day when you come in, so … ’.

**Scrutiny and surveillance**

Alongside interrogative pressure comes scrutiny and surveillance, and the analysis of this aspect of practice revealed some key findings. Fundamentally Foucauldian in essence, a deconstruction of the notion of scrutiny and
surveillance in modern PE teaching allows us to describe the operation of contemporary systems of power and also benefit from a conceptually projective exploration. In addition to Foucault’s notion of governmentality it is also appropriate to refer to his interpretation of panopticism (1977, 1980), as the continuous gaze of the concerned public regulates conduct in a startling parallel to the circular prison house that Foucault utilised (as referred to in Chapter II).

We are not only given insight into the levels to which PE staff are examined and scrutinised, but also the differing kinds of observation which have emerged, through the following comments. Corinne (29) stated: ‘I mean obviously there are lesson observations where conduct has been monitored by somebody outside’.

Shaun (33) also stated: ‘You might be sort of monitored peripherally if you’re out in the field, then the head of PE or someone else might be watching what’s going on. Then it might be a situation when they’d speak to you and say well, maybe next time try that, or try this, or in my experience this has worked’. Anna (22) and Debbie (27) similarly discussed this: ‘We do coaching observations. So you don’t get like the lesson observation, you don’t get the grade, you just coach each other. You watch them and then you write down the good points and the bad points. So you’re just sharing ideas and practices, behaviour management, um’.

‘We do a lot of peer assessment and stuff’. Following on from this Anita (30) described her experiences: ‘They do have separate inspections which might be smaller, and it’s looking at child protection and things like that. Um, we are ... it is obviously monitored internally, so if there’s ever any complaint or anything like that, you know whether it’d come through my ... the head of girls PE, head of department, child protection officer’.

These instances are a formal, overtly enacted aspect of regulatory procedure, allowing the teachers to moderate their behaviour in conjunction with the highly circumscribed, preventative imperatives that have been made abundantly clear.
to them. There are in addition many examples of a tacit, reflexively realised need to adhere to these rules, as the following statements reflect: ‘If I need to keep a kid behind after class, I have to have another person ... pupil with them’. (John)

‘The kid that I’m talking to will need to be watched by at least one more person’. ‘Um, as long as you know, you should never be on your own in a classroom with one person, as long as there’s other people around you’. (Corrine)

‘You wouldn’t be in the changing room with one student. Leave the doors open you know. I think people have had their fingers burnt in the past with those allegations’. (Connor)

‘If you’re chatting to a pupil in a room, leave the door open’. (Jevon)

A particularly interesting comment came from Gavin (26): ‘The camera sees me go in and I sort of sit in a position where I can be seen’. He welcomes the implementation of technology which will ‘prove his innocence’ in a climate where categorical evidence is the only way to mollify a blanket mistrust. The discomfort that is felt by populations outside of teaching is apparently mirrored although this occurs in such a way that the subject of scrutiny successfully facilitates its operation. There was also the by now predictable confusion concerning ruling in this context, as Victor spoke of the need to make interaction visible in a way which, although unsure of ambiguous ruling, remains inherently preventative: ‘I think there’s probably a rule about being in a classroom with a student if a doors locked or um you might be like meeting the students out of school or something like that’.

This issue has apparently been resolved with a kind of staff solidarity, as Kevin (34) stated:

‘The first witness is your colleague, um and we’ve always been taught that we need to keep an open environment. It’s always one where there are witnesses with the kids or there’s other staff about’.
It seems that by collectively entering into a form of mutual monitoring, the staff are able to exercise a sense of professional cohesion in a way that remains adherent to contemporary feeling. This is however a rather bleak admission that the only possible demonstration of collectivism is wholly enacted within the boundaries of a system of intense, restrictive scrutiny and a further example of the reach of modern regulation. The scenario is itself fundamentally representative of governmentality, as the very systems of control that have been implemented by ruling forces become transferable and automatically realised by a population which passively accepts and subsequently maintains them. There is indeed evident support for scrutiny in school settings in the interview findings, as the transparency which it affords teachers helps to placate their internal confusion when dealing with potentially ‘dubious’ situations. It is possible to contend that a PE teacher would be far more comfortable being watched whilst guiding a pupil through a gymnastic technique, rather than left alone to touch the child then internally revisit the action for fear that they had carried out the movement incorrectly and therefore inappropriately. Any potential for some recognition of legitimacy from another adult is surely welcomed in this instance, as self-confidence in this context is both discouraged and eroded.

**Self-scrutiny**

Discussing the vagaries of scrutiny and surveillance can be developed and made contextually resonant by exploring the idea of self-scrutiny. This is particularly important as it becomes possible to review the movement and increasing significance of intergenerational concern and its influence over behavioural tendency. In addition, this notion of collective scrutiny becomes more apparent here, as the adaptive qualities of the teacher are again enacted within a contextually acceptable circumstance. Nikki described the procedural realisation of this as follows: ‘We’re quite lucky in PE in the fact that we, quite often share spaces. So there’ll be two people teaching in the sports hall, or a couple of us
out on the Astroturf. We rarely teach completely on our own, I suppose you’re always aware of what other people are doing. Because even if we do then teach in four separate areas, we’re still all starting in the same point. So we’re in the changing rooms, dealing with the students with each other really. And then we all go down one corridor to our separate spaces. So we’re all sort of able to see each other in action all the time, and so are other staff who walk by’. Rather than embrace the opportunity to work independently, the teachers are encouraging an intra-professional system of surveillance to emerge. This can perhaps be described as a product of a panoptical model, in which rather than remain subservient to an inconsistent yet unremitting system of surveillance, the staff would rather pre-empt such scrutiny on their own terms. Whilst it remains in place, and potentially becomes more concentrated, the scrutiny is at least enacted by a known entity and thereby given some semblance of regularity. There is however a sense that pacification is the driving force behind this movement and subsequently remains problematic.

There are numerous examples in the interview findings of self-scrutiny; indeed this was the case to such an extent that it indicates a learned behaviour, a product of conditioning which has gone beyond normalisation. This came to light in particular during the discussion of school trips. The existential problems that this presents the staff member responsible became immediately visible as self-doubt and heightened levels of self-scrutiny were made apparent. Julia (29) described the relief provided by having other adults to share the burden: ‘I’ve led one trip, it was in my first or second year, just a local one, to a hockey tournament with a group, and I had a couple of parents there to help me. So there was no … the kids were great there was no issues’. Although she goes on to talk about her anxiety in leading an overseas hockey tour: ‘I’m going on a hockey tour to Spain in April with a group of girls. So that is obviously … obviously their safety is paramount. Um, so yeah, it is a bit of a worry, um I’m very apprehensive. What’s reassuring me is that it’s a joint rugby tour as well.'
So it’s a rugby and hockey tour. So there’s my head of department going and two other members of male staff. So there’s three male members of staff and me, staying in the same hotel. So ultimately, I know if they’re there if there’s any issues and obviously I can ask their advice, and ... but ultimately, the girls are my responsibility’.

Interestingly, her apprehension is tempered by the simultaneous presence of the teachers on the rugby tour, as not only does it offer the opportunity for blame to be diluted, there becomes possibility for mutual support similar to that mentioned above. There is seemingly inherent contemporary difficulty with the individual adult taking charge of a group of children or teenagers. Not only is this exercised by the concerned public at large, it has also become manifested in the behaviour of the staff themselves, who are exposed to narratives of intergenerational mistrust more than anyone. It is perhaps unsurprising that a group which is the target of modern fears surrounding adult/child interaction have begun to process such attitudes in a way which distorts the hysteria and focuses rhetorical panic inward. PE therefore becomes a breeding ground for self-doubt and self-regulation. Whilst this in itself is not necessarily a dangerous scenario, and is under the circumstances rational, the infighting and malicious civil warring within the profession which a cycle of self-loathing can potentially provoke is still a troubling prospect.

Transitions which have occurred in teaching – the subsequent problems

Investigating the transitions which have occurred in teaching was illustrative, as it offered the opportunity to gauge the manner in which changes have been provoked by a culture of risk and prevention, rather than more naturalistic development. There was a notable lamentation of the increasingly regulatory framework under which PE staff are expected to operate, and a longing for a
return to the days in which they were able to teach with freedom and autonomy. Gus (46) stated: ‘Before I did my PGCE it was kind of very much still at the age of there’s a ball, boot it on the field and off you go. I can remember seeing both of the PE teachers sat in the sports hall office watching Wimbledon, and me outside with the ball and 35/40 lads: which is why I kind of got into it and enjoyed it because they just let me do it’. There is clearly great value attached to a previous era, in which teachers were able to act with impunity away from the pressures and difficulties which a climate of hypersensitivity encourages. Far from a rose tinted perception of previous methods this sentiment was echoed by many other staff members, underlying an intrinsic professional problematisation of contemporary working conditions and the extent to which current staff are now accountable. Harry (45), David (39), Andy (42), Linda and Nikki commented: ‘But back then there was no safeguarding. There was nothing organised like that’. ‘I don’t ever remember being checked’. ‘I don’t remember any safeguarding or anything like that’. ‘I can’t remember CRB’. ‘It might have happened but it wasn’t to the degree it is now’.

Although there is considerable regret engendered in the shifting focus of school sport, attitudes which lament such a transition are perhaps no longer applicable. This initially seems somewhat negligent on behalf of the schools and authorities which presided over these staff. To overlook a system of thorough checking in a sense de-legitimises and de-professionalises an occupation which has become defined by its rigorous approach to the vetting of its members. It has become laudable to interrogate staff members to considerable and sometimes unreasonable levels and a misty-eyed reminiscence of a bygone era represents an unconscionable challenge to collective progress. An interesting reversal of sentiment has also taken place in the contact that staff have with parents. Previously, the parent would have been a largely absent figure, visible at parent
evenings or the occasional sporting fixture, although we now see a great deal more communication, and furthermore complaint, take place. David discussed this: ‘But certainly 15 years ago, we openly want more communication with parents, where kind of like things are going wrong in the examination subjects or whatever, we’re only too quick to ring home and we’re encouraged to ring home. And therefore its kind of like well, the door’s open now’. Alex (40) went on to say: ‘You would never … 10, 15 years ago definitely not have done that (taken abuse from parents). I think that’s a thing for the last few years, I don’t even think … when I started teaching eight years ago, I don’t think it happened then. I wouldn’t have got asked to justify myself what I’d done why I’d done this to a child. I think it’s just in the last maybe four or five years, I think for me it’s changed but I think we’ve invited it though’. In a period of two decades, attitudes, behaviour and organisational structure has changed immeasurably and this has largely taken place to the detriment of pedagogical autonomy. Alex’s admission that ‘we’ve invited’ more dialogue between teacher and parent not only speaks of the undermining of the role within a social order which now demands an answerable point of contact, but also the dissolution of trust between two entities who would previously have had similar objectives. The role of the teacher and the role of the parent differ greatly now in that the teacher is committed to education and child development, whereas the parent is counterproductively concerned with the protection of the child. This has occurred in ways that see the preoccupation with protection disproportionately favoured over the development of the pupil, perhaps at times misdirecting the discussion which increasingly takes place between parent and teacher. The teacher must, in this instance act as a medium for anger and fear in ways that completely overshadow their developmental motives.

Teaching is now a tumultuous profession in which constant change is expected. Lucy and Chris stated: ‘There’s paperwork for everything and there’s always
some new scheme coming in. Can we see one scheme out before summat else comes in. There just seems to be one scheme after another’.

‘I mean there’s been loads of changes. I think there’s obviously more rules and regulations in place but there’s always like more things you’ve got to include in your lessons to make sure you meet our set criteria. So that’s just being updated all the time. Every ... literally every term, there’s something new or something that you need to make sure you’re aware of’.

It is again possible to refer to Beck’s risk society (1992), as the manifest uncertainty that has been encouraged by a landscape of arbitrary change reflects the ontological concerns that have consumed social structures in contemporary ‘developed world’ contexts. Our attempt to manage the uncertainties that the revelation of new knowledge and new forms of interaction can incite sees a style of intervention that generally fails to accommodate inevitable transition productively. Instead of harnessing change, allowing new trends to form and organically manipulate established landscapes, (Western) organisations have largely dealt with this in reactionary, preventative and risk driven ways (Beck, 1991, 1992). Teaching is no exception as changing attitudes in parents, children and staff have in effect been pre-empted by a disordered attempt to regulate and therefore account for the behaviour of all parties. The results however have been unintentionally unsettling.

**Motivations for teaching – how they have been compromised**

Risk society can also be used to inform the two remaining themes, which included motivations for teaching and the subsequent compromise and potential for progression in PE teaching. Given that sport and its instruction represent at its most fundamental level, the opportunity to engage in competition and therefore avoid the drudgery of everyday life, the way in which most aspects of PE have become so heavily regulated has constructed a somewhat troubling reality for many practitioners. Original motivations for entrance into the
profession have been severely questioned by a climate in which paperwork, safeguarding and the protection of both child and adult must be satisfied before the seemingly trivial act of sporting interaction takes place. Suzie and Anna commented: ‘I didn’t think there would be as much paperwork’.

‘We got into it to, you know promote healthy lifestyles, and when you’re sat in the classroom doing written work ... it’s a bit too theory based now’. Some teachers showed little passion for the job from the outset, as Jake (24), Bryn (25) and Katy (27) stated: ‘I fell into it’.

‘I wouldn’t say I was motivated’.

‘I wasn’t sure what I wanted to do. But my dad had been a teacher and it was the easiest option really’. These teachers, perhaps on some level aware of the difficulties that they would face on entry, chose teaching as a career option in which the good marginally outweighs the bad. This represents a far cry from the definitive, lifelong career status that teaching would perhaps have previously evoked. More a craft than a job, practitioners would have regarded their role as fundamental to the maintenance of social structure, safe in their respected positions. Now it seems that this is not the case as Jevon stated: ‘Teachers aren’t valued in the way that they were years ago’. There is a problem inherent with the redefinition of teaching during a time in which the role must now encompass the administration of safeguarding procedure to as great a degree as it does sports instruction. Delia (28) asked: ‘How are you expected to teach normally with all this (intense safeguarding) hanging over you?’ failing to recognise that ‘teaching normally’ must now accommodate the myriad pressures associated with an intense system of regulatory prevention. PE teaching cannot any longer be viewed simplistically. It must be associated with a new model which is equally divisible between the maintenance of an ‘appropriate’ and conscientious reputation and thorough and inclusive sports and physical activity instruction. The language used here is deliberately mechanistic, representative as it is of the highly professionalised, newly marketable and most importantly accountable landscape in physical education.
It is not difficult to see why motives are at best challenged and at worst never established in an environment which continues to erode its once vital human element.

**Potential for progression**

In terms of the potential for progression and the future of PE teaching it is fairly clear that a reassessment enacted under the changing landscape of physical education will need to take place. It is perhaps no longer productive to simply bemoan the changes that have taken place and long for a return to the past when the transitions that have affected the profession appear so absolute. The negativity conveyed when the future for PE teaching was discussed was palpable, and the following comments demonstrate this. Nikki commented: ‘I don’t think it will change (culture of allegation). It’ll probably just get worse’. Anita claimed that: ‘Students are becoming far more powerful now. I don’t know how long it will be until there is a serious assault on a teacher or summat will happen, they’ll finally say well actually, summat needs to be done’. When asked what the future holds for the regulation of touch Shannon said: ‘I don’t think it can get any worse’. And Gavin stated: ‘I think (teaching) is less rewarding now ... I don’t know, now it seems, because there’s so many hoops to jump through, um, not just health and safety but kids have changed; their attitudes have changed. Because society’s changed as well. Yeah where there’s blame there’s a claim’.

This relatively bleak outlook was however paralleled by an encouraging pragmatism on behalf of the teaching staff. Now all too aware of the adaptations they will routinely have to make they have begun to prepare for this. Not only has the mutual intra-professional support mentioned above been in evidence as Shaun stated: ‘We’re normally pretty good at supporting each other’. Teachers have also developed heightened senses when judgement is
required. Gareth commented: ‘There might be some protocols or procedures where we need to go on courses, because like I say at the minute there is nothing to stop us from ... to say that you can do this and you can’t. There are no set rules, it’s just our judgement. If a problem ever did come up they’ve told us to use our judgement’. Darren also demonstrated an eloquent understanding of the need for behavioural modification and good judgement with: ‘I think we have to refine the way in which we behave with the children. In the past, I’ve known teachers grab them and fling them out the door’.

Indeed such is the intensity and significance of touch in an interactional and technical context, the judgement of the teacher has had to become finely tuned, sensitive to the potential enormity of the situation in a way that speaks of evolutionary development, itself a positive consequence of the litigation culture. This contributes to the notion that PE teaching is becoming an increasingly specialist profession, the members of which will soon be marked out as part of a select group who are existentially ‘able’ to process intergenerational touch. Although this may have something science fictional about it, such is the constant requirement for justification of ‘propriety’ that the systems of regulation will have exhausted and eliminated the opportunity for any ‘abuse of power’, thereby creating the transparency which is so consistently called for in today’s climate. What remains concerning however is the way in which civil liberties are eroded in the journey towards this apparently beneficial end.

The next two chapters reinterpret the dialogue analysed above in the form of two fictional narratives. The stories are presented and then discussed in such a way as to add an extra dimension to the empirical study and also build upon the trends and contextual nuances which we have identified. The stories do not simply fictionalise the verbatim dialogue, but rather project and then evocatively explore scenarios that have been informed by the sentiments and expressive comments of the interview participants.
Chapter VII
Story 1 ‘Carl’
Splat, splat, splat, creak, THWACK
Splat, splat, splat, creak, THWACK
Splat, splat, splat, creak, THWACK

The sound soothed Carl as he guided yet another pupil over the vaulting horse and on to the crash mat. This gymnastic production line continued for mere minutes, although his absent mind made it seem far longer. The slap of the children’s bare feet on the hardwood floor, the transitory journey from springboard to horse and the subsequent collapse onto the oceanic crash mat was deeply pleasing for the otherwise jaded PE teacher, who stood over the pupils, benevolently transfixed by the rhythm of this simple movement. The bell put a sudden, irrevocable end to his reverie. The predictable routine of the lesson now had to give way to the chaotic maelstrom of the changing room, and Carl became quickly unsettled by this. The children filed out of the gym, beginning slowly and peacefully until they believed they were out of the focus of Carl’s discipline. Their walking became a quickstep and then a canter until they were tearing round the corridors at breakneck speed. Carl was powerless to stop this although this minor infringement was always overshadowed by the sense of foreboding which had now well and truly engulfed him. This was a daily occurrence, but it was the room for error in this highly charged battleground which Carl could barely handle. In moments he would be forced to interact with children, as they were undressing, forced to listen to the year tens talk about their fallacious sexual conquests, forced to help the year sevens with their ties, forced to restrain some of the more boisterous year nines. He knew that the hellish ten minute period would probably pass off without incident, but he could not make that assumption as the heady aroma of value deodorant and post-pubescent body odour tinged his nostrils. He threw the doors open, attempting to affect gravitas and instil fear into this group of perennially disinterested year nines. Rather than fall silent, as he had optimistically hoped, they simply quietened to a sheepish murmur, aware that
Mr Sparrow was capable of causing a minor and far from insurmountable setback to their mischievous objectives. Carl sat down on an unoccupied bench and began to busy himself with the register.

“Sir?”

Billy Evans called out and Carl looked up with a somewhat inexplicable start.

“What is it Billy? This better be important I’m very busy” He lied.

“We were just wondering who you thought was fitter, Miss Jones or Ms Pritchard? We all reckon Miss Jones”

Carl could feel himself blushing and he hated himself for it. Once again a fourteen year old boy had got the measure of him.

“Don’t be so ridiculous Billy, haven’t you heard of sexism?”

“I’ve heard of sex..”

He retorted with impeccable timing as the room erupted with an explosion of laughter that can only be effectively generated by adolescent voices. There was something in the mixture of broken and unbroken speech which gave the hilarity an upsetting, almost disquieting immediacy. It warranted a response from Carl, but it was now in his interests to keep quiet and wait for the next distraction.

“I guarantee you he fancies Miss Jones”

Brayed Billy as he and his cohorts bundled out of the door onto the vast, vaguely correctional playground. They stopped at their usual spot by the wheelie bins and Brandon pulled out a pilfered cigarette. They were out of sight down there, away from the throng. It was a haven for the recently initiated smoker, as the boys were free to blacken their lungs with relative impunity. However on this occasion their conversation wasn’t private, as an open window betrayed their secret exchange. Mr Morris was listening intently, keen as he was to identify the voices and put a stop to their imminent transgression.

“Fucking Sparrow earlier, I’ve seen him sniffing round Miss Jones trying to chirpse her and shit, mans pathetic fam”.
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Morris chuckled, he had to agree with Damien; he had been witness to Carl Sparrow’s unwieldy attempts to win the heart of Rachel Jones on many a works do, and quite frankly he admired his tenacity.

“I reckon the only reason he goes round her lesson so often is to look at the year ten girls though, there’s some buff looking women in that year group”

“Yeah that’s true man, if I was him I’d make the most of that you know, have a good old look!”

More hilarity ensued as the boys stood about sharing round the dying embers of a Marlboro light.

Morris wasn’t laughing though. Should he take this seriously? There had been comments to this effect before yet he had always given Carl the benefit of the doubt in previous years. He knew Carl, they were friends. There was no way he was exploiting his position, but Morris thought he’d better follow this up, subtly nip it in the bud before Carl got in trouble, and before he got in trouble by association; he needed this job. With a loud, almost deliberate sigh Morris clicked on his computer monitor. He usually left it turned off unless he was forced to do otherwise. He hated computers and longed to go back to the days of pen and paper. It wasn’t that he was a Luddite, it was just that whenever he opened his email there was never any good news. Just the same old reminders that his profession was having the life squeezed out of it. Even the font was oppressive, it was as if Microsoft had conspired to emphasise his insignificance by electronically removing any semblance of control which lingered within his rapidly disappearing identity.

Who was he going to go to though? He didn’t want to approach Carl but neither did he want to go behind his back, grassing him up like a prison snitch. He tried to casually bring it up with his partner Shelly that night, but her reaction had not been one of pragmatism.

“Dirty bastard, he wants locking up”

She was half joking, but her flippancy wasn’t constructive.
"So what should I do then, you know he’s been all over the place since the divorce, this could end him”.

“To be honest Matt after his little indiscretion I’ve got very little sympathy for him, call it a momentary lapse, call it whatever you want, an affair’s an affair.”

Carl returned to his dark, empty new build and flicked the lights and the T.V. on immediately. He resented this house. The brand new appliances and communal spaces reinforced his solitude, as he had to exist in a place which was specifically designed for ‘living’. There had been no champagne when he moved in, and no one had been carried over the threshold. He moved in because it suited his budget and was in a convenient location, this wasn’t the Channel 4 bolthole that men of his age should reside in, it was simply a functional space which served a clear purpose. At first Carl thought this was no more than he deserved, he was metaphorically imprisoned so why shouldn’t he be literally? Forced to return to this mock Tudor shell on the edge of the ring road night after night, lights out at ten, wake up at seven. But once this became routine he felt himself suffering, suffering far more than he thought three incidences of extra marital horseplay warranted. This was subject to debate, although the way in which he was no longer in control of his own emotions suggested that he had paid a hefty price for his misguided infidelity. At least he still had his PE lessons. His concerns evaporated when he got a basketball in his hand and he could demonstrate the perfect bounce pass. His doubts were always assuaged by the thwack of plastic upon rubber and his equilibrium was restored as he handed out bibs and set out cones.

The phone rang. This in itself was unusual, Carl had grown used to its redundancy and its sudden jolly trilling was more than a minor disturbance.

“Hello”, he inquisitively croaked,

“Carlos, its Morris, do you fancy a pint? It’s been a while”
It had been a while. Socialising was not in Carl’s remit any longer and whilst he still took advantage of the anesthetising properties of alcohol the idea of drinking in public seemed difficult.

“Er ... I’m not sure Moz I’ve got a bit to do around here” he explained whilst examining a now putrid milk carton,

“Don’t be ridiculous, I’ll pick you up in half an hour” Morris then emphatically hung up, leaving Carl to go and change out of his jogging bottoms and into his jeans, ready for the outside world.

The meeting had been short but the messages lingered. STAY AWAY FROM THE KIDS. The members of staff, all of whom were duty bound to attend, could barely stifle their laughter at Janet and Seb’s seminar on ‘boundaries and the issue of touch in school’. They took the piss out of Seb’s cardigan and the way Janet insisted, quite forcefully at times, that everybody call her Jan. Yet this double act was a force to be reckoned with.

‘Remember if in doubt, don’t scream and shout, keep your distance and work it out’.

The group was made to repeat this preventative mantra after Seb and Jan, as the meeting took on an almost Evangelical feel. The majority of teachers were far too cynical to be taken in by this as they sat at the back sniggering like the children they consistently admonished for the same misdemeanour. Carl glanced at Gary Williams and Sian Smith, the respective head of geography and deputy head teacher. Far from staring idly out of the window or keying forlornly at their mobile phones they gave the ludicrous pair at the front their full attention. They were nodding along with this rhetoric with an apparent enthusiasm that went far beyond their role as interested host. The video was almost too much. It showed, in all of it’s hammy, wooden splendour, the ‘wrong’ and ‘right’ way to make contact with a child, as the second clip, an ‘arms-length’ demonstration of a tennis serve ended with the teacher and the children standing around with satisfied, almost demonic grins, safe in the
knowledge that no abuse had taken place. Their joy at having not engaged in any sordid practice was almost post-coital, and the discomfort that this engendered was palpable. Most of the staff left as soon as was possible, not staying to exchange unnecessary pleasantries with the smiley, bespectacled spokespeople. But Carl stayed, he was intrigued by this well meaning pair and the way that they had the higher-ups hanging on their every carefully selected word. Pamphlets were being thrust into hands and business cards were exchanged with a glee that was impossible to disguise. Carl remained on the periphery of this bizarre networking ritual until he was ambushed by Janet, who was still grinning inanely,

"Did you enjoy the seminar?"

She enquired with simultaneous innocence and loaded menace,

"Er ... yes it was very ... informative. Thank you"

"Good, there’s some more literature on the table if you’d like some?"

"Oh ... no I think I’ll be fi ... ”

Something had caught his eye. There was a pamphlet lying in amongst all the rest that was particularly arresting. Entitled ‘What to do if an allegation is made against you’, the booklet had a picture of a judge on the front pointing towards the reader in a Kitchener-esque pose. Yet this wasn’t a call to arms, it was a stark warning. Gravely informing the reader of the realities which now faced the professional who works with children.

Carl and Moz took their place in the far corner of the cavernous Victorian pub. The evening had begun uncomfortably as Moz had made reference to an earlier double date which he, Shelly, Carl and Susie had endured at the same location. It was obviously too soon for jokes and the fact that Carl’s situation was of his own making emphasised the desperation of it all. The pair simply sat there sipping their mid-strength lagers in silence at first, neither the volume of the music or the obvious tension was conducive to conversation.

‘So how’s it going mate?’ Moz eventually ventured,
‘Yeah not bad, keeping my head above water really. It’s taken a while to get used to the new house but I’m getting there thanks.’ The insipid response from Carl was an accurate reflection of his current state. Maintaining a veneer of normality by using stock phrases was about all he could do when forced to converse with his peers, he didn’t want to burden them with how he was really feeling and neither did he want to confront it.

‘Good, hopefully you can get back on track soon then, you know start looking forward again.’

Moz instantly regretted saying this as he remembered why they were there in the first place. The pub had emptied and the music had thankfully stopped as if to cue him up for his investigation of Carl. He was just about to broach the subject when Carl, belying his angst sprang to his feet and made his way over to the world weary barmaid. As he attempted to engage her in small talk, an exercise in futility for both parties, Moz agonised over his opening lines, ripping a bar mat to shreds in the process. Night had fallen quickly and the pub took on an ominous darkness. The only light was provided by the flickering of the fruit machine and the luminescent glare of the HD television positioned above the bar. Moz almost didn’t notice when Carl came back and unceremoniously plonked two pints of Beck’s in and around the detritus that had been created.

‘Cheers mate, look Carl there’s something I feel I should talk to you about.’

Carl sensed the worst, every chat he’d had recently had a distinct sense of finality about it and this felt no different. What now? Although he thought this might happen. It was no secret that Carl hadn’t exactly given the job his full commitment recently and whilst Moz was a friend he was also directly superior to him. Carl braced himself for the gestures of redemption. ‘I’ll try much harder next term’ and ‘My heads been all over the place’ quickly came to mind. But Moz was still not forthcoming, he continued to hesitate until he clumsily blurted out:

‘A few people have been saying things about you Carl. You know, implying that you er.. haven’t been acting entirely appropriately.’
Carl still hadn’t twigged. He wondered if this was some kind of management speak. An assessment of his relevance as an employee, in which acting inappropriately meant that objectives weren’t being met.
‘Look, like I said before I’ve been all over the place recently but I’m back on track now, my lessons are gonna be more structured next term.’
‘No Carl, it’s not your lessons that are the problem here.’
Carl’s mind raced, images of OFSTED inspectors and GCSE exams flashed through his head when suddenly he remembered the pamphlet.
‘There have been complaints made about you Carl. Some students and teachers have drawn attention to your presence at Miss Jones’ lessons, basically … you know saying that they only reason you go there is to look at the girls.’
Carl laughed out load at this suggestion,
‘Are you fucking serious? This is ridiculous Moz can we talk about something else now please. As the laughter was replaced with irritation and then the first flushes of fear.
‘You know it’s been a nightmare for me recently, I don’t need all this.’
Both he and Moz knew that this would not end here and all Carl could think about was the face on the pamphlet pointing at the reader with a fat accusatory finger.
‘I guess what I’m asking you Carl is whether there is any truth to these rumours, although I’d rather you didn’t answer here. What I really need you to do is recognise the fact that I have brought this up with you and attempted to form an appropriate plan of action.’
‘What the fu … ’ Carl was baffled by this hasty lurch into formal language.
‘I’m telling you now Moz that there is no truth to these accusations. Is that not enough?’
‘Look mate I’m trying to do you a favour, it’s best to follow procedure in a situation like this.’
‘A situation like what? Some bored idiots have been making things up and I’ve said that it’s bullshit!’ His voice became strained as all he could picture was the
face on the pamphlet growing larger and enveloping him as his protestations were drowned out by the regeneration of the music system. Rhianna’s nasal melodies and sexually overt lyrics providing an appropriate soundtrack for Carl’s demise in this desolate corner of the Rose and Crown ...

**Narrative deconstruction – why write a story?**

The decision to leave the story without an ending was a deliberate one. It is obvious what will happen to Carl as Moz’s management speak refers to the beginning of a procedure which will be lengthy and damaging regardless of outcome (Best, 1999, Piper et al, 2011), although we are encouraged here to discuss the events leading up to this, the innocuous and indistinct nature of the accusation and also the context in which the protagonist is situated. Generated by the concerns which many practising staff discussed during the interviewing, the story reflects the fears which have enveloped those who are both exposed to intergenerational tension and also groups which actively perpetuate this adult/child discomfort.

Whilst staff have spoken of a need to avoid touch in almost every context, the conditions which this climate has produced have invoked an environment of self-protection to flourish. The narrative above explores the consequences of a humanistic conflict with this, and the way in which the frailties of the human condition have no place within a setting which now demands a removal of personal substance or emotive manifestation. The narrative alludes to the way in which the therapeutic athletic regulation of PE was replaced with regulation of a more personally invasive type, designed to shift the focus from a coaching perspective to a preventative one (Garratt, Piper and Taylor, 2013). Carl’s failure to realign himself, alongside a difficult personal life which encroaches on his professional status, represents the marginal boundaries of behavioural acceptability and constant danger that his action will be questioned by an
unidentifiable but no less potent source of discipline. Carl had lost his wife as a result of infidelity, and as a consequence his ability to self-protect was severely diminished. He allowed himself to seek solace in school, acting without the inhibition which is now a prerequisite, and this of course led to significant ramifications. The ‘work/life’ balance which has been referred to by some of the practitioners spoken to, has been distorted and disrupted by an increased preoccupation with narratives of abuse and exploitation, and the story speaks of the contemporary teacher’s inability to individually interpret the idea. There is a requirement to subscribe to a ‘hand’s off’ (Piper and Stronach, 2008), ‘arm’s length’ approach to PE teaching in a way which holistically influences the staff member. No longer can a PE teacher ‘switch off’ when they return home, nor can the reverse take place, extinguishing a scenario in which their job becomes a sanctuary to a turbulent private life. The vagaries of the profession now permeate the lives of these workers unconditionally, in ways which go far beyond the original imperatives of child protection.

**Blame, risk and discipline – a theoretical investigation**

There are a number of references here to the theory we have discussed throughout the study, as we begin to see the influence of post-structural and late-modern concepts coherently realised in an interpretative development of empirical context. Carl’s story is not only indicative of the professional and personal unease which many practitioners spoke about during the interviews, but it also attempts to portray a more challenging reality for the adult in an environment which routinely contributes to the dissolution of rights which were previously taken for granted (Sumner, Burrow and Hill, 2014). There is a tangible sense within the narrative that significant changes have occurred, although these changes have taken place subtly, beyond the scope of many who are themselves directly affected by a shifting preoccupation with accusation and the movement of blame.
It is clear that the way in which this climate has emerged has overlooked the idea of child protection in favour of a system which attempts to avoid blame. The protection of the adult via a situation which perpetuates in-fighting and insidious cycles of blame becomes far more relevant and far more demonstrative in this instance. Carl struggles with the fact that adult/child relationships have become so fractured, finding it difficult to understand why and indeed how this has occurred. His incredulity when his friend and colleague Moz begins to act in an officious, procedural way in the pub reflects the incongruity and moreover ubiquity of a system which now has universal and seemingly incontestable reach. The scene enables us to envisage the realisation of Foucault’s disciplinary society (1977) with relative ease, as the difficulties and constraints which Carl’s profession has enforced are played out within a setting of supposed recreation, indiscriminate as they are to the trivialities of context. Indeed recreation becomes a heavily distorted notion to those who are responsible for its administration (see Hart-Brinson, 2012). The irony reminds us of the way in which this climate constricts the teacher by consistently redefining the boundaries of meaning. Previously stable conceptions have been reissued alongside a new interpretation of purpose and acceptability. For the contemporary PE teacher recreation now lies firmly within a prescribed environment of safe, incident free athletic instruction, a necessary release which combats obesity and improves academic performance. Recreation in the conventional sense however, is no longer available to the PE teacher, as the imperatives of the profession begin to consume every facet of their private lives until the idea of leisure time becomes distinctly anachronistic.

Risk society (Beck, 1992) has contributed to this in a number of ways. The dissolution of individual action, a collective acceptance of intrinsic prevention and an all encompassing reticence to disrupt this leads to a societal pressure which has reached a considerable intensity and established complexity. We are
all to some extent implicated in this, as the all consuming nature of risk practice far outweighs individual awareness. We may not subscribe to the tenets of risk society, just as Carl refuses to accept the behavioural requirements which his profession enforces, yet we have little ultimate choice over the direction which we take when confronted with what is contemporarily considered a precarious scenario. Carl may appear as something of a broken man, a defeated victim of his own fallibility, although he is simultaneously portrayed as a maverick in the narrative. His use of PE lessons for some kind of therapy in which he is able to escape his troubled existence is directly contrary to accepted practice. He doesn’t act within the boundaries of a collective good when he simply allows PE to organically unfold, and he is subsequently punished for this. How much of this retribution stems from his now outmoded pedagogical approaches, and how much is actually rooted in a viable concern for the welfare of children is up for debate, although the narrative points firmly towards an identification of Carl as a disruptive, even dangerous element in a context which seeks to extinguish such turbulence. We are in effect disapproving, perhaps even envious, of Carl’s apparent recalcitrance as we know that it is our own similar desires to forge a path of independence which are stifled by a rigid adherence to the imperatives of risk.

There is an interesting juxtaposition between Carl’s personal anguish, which is of course of his own making, and the freedom which he gains when teaching PE, a stabilising, rhythmic pleasure which lies beyond his control yet soothes him in unparalleled ways. That he eventually succumbs to the consequences of risk is evidence that a celebration or at the very least use of the unmanageable, more abstract aspects of life are inappropriate in contemporary education and indeed society (Woolford and Curran, 2013). He is punished for enjoying the intricacies, predictability and simultaneous volatility which sporting engagement produces, as the unaccountability which this engenders is routinely unsettling in modern contexts which rely upon an all encompassing system of regulation. The
details of the eventual accusation are in many ways irrelevant, as it is the way in which Carl has been made into a dissident and then accordingly rebuked which is pertinent. The fear of child sex abuse is an appropriate conduit by which to bring into line those who often unintentionally fail to cooperate with an overwhelming climate of risk aversion and cultivation. We can argue that the preoccupation with paedophilia in contemporary contexts is an extension of risk society, and it remains a fitting demonstration of the concerns which Beck (1992, 1996, 2004) discussed, yet the totality of its reach and the influence which this fear has held over Western populations speaks of a wider, more visceral irrationality than heightened risk consciousness alone provokes. This is perhaps a logical development of the agendas of risk which Beck drew his initial analyses from.

The issues surrounding environmental deterioration which prompted the investigation into the existential crisis which has influenced preventative intervention are given greater significance by the discussion which surrounds adult/child contact. We are aware that global warming and increasing pollution are the results of industrial and therefore ‘man-made’ development, although the dilemma is made palatable by the progress and capitalist opportunity which systematic manufacturing can incite. There is however, no such argument when we attempt to deconstruct paedophilia. Whilst we remain aware that child sex abuse is an inherently ‘man-made’ problem we are unable to account for or justify its existence. It is not a ‘product of modernity’ as global warming seems to be, although the difficulty we have with the subject, whether genuine threat or salacious speculation appears as such. Risk society can be debated and contested when we discuss environmental issues as there is a two sided argument within this context, however risk cannot, and in the eyes of many should not, be challenged under the auspices of a universal fight against the moral repugnance of child sex abuse. Precautionary agendas are therefore allowed and indeed encouraged to run rampant throughout a society which is
conditioned to ignore and thereby unable to acknowledge the consequences of this.

The narrative sees Carl reach what he believes is his lowest ebb. His marriage is in tatters, he lives in a house rather than a home and sees happiness as a fallacious concept. The only contentment he derives comes from his PE lessons and the repetition, order and chaos which they have always produced. Although changes are afoot, PE lessons have become structurally, imperatively and institutionally (see Brunton, 2003) different and whilst this is not overtly reflected in the narrative it is alluded to in the child protection seminar scene. The audience knows that Carl’s one bastion of hope is fading and this comes in conjunction with an accusation which represents the contemporary era and its subsequent prejudices. Carl is an anachronism here and there was a deliberate effort made to convey this in the story, as it demonstrates an increasingly unsettling reality for many practitioners in an environment which has left the individual behind. Indeed it may seem as though the tale is unnecessarily downbeat, exaggerating unease in order to present a desolate even dystopian landscape, yet the situation appears incontestably bleak when we begin to discuss the extent to which preventative measure has become embedded in (physical) education, and the subsequent ease with which an adult can be accused of ‘impropriety’. The teacher, sports coach and youth worker are, in addition to many others, made pariahs at best and criminals at worst.

**Discomfort in the workplace**

Having spoken to a number of practising PE teachers, and in particular the older members of staff (see Chapters III & VIII), it was possible to identify a palpable unease with the idea of touch in contemporary contexts and indeed the cognitive processes which surround it. It is difficult to approach the notion of intergenerational contact in a positive way as the issue has become so heavily
entangled in our individual and collective discomfort. We are unable to assess the situation with any sort of balance as our base, reactionary prejudices will routinely colour any attempt at a rational analysis, and the myriad imbalances, contradictions and changes which this has provoked have been dealt with in Carl’s narrative journey. Indeed, staying with the way in which change and moreover upheaval have become established fixtures within the PE teaching landscape, we can turn again to Bauman’s work in a bid to explore the consequences of Carl’s position in a contemporary educational context. There is a very visible ‘fluidity’ to the problems which surround intergenerational touch as we witness a systematically engendered variety of stages to the interrogation which Carl undergoes. Indeed this switches from a self-evaluating embarrassment in the earlier sections, in which the dominant concerns stem from his own insecurities, to an external questioning which comes from one of his close friends. As Bauman has alluded to (2000, 2002, 2004), fear has in this instance proved evolutionary, in the way in which Carl’s initial worries are set upon and then developed by the salacious hearsay of the playground.

What is representative of both the reach of intergenerational fear and Bauman’s notion that contemporary discomfort is a living, moving entity is the uptake of this information by the school’s establishment. They have little choice but to take the barely intelligible gossiping of a group of adolescent boys and give it the full focus of their investigative attention. That it falls to one of Carl’s friends to look into the matter merely emphasises the disconnection which this climate has invoked, and the realignment of what have previously been strongly upheld social institutions. What we are unable to do here is define not only the exact nature of the accusation which Carl is subject to but also the precise focus of the fear which manifests itself in a multitude of ways. We know that inappropriate action on behalf of a teacher is an ultimate derivative of our direct fear of child sexual abuse, although the failure to identify a particular grievance with Carl, either behaviourally and characteristically, is strongly indicative of the
eventual misuse and misdirection of fear based intervention in contemporary schooling and beyond. Carl is not portrayed in the narrative as an inherently ‘bad’ character, and whilst it is possible to contend that he is presented as a bygone relic of a pedagogical past, we should remain mindful that his role can be more accurately described as ‘ill-fitting’. He is not compatible with contemporary agendas and this comes into sharp focus when he is met with the child welfare seminar.

**The evolution of fear**

Fear moves and is manifested here not only in a temporal and spatial sense but also an ideological one. Whereas fear is visibly engendered in a behavioural context, as the seminar attempts to warn against the difficulties which surround adult/child touch, the endorsement of this by the superior members of staff and the attention given to a doctrine of indirect suspicion indicates how fear can establish itself in complex and insidious formations. The seminar represents a new model of discomfort which, often highly successfully, masquerades as a ‘greater good’, preventatively exploiting a combination of collective and individual fears. Although Carl and his fellow teachers are largely ambivalent towards the presentation, it is the procedural necessity of, and tacitly disciplinarian nature behind, the event which speaks of a fidelity towards notions of fear and the perpetuation of such an adherence. The role reversal which also takes place, in which the members of staff appear as their own recalcitrant students, emphasises a tension between the legitimacy of contemporary thought in a welfare/anti-touch context and a highly rational antipathy towards a bureaucratised system of behavioural management. The staff act with indifference towards the presentation as it undermines both their pedagogical identity and conceptions of professional practice. This is mirrored by the students as they correctly identify rules to be associated with a diminished scope for individual expression and a greater focus upon the
elimination of risk and thereby wider freedoms. This is occurring in teaching to such a degree that the adults are reduced to forming an inarticulate and ultimately futile protest (Young, 1999, 2009) whilst fully aware of their expected and eventually necessary role within all of this.

The relevance of touch in ‘hyper-modernity’

Whereas we have elsewhere discussed the idea that touch has become an anachronism in an age which values virtual interaction, the ramifications for reflexive expression are significant. Our relationship with touch becomes affected by the new immediacy of virtual interconnection, in which a ‘like’, ‘poke’ or ‘re-tweet’ becomes as demonstrative and in many ways more relevant than a hug or a handshake. We are also far more able to act reflexively (see Carbaugh, Nuciforo, Molina-Markham and van Over, 2011) in a virtual context than we are in a physical one. Instinctive action has been rendered simultaneously meaningful and docile in a virtual setting as the ‘like’ phenomenon is recognised as a viable method of communication without encroaching on the ‘personal space’ or physical ‘boundaries’ of the recipient. This has had numerous influences on the discussion which centres around physical education as a discipline, and this is represented in the narrative through Carl’s irrelevance and the intangibility of his apparent misdemeanour. Not only is touch explicitly discouraged, it is also tacitly and in many ways more efficiently eradicated as a result of the redefinition of social communication in contemporary contexts. This leaves PE, and the PE teacher in an environment of fluctuation. Stability has been undermined here by a changing experience of social communication and the redrawing of definitions surrounding formality and informality. Touch is no longer an informal communicative method so its subsequent use in a formalised, instructive setting is difficult for many to process.
Beck (2002) has referred to the increasing significance of virtual contact as being a consequence of a new modernity which limits the experiences that can be associated with contemporary unrest. In virtually communicating we eschew all of the pitfalls and problems that come with the complex performance surrounding physical human interaction. This virtual communication, a globally transcendental language, is the most expressive, contemporarily relevant and accessible medium, and has established itself in such a way as to make previous social entanglements inherently precarious. Notions of danger and familiarity become interrelated here, reinterpreted under a new model of practical knowledge in which physical distance is redundant. Those closest to us, or within ‘touching distance’, are made strangers by a system which devalues the previous legitimacy of contact in favour of the virtual embrace of those who reciprocally subscribe to this dialogue. Populations are unsure of what constitutes appropriate action, as the way in which individuals respond to emotional stimuli is undergoing a period of (in)distinct transition.

Interactive reflexivity would have previously been considered to be an action of instinctive spontaneity, encompassing any number of permutations. Elements such as physical embrace, violent expression, congratulatory touch or reassuring contact have however been deemed invalid by the deliberate and unintentional construction of inhibition, itself most evident within Western contexts. As these actions are transferred to virtual landscapes, this occurs under the watchful eye of other members of this now ubiquitous community and also the regulators themselves, forcing us to account for and scrutinise our own thoughts, comments and beliefs, ultimately bringing them up to a strictly adhered to, supranational code. Whilst there is obvious value to the suppression of violence, it is the way in which this expressive inhibition has become so all encompassing, influencing tactile release in almost every context, which presents a number of difficulties for those who must negotiate touch in modern settings.
There has been evidence (see Rowe and Hutchins, 2013) that links an online presence with greater politeness, as the user is bound by a standard of conduct which is maintained by those who enter into a particular social network. It is markedly alienating to transgress these lines given that involvement within such environments is becoming a necessity rather than a choice. Increased politeness is a direct result of the significance and influence of ‘belonging’ to an online community, as the anonymity which earlier message boards and chat rooms provided diminishes when personal information is reciprocally shared by millions of users. Reflexive action is again tempered, as engaging with the debate is undertaken in the knowledge that a ‘back story’ of varying levels of revelation will become immediately visible.

Carl has no ‘back story’. He is an unknown entity and therefore potentially dangerous. The pupils at school have all entered into this online dialogue, practicing the methods of communication with an ease which suggests hegemonic establishment. Students are aware of and interact with each other on levels which remain transitional in many adults and the tension created by this is apparent in a range of contexts. As the teachers in the narrative respond to an environment which their pupils have already adeptly taken to, there remain disparities in the opinions of staff members. Some, including the heads, embrace the idea of full disclosure, welcoming the transparency which increasingly preventative policies invoke, whilst others remain markedly sceptical about a system of institutionally endorsed personal invasion. The rise of social networking has proved to be a particularly difficult subject to deal with in many British schools, as the ease with which ‘friends’ can be made has led to connections between teachers and pupils being made in the interests of sexual liaison. This has of course led to a widespread discouragement of teachers communicating with pupils via social networks (NUT, 2013a) and whilst there is a strong argument which would support this, given the myriad risks involved,
there has seemingly been little attempt made to harness the way in which social media has become such a fundamental aspect of international youth and indeed mainstream culture. There is considerable pedagogical potential in the intergenerational use of social media (Rice, Moffett, and Madupalli, 2013), yet this remains unlikely to be realised under such rigid lines of association. As social networking is a tool which is used predominantly and most visibly by the young, any adult reference to or use of such methods of communication in a similar context marks the adult out as abnormal and potentially predatory.

The professionalization of schooling and the increasing prominence of the academy movement reveal a desire to bring children closer to adult standards, simulating workplaces and universities at secondary school level. However adults and children are practically kept apart by a number of complex social methods, themselves stemming from irrational fear. The incongruity of children and adolescents in environments which are deliberately made ‘adult’ has been overlooked alongside a resounding failure to connect with children in ways which facilitate reciprocal, intergenerational learning.

**A system of paradox**

There is perhaps a need to draw attention to the influence of reflexivity within this and the way in which its distortion is again symptomatic of a climate littered with contradiction and paradox. The rise of social networking as communicative necessity and the market driven professionalization of schooling are two products of modernity which are rooted in a combination of reflexive action and highly premeditated implementation. Although paradox is discussed here, it is possible to situate an apparently contradictory landscape within an analysis which accepts divergent scenarios. This is largely in keeping with the idea that reflexive modernisation (Beck, 1994, 1999; Giddens, 1991) has come to dictate the introduction and development of social institutions in such a way that the
complexities of human action are accommodated alongside notional progression.

Contemporary organisation has become ‘radicalised’ (Giddens 1990, 1991) to the extent that movement is constant and significantly, non-linear. The implementation of a corporate agenda in contemporary schooling and the way this manifests itself in the physical composition of school spaces is embedded within the conception that conflates a business led setup with progression (Hatcher, 2014). The move has been made in a context which is influenced by both reflexively led notions of educational reform and a more contemplative revision of the location of management and governance (Smith and Abbott, 2014; Woods and Simkins, 2014). The way in which there is an inherent, at times symbiotic, relationship between instinctive and ideologically grounded intervention is representative of this climate of intergenerational fear.

Contradictory circumstance is allowed to exist by an environment which is sustained by the simultaneous introduction and deconstruction of policy and social practice. There is a notional system of ‘trial and error’ in place here, in which various approaches to social management are brought in with an immediacy which often undermines existing models or established structure. This immediacy has been heightened by the public difficulty with adult/child contact and has subsequently seen attempts to approach intergenerational interaction become alarmist and at times resolutely dismissive of alternative methods. Reflexivity is sharply evident when we explore the way in which the regulation of adult/child contact has been regulated with ‘knee-jerk’ prohibition. That this lies within a wider landscape of risk aversion has simply legitimated the focus of such measures. The blanket expulsion of opportunity for touch between an adult and child remains a discursively ‘progressive’ tactic and again adds weight to the contention that the notion of independent reflexivity has been fundamentally altered under a climate which unintentionally counteracts
rational reflection. There is also an apparent, and perhaps hypocritical, difficulty with the expression and utilisation of reflexivity in the methods of social communication discussed above. Whilst there are disparities between the adult interpretation of social networking and the reality of its use amongst children and adolescents, its dangers are often discussed at length without any attempt to engage with these methods and utilise their potential value (Prescott, 2014). Alongside this there is an instant and in many ways equivalent backlash being mounted which itself benefits from the reflexive immediacy of social networking. The difference here is that the dangers that panic led movements such as this invoke are consistently overlooked.

It is relatively clear that there has been a composite failure to understand new modes of communication on behalf of the adults who are responsible for opinion formation and eventual policy intervention. The one environment in which the scope of social media has been realised has been in journalism, although this represents a particular arena that has capitalised greatly on the exaggeration and hyperbole which has surrounded adult/child interaction over recent years (Kidd-Hewitt and Osborne; 1995, Scraton, 1997). The irony exposed when a major newspaper warns of the dangers of social networking for ‘our children’ by conveying this information via the very same channels is a troubling and unchallenged reality.

There is an ultimate requirement to recognise the distinct, and perhaps previously unseen influence which a climate of intergenerational tension has had over social movement in recent years. The ramifications for PE teachers are of course significant, although the manner in which debate surrounding the adult/child dilemma has become a mainstream source of angst speaks of an urgent need to address mounting yet largely unwarranted public unease. The manipulation and adjustment of wider forces within this context is also worthy of note, as intergenerational fear interprets notions of reflexivity, a radicalised
modernity, and the subject of discipline in a way which contains and redefines these themes inside the boundaries of prohibitive intention. The story develops this idea as we see base human emotion replaced and overshadowed by a new language of prevention, evident in action and thought in a way which emphasises its enveloping characteristics. There is an implication here that interaction, intergenerational or otherwise, has undergone a fundamental transition. Interconnection is different under this climate and touch represents a difficult subject to theoretically discuss and practically confront.

The way in which Carl has been deemed illegitimate by a swift and uncompromising system of doubt is representative of the more dubious consequences inherent in a climate of mistrust. What began as genuine concern has quickly turned into irrational panic, culminating in a divisive culture of blame and recrimination. Self-preservation becomes a necessity here and a failure to recognise this can be irrevocably damaging. This system will continue to function if the consequences of transgression remain as destructive; however the advent of social networking has in turn influenced the nature of self revelation on a level which has simply served to widen an already considerable generational gulf.
Chapter VIII
Story 2 ‘James and Daniel’
Jimmy Docherty was about to embark on his first day as a PE teacher at Crown Park Comprehensive. A broad, imposing concrete edifice which lay in the outer reaches of the South-East London suburbs. His ambition to become a professional footballer had been cruelly dashed by a recurring knee injury. It still clicked when he walked, an audible reminder of his unrealised dream, but his enthusiasm for teaching wasn’t dampened by this. He vowed to give everything he had to this job and he approached his new career as he would a crunch match, training and preparing with the conscientious focus of a top level athlete.

The first few weeks were a blur. He had suddenly been thrust into chaos and the sights, sounds and smells of this environment had caught him unawares. He had read his manuals and handbooks from cover to cover, devouring the literature with voracious intensity, although nothing could prepare him for the onslaught of noise, activity and life which assaulted his senses as he edged through the bustling corridors. Although the atmosphere inside this hotbed of teen angst and hormonal transition was never one of intimidation. He felt confident in his role as an educator and although he was only marginally older than some of the sixth-formers, his job was a world away from their half inched fags and dirty magazines. Whilst the days were always febrile and often filled with incident, Jimmy settled in well and by the end of his first term he had become an established part of the Crown Woods team.

It was simple for him, teach those who wanted to be taught. If they weren’t willing to cooperate then he wouldn’t bother with them. He had some run ins with certain kids, but he ignored those who were deliberately belligerent and tried to support those who he thought were victims of circumstance. He was reluctant to get political but couldn’t help thinking that these lads (they were always lads) would be better off if they distanced themselves from the temptation of ‘the manor’ and concentrated on healthy sporting competition. Danny Oliver was a brilliant footballer but he was often absent when training
came around. This was frustrating for Jimmy as he knew that Danny’s mother was ill and there were three younger siblings to care for. It was a joy for Jimmy to watch this third former in full flow, skipping past defenders before deftly lifting the ball over a sprawling goalkeeper. He knew that football was an antidote to Danny’s worries so it was especially disheartening when the call of his name was met with silence at registration.

Jimmy left his motor on the High street and walked the rest of the way. There was a car park on the estate but he wasn’t going to take any chances. It was a brand new Ford Capri and would attract some very unwanted attention if he left it outside the flats. As he rounded a corner the frenetic bustle of South-London commerce was replaced with the aggression and mindlessness that lack of opportunity encouraged. A group of youths kicked a deflated football around a dusty courtyard with the defeated apathy of those much older. Cynicism and listlessness came far more rapidly to those who were exposed to life’s difficulties on a regular, almost predictable basis. Whilst he expected the lift to be out of use it wasn’t. He chuckled quietly and selected the thirteenth floor, amusing himself by attempting to decipher the graffiti written on the inside of the door. His knowledge of Susie Maxwell became intimate, as a jilted lover had no doubt attempted to express his heartbreak with frustrated, damning rhetoric, a reaction which spoke of the brutality of the surroundings with revealing accuracy. Carefully treading across the minefield of dog-shit and discarded cookware, Jimmy made his way to flat 28 and rung the bell. There was no immediate answer despite it being obvious that there was someone in. He peered through the letterbox to see a toddler running across the hallway and Danny running after him or her with a towel. He managed to apprehend the wayward child and came to answer the door.

‘Hullo sir’ He said calmly in a way which belied the chaos of the flat and indicated that this scene was a typical one.

‘Hello Danny, I see you’ve got your hands full here!’
'Er yeah, I've got to give Anna a bath quickly, come in though I won’t be long’. Jimmy went through to the living room and sat down. The radio and the television were both blaring, and children of various sizes ran in and out of the room. Jimmy sat down on the sofa and attempted to turn down the T.V. when the remote was plucked from his hand by an irritated infant. ‘I was watching that!’ said five year-old Bella as she tore away out of the room and through the kitchen. Eventually Danny returned, gathering up his siblings and ordering them to bed. ‘How’s your mum?’ ventured Jimmy, although the various prescriptions and empty boxes of pills which were scattered across the coffee table had already given him an indication. ‘Yeah you know, she has good days and bad ones, today was a bad one though. She’s gone to stay with my Auntie for a bit. It get’s a bit hectic round here sometimes.’ Jimmy thought he’d better cut to the chase. He was sure that another distraction would rear its head at any second. ‘I can see that Danny, you must have your work cut out with all this. I guess it doesn’t really give you much time for football does it?’ ‘No sir it doesn’t. There’s no way I could stay after school for training or matches. I’d miss the bus back and I need to be here in time to feed this lot and then put them all to bed.’ ‘What if I gave you a lift back after training? It’s on my way anyway so it wouldn’t make a difference to me. At least then you would always be back in time. What do you think?’ ‘That’d be blinding sir’, said Danny who was now beaming. His tired, gaunt features replaced by the excitement and enthusiasm which boys of his age were supposed to display, ‘We’ll just have to keep it under our hats, otherwise you’ll be giving everyone a lift!’
'Yes, you’re right, the last thing I want is big Liam Osborne wearing out my suspension!' For the first time in a while Danny was genuinely laughing, still tittering away as he saw Mr Docherty out. His mind was cast back to a goal he had scored last year in the cup semi-finals, and he re-enacted the victorious strike as he finished the rest of the washing up. He put the remaining crockery back in the cupboard then retrieved his boots from the back of the wardrobe. He began meticulously cleaning them, taking out the studs and screwing them in one by one. Unlacing them and then replacing the laces with surgical precision. He was a normal teenage boy again.

The pair of them got into a happy routine. Danny would hang around for a bit after the session and then wait by the Capri. He even started bringing some of his tapes to play on the journey and would irritate Jimmy by turning the volume right up. Sometimes, when Danny found someone to take care of the girls, they stopped at the chip shop after matches where they would go through the tactical nuances of the game with excessive detail, moving the salt, vinegar and ketchup around the counter much to the distress of Mr Contostavlos behind the deep fat fryer.

Time went by and this arrangement continued. It was obvious that there were a number of students who needed the help of Mr Docherty to circumvent the disruption and logistical pitfalls of living in an area of the capital which had been overlooked by both London Transport and the chattering classes. He would help out where he could, even part exchanging the Capri for one of those new ‘people carriers’ that had been advertised. This was particularly difficult for him as that Capri was his pride and joy, an exciting, erratic piece of machinery which was hardly paralleled by a turquoise Renault Espace. This was his life now though and although it may not have been glamorous he was more than happy with it. The way that the boys bounced off one another after a win, swapping stories of victory and indirectly congratulating each other with their
accounts of the recently enacted battle filled him with absolute contentment. He was even pleased to be party to the sullen despondency which followed a defeat, as he knew the bitter taste better than anyone and placed immeasurable value on its influence.

As the Eighties gave way to the Nineties and then the inevitable dawning of a new Millennium, Mr Docherty had become an institution at Crown Woods. Going above and beyond in order to provide lifts, support, mentoring, even financial support in one instance to children who were affected by the limitations of urban deprivation. But three decades is a long time. Things began to change around Jimmy. It was small things at first, an extra meeting here, a three day course there, but these began to add up and the make-up of teaching shifted. As he approached his fiftieth birthday he felt as though he was drowning in a sea of regulation, engulfed by a torrent of paperwork which showed no signs of receding. This was not the profession he had entered and he wanted out. The one saving grace was his devotion to the school football team, which under his tutelage had become one of the most feared outfits in the borough. Silverware came easy to them as they ran through sides like a hot knife through butter. Danny had even come on board as a part time coach having been on the books at Millwall. His playing career had never materialised but at least he could still make a living out of the game. He and Jimmy had become firm friends and stood at the sidelines together gesticulating wildly and scribbling on notepads. Danny hadn’t forgotten the way Jimmy had looked out for him all those years ago and looked upon him as a more than adequate replacement for his own absent father. As a result Danny emulated Jimmy, often staying late to practice with the boys, giving them lifts to games and joining in with their impromptu kick-about in the park. He wanted to offer these boys the benefit of his experience and saw himself now as a suitable role model, as various tensions had made South-East London increasingly turbulent. If he could do something
to contribute to stability in a time of great upheaval then he had at least achieved something. This community was complex and whilst he certainly didn’t have all the answers he knew that football could heal and would do his level best to enable this.

Danny and Jimmy were collecting in the balls, bibs and cones that littered the field after one of their regular Thursday night sessions when they noticed Zack Donald lingering sheepishly by the entrance to the changing rooms.

‘Everything alright Zack?’ Yelled Jimmy as he attempted to gather a recalcitrant ball.

‘Yeah fine sir, I’m just waiting for someone.’ Jimmy and Danny glanced at Zack’s dishevelled appearance, not only was his jumper ripped and frayed, but he was only wearing one shoe. They looked at each other and exchanged glances of concern, this wasn’t the first time that Zack had been targeted by the other kids. He was clearly waiting for the dust to settle until he made his journey home, under the cover of darkness, away from the predatory year elevens.

‘Maybe we should take you home Zack, it’ll be getting dark soon. Go and wait by the car we’ll be there in a minute.’ Jimmy walked through the changing room and into the PE office where he made a clandestine call to Zack’s father. He knew Zack would hate this but it had happened once too often and it was time action was taken. Zack had been vulnerable ever since he came to the school, as the ‘new boy’ tag had never quite left. He was too different from the other lads and this was enough to warrant constant physical and emotional abuse from his bloodthirsty peers. His father was grateful for Jimmy’s call and found it difficult to hide his anger, directing it at Jimmy in the first instance, then relenting and revealing the myriad problems which had infected life at home. Jimmy eventually replaced the receiver and strode out to the car, eager to get Zack back to his house where these issues could be addressed in kind.
The three of them set off down the road which ran parallel to the playing fields, dog legging left to come face to face with the four colossal tower blocks which comprised just one half of the Ferrier Estate. There had clearly been an ‘incident’ of some kind as there was a heavy police presence both on foot and road. They slowed to what Jimmy thought of as an acceptable, socially upstanding speed and attempted to drive past. They reached a crossing when a squad car advanced quickly behind them with the siren wailing and the lights flashing. Jimmy looked for an appropriate place to offer room to the howling vehicle when it became disconcertingly evident that the officer was signalling for Jimmy to pull over. Jimmy, who had never previously been given so much as a speeding ticket was deeply unnerved by this, he was the Gary Lineker of South-London, adhering to the law with mind-numbing consistency. This was worrying.

‘Don’t sweat it Jim, it’ll be a routine stop. They’ll be after witnesses.’ Danny said quickly, attempting to reassure the now quivering driver. A robustly proportioned police officer stepped towards the opening window.

‘Would you mind stepping out of the car please sir?’ Jimmy struggled with his seatbelt. Finally managing to free himself in an incriminating display of flustered ineptitude. He walked round to the back of the vehicle with the policeman who was, to Jimmy’s amazement and unreserved relief, chatting to him amiably. He had registered Jimmy’s status, intent and social position as he nervously complied with the Policeman’s every command and deduced that he was no criminal, nor could he help with his enquiries.

‘Anyway mind how you go’ said the burly officer as he turned to re-enter his squad car. He was strolling away slowly when he turned round again, as if he had overlooked something. Although the triviality which his smile betrayed was replaced quickly by one of concerned inquisition. He had noticed Zack in the backseat, who still had yet to address his appearance. He stopped Jimmy driving away by placing a firm hand on the roof of the car, striking it twice with rhythmic discipline.
'Can you step out of the car again please sir?'....

The situation had pushed Zack, already distressed, past breaking point. His tears piqued the interest of the officer who took Jimmy in for questioning without hesitation. It was some time before the issue was resolved, yet the damage had already been done. The incident of course filtered through to the heads, who without pausing to investigate or obtain any details, called Jimmy to the office for a ‘discussion’. There was however very little discussed. Jimmy simply sat motionless in the airless prefab, as his incredulity rendered the dialogue spewing forth from Mr Jenkins inaudible. He caught the occasional word; reputation, accusation, negative association, but walked out before apology could be proffered or the consequences revealed. He continued walking, out of the front gates and down the high street, oblivious to the lively hum of traffic and the interaction of pedestrians, his incandescence filtered everything out until he arrived home and stood in the hallway, unable to enter the living room and affect normality. He remained in this state for sometime, replaying the events over and over in his mind, attempting to establish exactly what people had become so obsessed with. Nothing had happened, yet he was clearly responsible for some abstract transgression.

The phone rang. Jimmy answered with a quick ‘hello’ that seemed almost incongruous. It was Jenkins again, calling to end the meeting which Jimmy had cut short an hour or so earlier. He once more failed to listen, there was no need to, his impending disciplinary was obvious from the moment he picked up the receiver. Jimmy composed himself and told Mr Jenkins politely yet firmly that if the school were not prepared to support him then he would not be prepared to work at the school. He hung up the phone and immediately began drafting his letter of resignation. This was final. The ultimate decision of a professional who had been simply cast aside as the imperatives of education shifted like tectonic plates beneath his feet. In a few short weeks he would be gone from a job which had sustained him for twenty eight years and there was precious little
that would reverse this. He took the time to remember his career at Crown Woods. He thought about all the kids he had helped and all of the kids who had helped him, he owed them everything in truth, their enthusiasm and excitement offered him the perfect antidote to a life which was otherwise painfully dull. And then he thought of Danny. The cognitive segue was instantaneous, as he remembered what a joy it was to see him tearing down a muddy flank with balletic grace. At least there was one visible reminder of his legacy. With this he became melancholically reflective. Jimmy was getting older, becoming a relic. He was almost a pastiche of the track suited, whistle blowing PE teachers of the seventies and eighties and realising his time was up, he prepared himself to hand the baton on to his protégé.

Danny had been trying to get into teaching for a while, taking A-Levels in the evenings and then completing a teaching degree in his spare time. It was all progressing well. The hours were difficult and left him with very little time to see Becky and the kids, but this would be his chance to solidify a future. He heard what had happened to Jimmy. He was devastated of course, but the situation made him even more determined to realise his target. He began to see why the school had taken the incident seriously, after all you can never be too careful these days. His PGCE had nearly come to an end and he was finishing off his last ‘in school’ placement. The school had recently opened and merged two existing comprehensives in order to form a large academy. He spent the time shadowing the head of PE, Mellissa, who seemed to move from one challenge to the next with a deft precision which belied her youthful appearance. Danny would later discover that she was ten years his junior, a statistic that lingered with him. They worked well together and Mellissa was impressed with Danny’s progress, it was one thing to show sporting prowess but controlling a group of thirty boisterous year nines presented another hurdle entirely. Danny’s calculated management of a milieu which would discourage even the most battle hardened coaches saw him take to teaching quickly and
appropriately, as he left himself little room for error. The pupils were there to be guided through each lesson correctly and without incident. He led with immediate discipline, establishing a code of conduct in his lessons that rendered misbehaviour an abhorrent and irrevocable character flaw. He loved this regimentation and took great pleasure in instilling uniformity and order in children who came into the lesson scruffy and disorganised, and left with a working grasp of restraint. He was struck by the requirement to maintain a professional relationship with the pupils. Whereas his coaching sessions had often ended in a chaotic, mud splattered free for all, in which the ball would be chased around the field with frenetic abandon, there was no room for expression such as this within the boundaries of a PE lesson. Logical and measured progression was expected as the end of each session represented a culmination of the teaching points previously emphasised.

Jimmy and Danny shook hands warmly. Jimmy clasped his left hand around the shake, unable to hide his affection for his sharp suited former sidekick. They found a table towards the back of Costa’s, away from the noise of the counter. Jimmy ordered a strong tea while Danny agonised over which bean to select. When his macchiato was ceremoniously placed in front him Jimmy could barely conceal his mirth.

‘So apart from watching too much sex and the city what have you been up to Dan?’

‘Piss off James I’ve always drunk coffee!’

‘You’ve always drunk Nescafe, I’m not sure about this little number!’

The two continued their familiar, light hearted bickering for a while, neither making any weighty contributions to the exchange, yet there was clearly something separating the two. They were usually able to read one and other with effortless precision, there was a transparency which only years of companionship could evoke, though this wasn’t in evidence here. Their differing approaches to teaching had been apparent for a long time now, but they both
knew that discussion of the subject would transform this amicable meeting of friends into an ideological battleground. This could go one of two ways. They could either continue gently ribbing each other and eventually leave, charging their next meeting with an increasing potency, or they could relieve the pressure with a highly necessary yet potentially destructive public quarrel.

‘I’d better shoot off then Jim, I’ve got more lesson planning to do.’

‘Yeah go on then, can’t have those objectives left unmet can we?’

Jimmy’s frustration and envy was more than a little visible in this seemingly innocuous jibe.

‘What’s that supposed to mean then?’

‘Nothing Danny, now run along before it gets dark’

‘Don’t fucking patronise me Jimmy, I know you’re still upset about what happened but you can’t blame me for wanting a career. You know I’ve got to get this done, why can’t you let me do it my way?’

‘Because your way treats the kids like bloody clients! They’re not clients they’re young people who want a run about after they’ve been in a fucking laboratory all morning! Why don’t you and the rest of the PE department let them play sport instead of ticking boxes and avoiding their gaze?’

This friendly coffee break had quickly and irreversibly descended into confrontation, as Jimmy and Danny relieved themselves of the disquiet which had built up in the preceding months. Jimmy’s heart broke every time he heard Danny talk about guidelines and Danny hated the bitter resentment which Jimmy now constantly exuded. Years of friendship appeared to burn away as the two became strangers once more. They were now different to the point of incompatibility and they both knew this.

This was particularly difficult for Jimmy to stomach. Days, weeks and then months went by without any contact with Danny, who would by now be beginning his first full year as a PE teacher at the Sedgehill Academy. Jimmy took a risk when he reached out to Danny all those years ago, but it was a risk
which he saw as necessary. A risk which anyone in his position would have taken. He became a father figure to Danny because he acted instinctively and benevolently, attributes which he saw as fundamental to the continuity of effective teaching. These principles had however cost him his job and while he could cope with this, the breakdown of his friendship with Danny remained a source of unyielding regret.

**Comment – constructing the narrative**

**The absence of touch**

The subject of touch has not been explicitly addressed in this story for a number of reasons. Whilst its absence in the narrative is a reflection of its increasing disappearance in PE teaching, there is also a need to explore the wider implications which a climate of fear invokes, and the role of anti-touch procedure within this. Generational change is in evidence here, although the overt differences between Jimmy’s era and Danny’s have been portrayed in a way which explores the consequences of a climate of intrinsic prohibition. Interpersonal connection and the development of strong, lasting relationships between teacher and pupil may not have been common, however the mere fact that they were possible in previous years is immediately indicative of the lack of opportunity for collaborative enrichment in contemporary contexts. Indeed the idea of collaborative enrichment, sounding as it does like a term plucked from an educational management seminar, is one of the many aspects being extinguished in modern schooling, as the story above attempts to reveal.

Jimmy’s friendship with and inadvertent guidance of Danny through the ‘harsh realities’ of inner city life implies a level of initiative and freedom that is unfeasible in today’s landscape. This kind of ‘relational’ teaching is used to illustrate the scope for the facilitation of change which was previously more visible (Meanwell and Kleiner, 2014), as the boundaries which now encircle the
profession were absent. The significance given to Jimmy’s relationship with Danny is only resident in the discussion of its positive effects, as the audience is able to enjoy the intergenerational companionship between the two as it does not violate the context in which it plays out. Readers can empathise and relate to the earlier stages of the story as they reflect the established and in many ways simplistic notions of decency which reside outside of a climate of suspicion and accusation. It is only when Danny begins to teach, and quickly adheres to the contemporary demands of the job, that the damaging effects, which an atmosphere of regimented distance invokes, can be duly identified.

The narrative attempts to expose the distinction between the developmental, reciprocally beneficial influence of an era which allowed teachers and pupils to interact, and the conversely destructive characteristics of an environment of intense accountability. The relationship between Danny and Jimmy flourishes under the former and then breaks down under the latter, representing not only the disavowal of personal connection in modern settings but also the unintended yet significant consequences of a blanket approach to child welfare. Touch is not mentioned in the text because it has become an automated, subconscious taboo, absent from discussion because the act has been ground out of practice in all but the most unavoidable scenarios (Johnson, 2011). Touch between a PE teacher and pupil is an act so procedural, so highly orchestrated that situating it within a dialogue which deals with idiosyncrasy remains implausible. There is no place for (instinctive) touch in PE teaching so there is ultimately little need to represent it in fiction. Not only is this overtly exposed in the section which approaches Danny’s pedagogical methodology, but ‘touch’ is also left out of the opening part as there is no question of impropriety between the two. This reflects contemporary discomfort in a way which refers to the negative and dubious connotations that touch now evokes. Had there been some discussion of touch between Jimmy and Danny, regardless of context, intent or meaning, the narrative would have, under the auspices of the
contemporary climate, had to explore, and in a sense justify the act. By avoiding the issue in an overt way, with Danny’s formulaic adherence to professional guidelines, and also a more abstract omission in the representation of a legitimate and implicitly non-tactile friendship between Danny and Jimmy, we can begin to identify a public concern which is operational on a number of nuanced levels.

Not only is a fear of touch manifested in a liminal, consciously governed space, it has also been more deeply instilled within our thoughts and actions (Jones, 2004). The narrative portrays a regression and distortion of an interpretation of touching practice, as the inhibition which this has encouraged develops in conjunction with a more resolute establishment of touch as a prohibited action. With this in mind the narrative attempts to deal with the problematic consequences of a routinised aversion to touch which is based upon fear and mistrust. Touch isn’t dealt with as its presence is of no significance. Jimmy and Danny are engaged in a legitimate, contextually ordinary relationship, built on a natural humanistic predilection towards nurture. Touch between them is a possibility, however there is little debate over its existence as the friendship is a viable and accountable one.

By reinterpreting (intergenerational) touch as a highly dangerous act, and dealing with it in an officious, clinical and distanced way it becomes far easier for negative influence to emerge. It is inevitable, in this climate, that touch and its absence will be discussed and then developed into a source of great discomfort. Not only does this invoke both public and private unease, but the entire basis surrounding the way we approach adult/child interaction is re-evaluated alongside narratives of categorical opposition (Owen and Gillentine, 2011). There are in addition various levels of ‘othering’ taking place, as adults and children are forcibly repelled. Adults who interact with children other than their own and to whom they are not related are severely questioned, and adults
who have the misfortune to work with children on a regular basis are made socially ‘dubious’ through a once tacit and now overt system of regulation (Piper, Powell and Smith, 2005). It became relatively clear during the interviews that touch was largely an ‘off-limits’ action, which was only to be used in the most unavoidable situations. Not only was there a procedural avoidance of touch in evidence, but the subject itself elicited a number of terse, self-absolving responses as if the participants themselves were under accusation. This kind of reaction, often a defensive, uncomfortable denial, can only be encouraged by a system which employs ‘arms length’ measures and renders intergenerational touch distinctly abnormal, itself a tacit yet integral source of division in the narrative above.

**Contemporary teaching – a loss of ‘identity’?**

Danny’s behaviour in the latter section of the story is representative of the professional conditioning that is a highly necessary aspect of contemporary teaching practice. Accusation being an occupational hazard has led to the formation of strict, rigid codes of conduct for teachers to socially, practically and pedagogically adhere to (Scott, 2013, Sikes and Piper, 2010). Whilst this has been well established in the previous sections it is possible through the depiction and deconstruction of a ‘dehumanised’ teaching model to interrogate this climate in a way that begins to gauge the potential continuity of such a landscape.

Bearing in mind that there is now an inherent aversion to touch between adult and child, where does this leave the professional who values a well rounded interaction between teacher and pupil? Or is there indeed room for such a worker? The idea of identity for PE teachers becomes a relatively difficult prospect here. Whereas initiative and independence were viable and available options to teachers in preceding generations, it seems that there is little
opportunity for individual expression in today's climate. Danny's resolute and single minded work ethic demonstrates the intensity of an atmosphere which cannot accept or process mistake. His introduction to teaching has been deliberately regimental as the consequences of a contemporary transgression regarding the perceived welfare of the children are particularly significant. He represents a 'blank canvas' in teaching terms, as he is moulded and manipulated by a system which eliminates blame, yet the long term effects of this influence and the eventual possibility of resistance remain difficult to project. Many of the teachers spoken to comprised a generation of practitioners who had only ever known a welfare conscious landscape, and the majority, whilst bemoaning the extent to which safety concerns have enveloped teaching, showed no genuine desire to engage with an alternative. In addition, the older members of staff recognised that the current system is fairly immovable, despite maintaining that there was greater value in previous interactive methods. Expression and discussion of identity therefore should perhaps be differently approached.

The immediate problem presented for those who work with children in contemporary settings is that they must first prove that they do not have abusive intentions before their beneficial capacity can be gauged. Teachers, coaches and equivalents were previously judged on their ability to help children, although we have now reached a stage where such professionals are judged by their inability to harm or sexually abuse. This prohibits any potential interconnection between teacher and pupil, stifling the notion that a teacher can lead and implement their own systems of operation regardless of efficacy. Pedagogical identity may have been associated with the development of alternative teaching practice, benefitting from a productive discontinuity, although it is markedly difficult to separate contemporary practitioners from the regulatory procedure with which they must comply. Given that they are predominantly under suspicion from a range of parties and on a range of levels,
teaching identity perhaps becomes more concerned with the most efficient way of dealing with this intense and unremitting scrutiny (see Clapton et al, 2012). Danny excels under these conditions, as he subscribes to and recognises the importance of complete transparency and reaching the targets which ensure this. Accountability is to be strived for here and Danny fulfils this requirement with consummate ease. Indeed the speed with which context can be changed in order to placate the vocal majority is of considerable interest in this instance. The objectives and underlying targets which manifest themselves in ‘good’ teaching practice represent the changing landscape of public opinion and the increasing pressure behind moralistic imperatives. Any question that contemporary procedure is somehow restrictive or prohibitive is lost in a language of practice which promotes and incentivises the continuity of a system of accountability (Morrison, 2010) and the subsequent suppression of individual autonomy or collaborative affirmation (Bolen, 2001). It takes Jimmy’s distance and his previous experience to identify a difficult truth in the narrative. However such is Danny’s embryonic teaching status and eagerness to comply with his well meaning superiors, he is unable to see any problem. There is then a well established and efficiently functioning distortion of the restrictive reality which appears to hold sway over practitioners. Whilst it remains fairly clear that the situation is one of considerable regulation, any alternative to this, or indeed allusion to an alternative is suppressed through its implicative potential.

**Power without touch - truth or fiction?**

There is a process of marginalisation at work here which itself operates on subconscious, largely projective levels. Rather than overtly target PE staff, marking them out as sub-human degenerates through overt pillorying, many practitioners have been forced to contribute to and facilitate their own negative public image. Again broadly Foucauldian, it is of interest to explore the development and reinterpretation of the focus of discipline in contemporary
settings, and the way in which the notion intelligently establishes itself within social system. Of course the situation evident in modern PE teaching is more complex than a simple before and after, in which Jimmy represents the halcyon ‘old school’ and Danny is the archetypal new professional. However this juxtaposition remains a pertinent one if we subscribe to the idea that there has been an overhaul of educational imperatives. Whereas British PE teaching in previous generations can be generally associated with themes of military preparation, paternalistic hegemony and vestiges of ‘muscular Christianity’ (Watson, Weir and Friend, 2005), the redefinition of these objectives and their manifestation in a markedly neo-liberal landscape has enforced a new and far more fragmented dispersal of power (Elliott and Hoyle, 2014). It is perhaps possible to discuss a multi-faceted power structure in the debate which surrounds the suppression of teaching identity and reactionary awareness. Whilst Foucault situates a fluctuating, sporadic power structure in a productive sense, it is potentially more useful to interrogate the considerable distortion of what were simplistic conventional teaching practices, under a system which maintains the imperatives of control in a number of intricate ways. To discuss productivity alone here overlooks the way Danny and his colleagues have been convinced that their professional approach is for the benefit of the pupil, and not enforced in the interests of reputational protection. Indeed this maintenance of appropriate reputation, and ultimate expulsion of blame has become so ingrained in the make up of contemporary PE staff that it is now virtually impossible for practitioners who have become established under this climate to envisage any change in conduct or practice.

Foucault’s interpretation of power presented an idealisation of its optimum effects. The notions of the panopticon and governmentality have been developed in order to represent the influence of a system in which power most efficiently functions. There has however been a common misconception that Foucault’s intentions were to use these models to imply that modern power
operates flawlessly (Cole et al, 2004). By recognising both the considerable complexity and reach of contemporary power under a broadly Foucauldian approach, and also the shortcomings of modern disciplinary measures, it becomes possible to address the many paradoxes which inhabit intergenerational tension. Power, or the way in which adults are forcibly encouraged to placate the concerns of a vocal majority, is in this instance both highly effective and simultaneously open to salient and rational criticism. There has been an apparent schism evident between the way in which this climate of fear has had such an all-consuming influence on teaching practice, and the identification that adults in such contexts are becoming increasingly marginalised. Power, in this environment has played an instrumental role in the perpetuation of an idea that adults and children should not be able to interact, as the notion of personal protection and the avoidance of culpability has been exploited to an extensive degree.

The idea that intergenerational concern is purely motivated by child welfare is now difficult to accept, and the ways in which elites and interested parties have deliberately cultivated narratives of intelligent abusers or rhetorical ‘epidemics’ gives an indication of the highly engaged and heavily political characteristics of the notion of contemporary child sex abuse. With this comes a tendency to view such a situation, and by extension Foucauldian interpretation, as an untenable landscape of irrevocable oppression; however such an atmosphere is unlikely to be met with universal docility in modern settings. Although Foucault discusses docile bodies (1977) in relation to his work on discipline, and it is an important concept given the lack of touch in a PE context and the constant self-regulation, we cannot disregard the significance of ‘alternatives’ in current organisation, and indeed their possibility given the accessibility and widespread dispersal of communicative methods. The idea of disembodiment becomes, as mentioned elsewhere, a noteworthy point of discussion, as the virtual connections we make begin to supersede the physical. Bodily docility becomes harder to identify when
the notion of embodiment is challenged as such. Whilst PE staff and equivalents still actively contribute to a system of suspicion and mistrust, there is an opportunity for a discourse which challenges this to emerge, as the media of dispersal operate outside the parameters within which adult workers are bound.

It should be noted that in most cases in the UK contact via social media is prohibited between teacher and pupil (NUT, 2013a), yet the manner in which touch and the physical is undermined by an increasingly ethereal landscape of interaction immediately relieves many of the tensions which have been developed in ‘no-touch’ contexts. Being discouraged from making contact in an environment which requires and often necessitates touch can encourage the emergence of a repressive and distorted practical setting. However the gradual removal of touch from communicative and then relational methods has the potential to realign some of the imbalances which a swift and uncompromisingly preventative reaction has incited. Of course this technologically driven adaptation of our social interaction is itself rooted in the continuity of a system of corporate dominance, although there has been a recognition on behalf of these supra-national, superficially benevolent entities to maintain a semblance of independence for the much valued consumer. Power becomes in effect ‘shared’, although not equally, amongst those who provide and those who consume in an arrangement which sustains such a system indefinitely (Orchard, Fullwood, Morris and Galbraith, 2014). This is also influenced by the existence of social media as a vehicle of mistrust, establishing and consolidating the apparent need to accuse which this climate encourages. A telling comment from Andy (34) articulates this professional concern:
‘I think, like you've just said there, the kids know their rights, but it's amazing how one kid knows that you're just helping them, another kid on Facebook or another kid on Twitter might have put "I saw the teacher, er, moving you today" ... That, read by 20 of his mates, can suddenly ... could, theoretically, become an absolute beast where, you know, all of a sudden, you've been
touching a kid, when really you've not been anywhere near him, you know what I mean?

The way that social media has a damaging potency in contemporary contexts, and the more general fear which this engenders, is responsible for a professional transparency which takes communicative method into account and furthermore neutralises its tacit threat. The generational fragmentation which has been alluded to in the story is realised when social media is discussed, as it strictly divides along the boundaries of age yet purports to be a universal, and moreover cohesive, social tool. Combined with the vagaries of interrogation which abound in education and elsewhere, teaching staff are trialled and convicted in a way which responds to and develops a distortive atmosphere from the outset.
Chapter IX
Personal Reflections
Reflexive realities – the author’s interpretations

Given that we have discussed reflexivity, with particular influence from Giddens’ work (1984, 1990, 1991), the next section will attempt to deconstruct my own experiences during the research process in such a way as to ‘feedback’ and investigate the methods by which theoretical knowledge, empirical procedure and narrative composition were originally undertaken. The following account of my research experience is presented in a way which accepts the influences of both personal and general context and expresses the need to accommodate reflection (and subsequent reflexivity) in an analysis that discusses and utilises post and late-modern approaches. In addition, the tension between the positivistic characteristics of reflexive study and the adoption of a broadly interpretivist line of thought (as referred to in Chapter V) is tempered here, as the idea that observer and observed are reciprocally engaged is given a further, ‘multi-hermeneutic’, dimension through narrative construction.

‘Back to school’

Not having come from an educational research background, returning to a school for the first time since my own experiences at a suburban comprehensive marked me out as an outsider. I felt as though I was trespassing in a context which I had divorced myself from nine years earlier. Of course, had I not been attempting to explore the existence of intergenerational fear I may have been more comfortable. Although this wasn’t an expose as such, the way in which I had merely referred to the ‘challenges’ which teachers face in my establishing correspondence did perhaps encourage a certain undercover element to emerge. Full disclosure was given, and full and frank discussions often ensued, but it was my initial reticence to reveal the exact nature of the research which served to slightly disconcert. In addition to this was the empirical difficulty with which the schools themselves were accessed, as procedure was consistently
important and I was understandably not able to freely enter the premises. This contributed to a very definable sense that I was a transient and ultimately inconvenient visitor in schools which were under significant strain in the first instance. The teachers spoke to me with warmth and sincerity although I got the impression that they regarded my desire to speak with them as simply another meeting to get through, another unnecessary extra curricular hurdle to be negotiated before they could actually go about teaching. Whilst this is far from unreasonable, the opportunity to discuss the rigours of teaching in a climate of distinct adult/child separation had perhaps not been presented to these practitioners before and this was evident as a tepid start often transformed into lively, informative debate.

It was relatively straightforward to construct a fictional narrative after listening to the anecdotes and travails of a range of teaching staff. Their willingness to talk about the job and its pitfalls enabled me to engage with their professional make-up on a level which was comprehensive and illuminating. I was granted a window into the difficult and often turbulent teaching landscape in ways which felt as though they would be impossible when I first entered the school buildings, coldly and tentatively. The characters I was able to construct fused elements of the teachers with whom I spoke and walked through the corridors with, as nervous small talk gave way to discussion of far greater depth. In many instances we would be talking up until we shook hands at the gates, I was able to see how passionate these people were about a profession which is seemingly undergoing a somewhat difficult transition.

It was this upheaval which I consistently encountered, as the buildings I entered contained within them a chaotic continuity which bore testament to the temporal movement and influence of the school year. An environment in which nothing stays the same and stability is constantly challenged, state secondary education seemed like and to the best of my knowledge is an intensely frenetic,
highly charged cauldron of familial interconnection. Hierarchy, rules and an easily identifiable sense of ‘school spirit’ manifested itself in the movement of the pupils, the demeanour of the teachers and administrative staff. Indeed the way in which everybody, with the exception of myself, knew what to do, and what their particular role entailed within this giant mechanism was striking. Rebellion or even misdemeanour was not an option here as the idea of community was clearly instilled from the outset. It would have been sociopathic to upset or disrupt such an environment which prided itself on enrichment, although there was a simultaneous feeling that this could be spoiled at any minute. The pupils excitedly bounced through the corridors on their way to the next lesson, happily contributing to the maintenance of the institutional status quo, whilst the teachers surveyed and encouraged them, coaxing them down the hallways with a friendly yet authoritative command. These schools were, on the face of it small social eco systems, microcosmic versions of the society they derived from. It was the discussion with the teachers, which indicated that there were as many complexities and contradictions evident here as there are in the ‘outside world’.

**Complex reality**

The simplicity with which schools previously functioned, became slowly undermined by a new interpretation of adult/child interaction which was largely based on fear and prevention, rather than disciplinary education. When variables and doubt are extinguished by requirement, there are often consequences, as the messy reality of life and social practice are incompatible with an all encompassing attempt to account for a myriad of unpredictable eventualities (Bauman, 2001). I was able to see this tension in the exasperated speech of the teachers, who described their movement from pillar to post at the behest of regulations in constant flux (Bauman, 2000). There is a difficult
necessity here to keep up with policy change and guideline intervention which is motivated by an unidentifiable fear (Bauman, 2004).

Whilst child sexual abuse is a genuine problem and a subsequently disconcerting presence in our collective consciousness, the failure to coherently address this in a single, structured way was reflected in the referral to the turbulent landscape for professionals in intergenerational contexts. The teachers I spoke with largely agreed when they claimed that the expectations placed upon them from ‘above’ did not correlate with reasonable or attainable objectives, often being implemented and then withdrawn within weeks. How then did teachers, pupils, administrators, caretakers and lunchroom operatives all coexist so contentedly? I was struck by the manner in which the schools themselves appeared as such specific, interdependent contexts functioning with a clear intention, whilst fragility became an enduring feature on deeper exploration. Perhaps there is an explanation for this in the resilience which teaching staff have been forced to display during this period of rapid change. Many staff showed an indefatigable commitment to their professional interpretations of good practice and teaching standards, often without regard for the climate which increasingly encroaches upon previous notions of autonomy.

**Professional unity?**

I feel as though there should be some recognition of the strength of human character in amongst this, as I encountered an encouraging and thought provoking inter-faculty interaction during the group interviews. The way in which colleagues engage with each other in familial and mutually supportive contexts is not limited to PE, although the evident camaraderie between the staff went beyond ‘office banter’. Mediocrity and workaday tedium evaporated when the teachers began to discuss their trade with each other. This often took
place in less than sanitary PE offices and in one instance a changing room itself, however the way that the profession was deconstructed, bemoaned, celebrated and interrogated transcended these uninspiring surroundings. The individual interviewees also referred to mutual support on a basis which led me to the conclusion that it had become an essential and largely instinctive aspect of contemporary practice (see Beck, 2004). The way in which these teachers expressed the necessity of constructive cohesion amongst colleagues revealed the stoicism of humanistic manifestation and its constant reinterpretation in times of otherwise abject suppression. I should not perhaps have been surprised that such a vibrant communality exists between teachers who have elsewhere been forced to think about the consequences of their every act, often contradicting the very reasons they chose to pursue a career in sports education.

This professional ‘togetherness’ is also a more sophisticated response to adversity than a simple reaction to change. The collective knowledge that touch is to be avoided has enforced an innovative reciprocity to emerge amongst professionals who respond well to challenges. The way they negotiated the frenetic environment of the state secondary school with ease and authority is perhaps a testament to their ability to forge strong, co-dependant working relationships in a climate which actively attempts to counteract this. Suspicion has become a significant by-product of adult/child concern and this has proved inherently divisive in many contexts. The threat of accusation and subsequent requirement for many intergenerational professionals to account for their own actions and intentions has led to real potential for an individualised, self-excusing ‘witch hunt’ to emerge. To deliberately ignore this is not only brave, but also representative of a forward thinking, progressive alternative. How much of this was sub-conscious and how much was premeditated was difficult to ascertain, although the consistent and in some cases dogmatic commitment to this sense of unity indicates a sharp recognition of its merits. The deliberate
and unintentional resistance against an inherently polarising force was deeply encouraging, yet I was simultaneously made aware during my in-school visits of the rigidity of safeguarding measures, the associated fears, and their ultimate strength within an environment which has little choice but to embrace them (see Allen, 2011, Foucault, 1977, 1980, 1997).

'Subversive' rationality

It became increasingly apparent during the interviewing process that my exploration into the plight of contemporary PE staff represents a minority approach. To suggest that child welfare measures are too stringent, or indeed concerned with accusation rather than genuine protection is not a popular position to adopt. This would have been particularly unsettling, given my confrontational inability, but the overwhelming and in some cases unanimous concurrence from the teachers assured me that there was real value to pursuing an interrogation of contemporary practice. As alluded to above I often danced around the subject in the first instances, reluctant to discuss paedophilia or the less potent but more ambiguous child sex abuse from the outset. I was perhaps wary of the fact that these professionals are constantly advised on how to suppress, detect and reveal such acts yet they are rarely discussed with such terminological frankness.

Safeguarding measures seemingly emphasise a gradual removal of risk and the expulsion of potential blame, yet do very little to explore the realities of paedophilia and the actual consequences of an international preoccupation with the issue. Amongst the somewhat predictable comments along the lines of ‘it’s gone too far now’ and ‘they’re (safeguarding measures) putting off potential teachers’, there was a palpable sense of relief when the staff could discuss the reasons why they were expected to meet and exceed standards so regularly and efficiently. They realised that child protection had become a disingenuous
title to give to practice that was in truth designed to protect the institutions to
which they belonged (Foucault, 2000). I could have perhaps probed this further
given the astute nature of the observation, although it offered further support
to the idea that teachers were able to identify the problematic agendas which
often manifest themselves in this discussion.

It is easy to exploit fear when it is so influentially revered, and teachers have
been affected by this in a number of ways. In addition to the exploitation of
those who operate in intergenerational contexts, there is the manipulation of
those who do not. I fall into this category, and have therefore been subject to
the regular appearance of advertisements and media campaigns which attempt
to warn of the dangers of child sex abuse by exaggerating its presence. I
cannot pretend that I have never viewed eccentricity in the lone (often male)
adult as a completely benign characteristic.

Heteronormativity and nuclear conceptions of family are still resolutely
dominant in modern contexts, and any deviation from this has encouraged a
very distinct demarcation of role and status to emerge. It is possible to be
‘different’, although this can only claim legitimacy once it has been appropriated
by the established forces (Bauman, 1991, 1997). Therefore anyone who
remains indistinct in their status or even general demeanour is swiftly and often
damagingly questioned. The vast majority of the British population remains
firmly influenced by a conventional interpretation of interpersonal relations and
this general and pervasive position makes the necessary interaction between
adult and child during a PE lesson routinely concerning. It becomes unnatural
through an increasing failure to extricate the national consciousness from
classical and perhaps outmoded conceptions of family life and personal
choice. I fit into this because I have been influenced by this disdain for
alternatives. Despite being single myself I regard those of a certain age with no
significant other as being suitable for questioning. There must be some
explanation for why these people have not found a ‘life partner’; simply being single does not quite seem a good enough answer in contemporary settings. ‘Funny s/he never married’ is a phrase often uttered when the solitary status of spinster or bachelor is pronounced and although rooted in some kind of post war British prejudice, the phrase is a fairly revealing representation of the clamour for an explanation as to why someone has chosen to be, or simply is alone or more importantly, different.

‘Risk’ in the corridors and classrooms

Risk, and its various influences became particularly apparent in the dialogue, as it was both an explicit aspect of regulatory practice, and also manifested itself in the cognitive processes displayed by the staff members themselves. Risk has seemingly subsumed modern practice and this was in evidence on a number of occasions; I was duly caught up in this as I was treated as a dubious outside figure deemed dangerous by virtue of my anonymity. The teachers were, although sympathetic, visibly inconvenienced by me, disruptive as I was to the risk averse routine of school life. I got the impression that lessons occurred with a necessarily keen vigilance on behalf of the teachers, leaving ‘downtime’ a precious and much needed commodity which I was consistently encroaching upon.

Whilst I was clearly something of a nuisance here, the teachers had agreed in advance to speak with me so there clearly remained a latent desire to express their views with someone to whom they were not directly answerable. As I was not a parent or indeed a teacher there was an opportunity for the shackles of previous procedure to be loosened and for the staff to discuss their profession in an alternative context. However risk remained a residual presence in the discussions, influencing most of the dialogue in a particular way. Whether it was being adhered to or bemoaned, the discussion of prevention, a semantic
consequence of risk, was never far from the root of conversation. The number of times teachers described situations as ‘not being worth the risk’ was significant, and this applied to scenarios which transcended touch alone. The lack of enthusiasm towards school trips and indeed any ‘off-campus’ activity was another good indicator of the wholesale culture of avoidance which these teachers have little choice but to perpetuate. In one instance I was shown an instruction manual which I could barely lift for the procedure behind trips and external fixtures, as the staff members sat around laughing about the farcical lengths to which they must now go in order to simply limit the opportunity for accident or incident. Although they were laughing on this occasion, there was nothing funny about an accusation of neglect or impropriety and the stern brevity with which this was largely discussed uncovered a significant level of fear.

It was apparent that the idea of discipline had been reinterpreted here, played out under the auspices of a more urgent imperative than that of imperialistic agenda. Whilst Foucault enables a nuanced appropriation of this disciplinary shift, we are also able through Giddens to explore the recursive characteristics of this discipline and how a non-linear social narrative has been influenced by a climate of intergenerational fear. Discipline has re-emerged in contemporary schooling, albeit with a different focus, and has as much of an impact on practice as it has done in previous and markedly different educational incarnations. The way that we now see discipline in a different guise yet one which maintains a managerial potency, not significantly dissimilar to a previous era, invites an interrogation of the ways in which contemporary examples of lifestyle negotiation are unavoidably manipulated by what came before. This brings me to the ‘demeanour’ of PE staff which has been discussed above, and how the reinterpretation of discipline and its simultaneously residual presence in physical education has influenced the behaviour and self-regulation of the teachers. There is an inherent difficulty in the transition from domineering
'games-master’ to a submissive member of the PE faculty, and while this is a somewhat caricatured rendering of the situation, it became strongly evident that there was an equivalent discomfort resident in the teacher’s dialogue. The totality of the shift has perhaps not been fully realised as many staff members refused to accept that the disciplinary balance has come full circle.

**Regulated lifestyle – theoretical and empirical**

Giddens has approached the notion of lifestyle in some of his later work (1992, 1999) and it is alongside this that we can explore the idea of a teaching *lifestyle* and its manifestation within a climate of fear. The interest lies in the extent to which lifestyle, demeanour and action within a teaching context is imposed upon staff members, and the levels to which it has organically emerged. Giddens has discussed the way in which lifestyle has become increasingly motivated by market forces and it becomes possible to parallel this in contemporary teaching, as staff are given nominal freedoms in the name of a wider, (in)visibly dominant end. This differs from Foucault’s governmentality in its recognition of the inevitability of manipulation of a subject in an overt and constituent way. Whilst lifestyle and lifestyle projects may be rooted in the commercialism which pervades modern contexts this is accepted by Giddens rather than challenged, as he explores their transitional and representational qualities in addition to this, not necessarily in spite of it. We can subsequently attempt to situate the teaching lifestyle, with its transitional or aesthetic characteristics in mind.

We know that Giddens refers to lifestyle in a context of global interdependence (Horne and Jary, 2004), yet there is perhaps a superficial problem with the notion of reflexivity within this. To discuss ‘narratives of the self’ whilst allying them to some internationally reciprocal idea of individuality appears somewhat contradictory, given the significance placed upon both. However on further
reading it becomes possible, especially within a PE teaching environment to recognise the synthesis between a reflexively enacted lifestyle project and the wider social influences which have facilitated this. During the interview process I became aware of the extent to which lifestyle and the constituent ideas which surround the notion are themselves fragmentary. They remain in keeping with more general imperatives, including local and national identity, associated etiquettes and tacitly political discussion, yet there is a distinct divergence when professional status and the subsequent behaviour which this implies is mentioned. Whereas some would distinguish professional and personal lifestyle as being two separate entities, this is not true of PE teaching. PE appeared to envelop the entire make-up of the teachers I spoke with, functioning as a standalone, occupational whole.

My role as a researcher enables a fleeting immersion in a subject and then a shift towards ground which may be totally unrelated. With this in mind it was to me remarkable to see a group of people who so encapsulated the unremitting perpetuation of the ‘PE teacher’ in almost every context. The boundaries between social and professional were very fine here, as the staff members discussed the extra curricular expectations, their inability to ‘switch off’ when they returned home from work, and the ironic release they gain from engaging in organised sport when time permits. Although this is an obvious consequence of operating in a system which puts unnecessary pressure on adult workers, the way in which the idea of a total, ethically complete PE teacher intersects the reflexive reality for many of these members of staff creates an interesting and potentially productive tension to emerge.

Giddens’ work on lifestyle explores the way in which actors refine and develop an interpretation of ‘how they should live’ in an increasingly globalised context. How teaching staff ‘should live’ is infused almost without distinction with a resolute devotion to adult/child distance and preventative measure, yet it does
not fit with the ‘freedom of choice’, which a globalised, indirectly capitalist, social system would emphasise. Whilst those in what can broadly be described as conventional roles, or those who are not required to work with children, are gently coerced by a number of forces beyond their control, PE staff are consistently and overtly led by a system which offers them little in the way of freedom or even perceptions of such. Those in safe, adult only contexts, remain relatively able to decide upon their lifestyle trajectory although they are often, and this is important, led by each other in a cyclical and superficial perpetuation of the banality of corporate intervention. PE staff have been unintentionally yet uniquely extricated from this and are therefore far more focussed on alternative and often more robust social projects than the ones which appear to consume the vast majority of those in a position to sculpt a composite ‘lifestyle’.

There is an intricate and often paradoxical reality for PE staff in contemporary settings. I was offered an insight into the functioning of a system which has had a number of significant and in many cases unprecedented influences on the behavioural traits of a complex group. The way in which the staff member has become so heavily inured in preventative measures, whilst simultaneously galvanising themselves as an increasingly resilient collective entity, represented an enriching and thought provoking experience for me as a researcher. The varied discussion was a more than suitable catalyst for the narratives, which attempt to crystallise the consequences of a comprehensive transition and the various tensions and behaviours which result from this.

Although I was made acutely aware of my ‘outsider’ status, it was possible to see how simply and efficiently the inner mechanism of the school functioned in what was a superficially hierarchical environment of definitive role appropriation. The graceful movement of teachers amongst pupils in spite of the chaotic appearance of a crowded corridor resonated with me, and demonstrated a developmental regimentation of action which provided a key
focus in the stories above. The teachers were very keen to discuss the procedural aspects of the job, at times almost delighting in the rigidity of practice which they have no choice but to adhere to. This was an evident illusion, disguising the desire to break through the restrictions which have been placed upon them in both a practical and more subtly enforced behavioural sense. There was a discomfort with current systems which threatened, and at times did, break through the veneer of contentment which was initially presented by staff who were perhaps wary of my intentions. Reflected in the dénouement of the second story, in which a friendship eventually disintegrates, the ultimate conflict between submission and the irrepressible desire to counteract this has been deemed a destructive force under a system which strives towards accountability and limitation. There is perhaps a need for me to explore the possibility of coexistence between a continuous and orchestrated disciplinary structure and the reflexive, naturalistically benevolent characteristics of the teachers.
Chapter X
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Further reflections

Exploring the plight of contemporary PE staff is a somewhat frustrating undertaking. Whilst the restrictions and limitations placed upon them are clear to see, any amplification of this is always likely to be overshadowed by a ‘socially responsible’ commitment to child protection. The way in which child sex abuse is sensationalised, exploited, perpetuated and ultimately facilitated by the prevalent climate, offers very little room for a conventional resolution. To even opine that teachers are undergoing a systematic process of marginalisation can be inherently dangerous in an atmosphere which appears to accuse and then investigate, with a wanton disregard for the myriad consequences (see Furedi, 1997, 1999, 2002). Why would someone endanger their reputation with a misplaced remark or instinctive criticism, when the submissive alternative is so much safer? Prudence now demands that an adult remains entirely scrupulous, serving to influence thought and action with an all-encompassing efficiency.

The preceding chapters suggest that in order to counter what has been one of the most enduring hegemonies of recent generations, a recognition of this dominance and its subsequent intelligent manipulation will perhaps upset what is an established equilibrium, although this is a difficult task. There has been consistent evidence throughout the thesis of the strength with which current regulatory system has embedded itself within the practical and cognitive makeup of PE teaching, and this has been reflected in the despondency and exasperation which many of the staff members expressed. To overcome a regime of thought which is almost reflexively adhered to requires a wholesale interrogation of the complexities of child sex abuse, rather than an investigation of its existence.
Whatever moral difficulties society has with a previous inability to coherently deal with abuse, are tempered by a reactionary saturation of potential sites of impropriety. This masquerades as thorough investigation yet it is often enacted in a bid to exorcise the demons stemming from ‘discrepancies’ that have for a number of reasons been historically overlooked. We have moved into an era in which full disclosure (see Kemshall and Weaver, 2012) is the only apparent remedy for a problem which supposedly continues to expand. Notions of trust have been fundamentally realigned here, as it is far more culturally observant to suspect (Bell, 2002) rather than negligently rely on the dubious and fallible idea that ‘strength of character’, which would have previously sufficed, is an appropriate marker of intent.

**Original contribution**

There is a requirement to explore how and to what extent the findings and their deconstruction contribute to knowledge. It would be relatively simplistic (although not inaccurate) to contend that an investigation of this kind has not previously taken place in a PE teaching context. With the exception of Piper et al (2013), there has been a lack of research which focusses on the realities of a non-tactile landscape for PE staff, although this fits with what has been a general disparity between two paradigmatic approaches. Work which attempts to expose and identify abuse and work which attempts to expose and identify the problematic narratives of ‘abuse’ has presented a dichotomy of sorts (as referred to in Chapter II), with the former being far more prevalent than the latter. This thesis has therefore been more identifiably distinct in the development of a theoretically and narratively informed response to an environment that appears to be relatively immovable. There is an urgent need to address the marginalising processes that have taken place in this context yet the resilience with which public concern has been upheld makes a conventionally enacted response somewhat ineffective. Recognising the
requirement to evoke alternatives amongst the investigation of a climate of preventative agenda marks investigation out as refreshing, and we can highlight the way in which this project follows such a direction.

The creation and deconstruction of fiction in a PE teaching context and the adoption of a narrative of marginalisation which counters the prevailing discourse surrounding child protection reinforces this recognition, yet it is the evocative depiction of a very real climate of fear which allows us to begin to discuss intervention in ways that confront existing protocol. In utilising this approach, we have looked beyond the idea that policy amendment represents a standalone medium of affect, and encouraged a more vital understanding of context. Engaging with the human consequences of a restrictive environment, rather than attempting to quantify or ‘manage’ problematic circumstance enables a discursive reaction to a discursively embedded source of tension. Realising that an effective response is engendered in a broadly equivalent, yet more informed, interrogation of the contemporary British ‘moral compass’ and its rhetorically engendered development has yet to take place in any organised sense, and it is hoped that this project has at least drawn attention to the value of such investigation.

**Contemporary difficulties**

Considerable mistakes have been made in the interrogation and identification of child sex abuse, although it seems that retribution has been manifested in a system of insidious degradation. Rather than attempt to approach the subject with a rationality which we are in many instances capable of maintaining, there has instead been a clamour towards public accusation, in-fighting and reciprocal defamation (Bolen, 2001). Social order is defined by who is least able to commit acts of abuse, and thereby automatically criminalises those who unintentionally stray from the narrow parameters of acceptability. Physical education is
therefore unfortunately positioned in contemporary contexts. It is recognised as a valuable and in many ways fundamental aspect of the development of children and adolescents, yet the requirement for adults and children to interact during its delivery and the subsequent discomfort which ensues, tempers any positive influence.

The relational and socially cohesive capability of PE is entirely extinguished by a minimal commitment to the fulfilment of exercise quotas, whilst the remainder of the time is focussed on the avoidance of problematic incident. PE as a discipline is therefore unlikely to develop pedagogically, if the teachers are forced to concern themselves with the threat of danger rather than the potential of sporting collaboration. Described by one practitioner as ‘glorified babysitters’ the discontent amongst staff who largely entered the profession to remain within a sporting context has been palpable. In addition to this come the manifest insecurities which a ‘no-touch’ culture invokes, naturally inhibiting the conduct of teachers and pupils alike, in an environment which exacerbates rather than alleviates fear and mistrust. It is important to maintain at this stage that in the cases of the schools visited, and indeed many schools nationwide, the explicit instructions or regulations implemented which categorically prohibit touch between an adult and child have been ambiguous, misleading or in fact non-existent.

The physical and figurative distance which has measurably increased between teacher and pupil has been encouraged to emerge through discursive and rhetorical pressure. Teachers are simply reacting to the groundswell of public opinion which has shown no signs of abating. Policy and ‘guidelines’ have urged in favour of cautionary practice (AfPE, 2008, Whitlam, 2012), yet these relatively ineffective measures have themselves simply been borne out of the consensus of a concerned populace. Although the behavioural characteristics of a collective are likely to follow some kind of moral pattern, this has historically
followed a line of reasoning based upon religious belief (Kincaid, 1998). Now that we live in an increasingly secular society, moralistically engendered coercion is forced to attach itself to a threat of greater substance. The ‘devil’ is represented by the paedophile and the innocence of the child remains divine. Although this may seem unnecessarily hyperbolic, there is an undercurrent of fear surrounding adult/child contact which goes far beyond the rational, as child sex abuse has tapped in to our base terrors, unleashing a demonic apparition and fulfilling an instinctive societal need to personify evil (see McCartan, 2004).

**Professional redefinition**

Though perhaps not deliberately targeted, PE teachers, sports coaches, youth workers, child minders and an increasing number of equivalent professionals bear the brunt of public fear and the clumsy, misdirected outrage which this invokes (Furedi and Bristow, 2008). By touching and in some cases cultivating friendships with children these workers are encroaching on what is perceived to be very dangerous terrain. There is a troubling contemporary reflex which pillories the adult in the first instance, engendering a reticence and natural conservatism in contexts where these elements should not necessarily reside. Indeed it was reticence which was exemplified in both the empirical investigation and the subsequent narrative analysis, as the stakes have been systematically raised for those who make contact with children. A fundamentally more reflective, distanced PE teacher is now the norm as the model employee becomes one who lowers risk first and educates second (Johnson, 2011). Establishing a relatively universal trend such as this in the interviewing stages, and then elaborating using fictional explication has enabled the reticence visible amongst the cognitive and practical make-up of the PE teacher to be suggestively explored.
Emanating from a deep seated fear which manifests itself both in accusation and self-protection, the reticence identified in the dialogue with the teaching staff is a multifaceted and evolutionary representation of the complex reality which faces contemporary PE teachers. Not only are staff reticent in their conduct with pupils, itself the most obvious marker of a system of intrinsic self-doubt, this reticence has influenced many other aspects of practice. The reluctance to lead school trips (Hunter-Jones and Hunter-Jones, 2007, Wainwright, 2002), the stringent adherence to paperwork and the swift phone call home following any abnormality all reveal a reliance on formula, in which procedural stability takes the place of dangerous potential. Reticence has become a soothing disposition for the PE teacher, who must now think before response is enacted. There is perhaps superficial merit to a system which encourages a more measured approach to intergenerational conduct; ‘damage limitation’ after all appears a highly sensible mantra to adopt in this context. We cannot however ignore the conditions under which such ‘measurement’ is performed. The pause prior to action occurs alongside a necessary evaluation of solely personal risk, as the welfare of the child is only ever indirectly attended to. The brief reflection before contact is made or indeed non-tactile instruction is given, has not been motivated by rationality as the use of the term ‘measured’ would suggest. This is instead a far more heightened, alarmist reaction to the general climate of concern which influences the adult on a number of different, in some cases wildly fluctuating, levels.

**Structures of ‘identity’ – individual and collective tension**

The notion of teacher identity, in its individual and collective senses, should be given some attention here, as the profession and its representation in public and private domains have undergone an unprecedented shift in recent years. It is now difficult to refer to the teacher as a standalone subject whilst it remains simultaneously problematic to attempt to define group narratives in current
contexts. Rigorous redefinition of behavioural imperatives in PE teaching has reinterpreted not only the way in which the practitioners view themselves, but also their interaction and connection with colleagues, as revelation is both demanded and then naturally suppressed in a climate which is perpetuated by fear. The idea of acting instinctively and naturalistically is rendered unfeasible, standing as it does in an environment which is built upon artifice and the veneer of propriety (see Piper and Smith, 2003, Piper and Stronach, 2008, Piper et al, 2005, 2006, 2012, 2013).

Many genuinely contribute to this system with a firm adherence to the transparency which is duly enforced, however the research suggests that this kind of action occurs in contradiction to the pedagogical and conventional objectives of the PE teacher or sports instructor. Whereas there is an argument which upholds a rather defensive ‘nothing to hide’ attitude, embracing the interrogation and barely concealed indignity of a system of intense, multifaceted surveillance, the manner in which this ultimately deflects focus from the positive, developmental capacity of PE is hard to ignore. In addition to this, there are numerous other sources of contention for the contemporary PE teacher, posing existential dilemmas and slowly yet forcibly altering the make-up and meaning of the profession as a whole. That the ability to actually teach is becoming less accessible represents a particularly concerning aspect of modern practice. Whilst this has been alluded to above and elsewhere, the consistent call for vigilance and ‘due care and attention’ when handling or talking to children has significantly diminished any opportunity for free flowing instruction. The teacher has undergone a particularly complex and somewhat unsettling transition from disciplinary leader to a simple symbol of institutional integrity, and the way in which this has been embraced by some and challenged by others has engendered an outlook of troubling inconsistency. There is little opportunity to assert even a notional ‘identity’ here as the demands and vagaries of practice are subject to such considerable change (see Young, 1999).
There has however been some manifestation of a collective identity amongst the various restrictions and regulations in modern PE teaching. The idea of collective unity is an encouraging one and shows genuine signs of emerging; the movement exists and is in many ways sustained by the tensions which we have discussed. It will be of some use to gauge the efficacy of communality amongst PE staff alongside a system which continues to expand.

**Professional cohesion – productive or reactionary?**

The idea of a PE teaching ‘community’ is not necessarily a recent development, as the unity which sport and its devotees engenders has marked PE staff out as distinctive amongst others educators. It does however come into particularly sharp focus when there continues to be such significant inequity between the public perception of staff and their subsequent treatment both in and out of school. Whilst the interconnection and collaboration between PE staff is a positive move when organically cultivated, the pressure on teachers to mobilise is problematically raised when their plight is seen as a hopeless one. Itself simply a knee jerk response to a pedagogical crisis, there is relative danger in the formation of nominal solidarity which lacks focus, drive or energy. Another unwanted influence of the wider climate of suspicion, there is perhaps a tendency for PE staff to attempt to come together out of some instinctive sense of professional survival, which negates more genuine or effective attempts to overcome a system of autocratic rigidity.

The teachers spoken to expressed the importance of unity and mutual support in a way which articulated the urgency and desperation of the contemporary atmosphere. Obviously a much needed antidote to the emasculating influence of rigorous checking and a culture of accusation, the intermittence and irregularity of public unrest has naturally influenced and in some contexts
directly countered any coherent mobilisation of staff. The alarmism and reactionary rhetoric which is increasingly evident in today’s educational climate (Zanker, 2012) has had an understandable role in the formation of new bonds between teachers and other professionals, although this has largely taken place without the organisational nuance which would legitimately enable an alternative voice to be heard. The problems do not necessarily reside in the behaviour of the teachers, much less any kind of organisational failing, but are rather manifested in the insidious and self-sustaining nature of the paranoia which inhabits public perception. The current modes of unity amongst staff members have been almost survivalist, tapping into the interaction between individual and collective teaching identity and sharply upholding the ideals which motivated them.

This adoption of professional militancy is admirable, especially given the climate which presides, although there has been a less overt yet arguably more effective appearance of pragmatism in the values of contemporary practitioners. Shaping the current environment by accepting that there are inherent and in many ways immovable systems of thought in place offers a far more reasonable approach to the questioning of established convention. Many teachers spoken to during the interviewing process recognised that the fear and mistrust which emerges when adults and children coalesce is an endemic characteristic of our collective consciousness (see Furedi, 2013). It is particularly difficult to challenge any initiative or development which has child welfare at its core, and the teachers largely accept this, referring to over-zealous implementation as an occupational hazard and part of the reality of modern practice. Instead, there have been signs of a complex and highly sophisticated interpretation of the contemporary restrictions in place in many secondary schools, which deflect and in some cases bypass the tension which is now associated with adult/child touch.
The contemporary development of the ‘pragmatic teacher’

Given that the themes that have emerged in the analysis of the interviews are predominantly negative, as they explore the myriad restrictions and challenges which are now associated with PE teaching, there remained a number of notable examples of professional stoicism. As Milton (42), Gail (34) and Paul (24) discussed: ‘I think we definitely would, you know, back each other up and…’

‘I’ve learnt from other colleagues and if I was to do it again, you know, I’ve not done it for a while so I’d be like, oh, can I just refresh your memory, so that I know clearly how to do it properly’.

‘You’ve got support there from like your teachers … you know, members of the teaching union if there ever were any accusations’.

‘And maybe I’ve gone to a match and I’m not sure of something, or … “Louise, what would you do?”; or this is what I’ve done, what do you think of that, which I think is invaluable’.

‘For me who’s only been teaching a few years to speak to someone who’s been teaching 20, 22, 23 years, that’s massive’.

This suggests that in spite of the considerable difficulties and at times severely inhibitory measures implemented both practically and discursively, the determination to extract some semblance of job satisfaction invokes the embryonic formation of a legitimate response to this climate. A tendency to remain professionally interdependent was a telling reminder of the significance of trust in intergenerational contexts and the teacher’s ultimate intentions to maintain it. They have spoken about the way that they interact with children at their particular institution with warmth and fondness rather than the fear which may be tacitly resident. ‘We’re really lucky with our kids’ and ‘we make sure we have a good working relationship with our pupils’ are comments indicative of the simultaneous importance and tenuous nature of trust between teacher and
pupil in contemporary settings. That an understanding of modern concerns resides alongside a resolute desire for trust in a context in which it is often undermined, shows significant perception on behalf of the staff members.

There is a recognition of limitation to the same extent that there is desire for the maintenance of the civil liberties that can themselves no longer be taken for granted. The way in which such a balanced approach to a situation that remains objectively bleak for many practitioners has been developed speaks of a sophisticated professional reaction, that is undoubtedly overshadowed by a consistent preoccupation with the vagaries of safeguarding. PE staff have in effect quietly and patiently adapted to modern systems of thought and action in a way which sharply contradicts a reading that positions them as one dimensional automatons. Whilst there is considerable scope for a robotic, 'worker ant' culture to be engendered in contemporary teaching there is a fully functioning resistance to this in existence. As explored in the second narrative, there is a difficulty inherent in the relationship between an established and (previously) well-respected PE teacher and a newly qualified professional who adopts contemporary approaches with passionate zeal. Neither are necessarily wholly reflective of the modern teacher, yet they both possess the conflicting elements which a climate of hypersensitivity has invoked (Honoré, 2008), and while they separately reflect the divergent narratives of relational and distanced teaching there is evidence to suggest that contemporary teachers have successfully fused aspects of both. By developing ‘trust’ in an environment that favours mistrust and at the same time remaining mindful of the necessary separation which current climates demand, PE staff have demonstrated a workable alternative to an atmosphere which continues to engulf the profession.

There is a strong argument to suggest that not enough is known about child sex abuse and/or paedophilia (see Goode, 2011). The discourses which surround this have been subsequently associated with a reactionary narrative of
prevention, although we can also suggest that PE teachers have implicitly understood this as they continue to look beyond unnecessary characterisation. This has manifested itself in various ways, although the most visible reminders came at opposite ends of the spectrum. There were those that simply chose to ignore the delicacy of an intergenerational context, and insisted on performing their jobs with a regard for the safety of the child which did not detract from their own professional objectives. And there were those who were exceptionally mindful of the problematic associations which can be made when adult and child interact. These two approaches may appear converse, however the manner in which an interpretation of appropriate professional conduct has been independently made here is representative of an intricate and nuanced approach to contemporary challenges. There is little submission evident in either example, and the way that this takes place amongst a climate which has been consistent in its emasculation and interrogation of an entire community of workers sets an encouraging precedent.

PE staff have in a sense manipulated current practice by reimagining the discourse which has hitherto proved so restrictive. The way in which an apparent authoritarianism has been overturned here is sharply reminiscent of Foucault’s study of modern power in which the notion becomes empirically productive. There are obvious parallels and we can take a great deal from this, although the way in which the situation remains a strong and socially prevalent difficulty should not be overlooked. Whereas Foucault uses the productive capacity of power to provide an alternative to the modes of thought which have dealt exclusively with repression, it is impossible to ignore the impact and influence which intergenerational concern has had on contemporary constructs, making a relatively simplistic oppression/reaction/equilibrium narrative insubstantial.
There is genuine need to regard PE staff within this context as simultaneous adherents to and reactors against an inherently complex system of thought and action. This is a difficult reality to accept for many, as those who have subscribed to the tenets of a culture of excessive child protection are generally unable to accommodate the idea that teachers are becoming marginalised. It is perhaps superficially detrimental to publically enable PE staff to operate independently of a mechanism of prevention which has begun to run so smoothly, saturating the intergenerational landscape with comforting exhaustion. Yet PE staff continue to exercise a number of interpretative liberties in spite of consistent opposition from both managerial and populist influences. Can staff continue to subtly buck the prevailing trends in a child centric environment or will the sheer weight of prevention and concern ultimately render their collaboration ineffective? The mere fact that it is possible to pose this question represents a major step forward. To be able to discuss the collaborative efforts of a group which has been professionally manipulated to such an extent is a testament to the strength of character of a teaching community which has shown evolutionary qualities. This is in fact highly necessary given that the cultivation and perpetuation of fear based implementation has proved to be both highly sophisticated and constantly changeable (Bauman, 2002, 2006). The atmosphere is one of fluctuation, in which all parties must constantly adapt and interpret a scenario which remains remarkably simplistic. The instinctive desire to avoid the ‘unspeakable truth’ which child sex abuse represents has transformed into a national fixation, operating as an industry. That there have been consequences ranging from the benevolent to the exploitative is strong evidence of the divergence and multifaceted nature of public perception of child welfare projects, and the contextual diversity of a subject which is routinely misunderstood.

It is therefore difficult to expect that PE staff can negotiate this climate easily and in a definably linear way. Whilst evidence presented here suggests that
they have reacted to these changes with professional idiosyncrasy, engaging with each other in an organic collaborative effort which supersedes the more deliberative attempts at cohesion, it is hard to ignore the statutory pressures to which they must adhere. Alongside this comes a complex and sometimes problematic overlap between the rigours of a preventative environment and the realisation of teaching identity, one which as mentioned above is now particularly difficult to define. The teacher is essentially presented with a simple and often significant choice between a commitment to the various processes behind preventative pedagogy, or a more interpretative approach to a corresponding landscape, yet the way in which elements of both ultimately intermingle in everyday action belies this simplicity and redistributes conventional perception (Johansson, 2013, Owen and Gillentine, 2011).

PE staff can both remain faithful to the distance which a ‘no touch’ culture implies, whilst mounting a certain resistance to this in their demeanour and pedagogical attitude. There is room for a combination of approaches in contemporary PE whilst the child remains at a safe, accountable distance. Knowledge of this reality however is still routinely suppressed by an overwhelming and rhetorically dominant system of risk aversion, often overshadowing any awareness in staff which is anything other than subconscious. There is, in a sense, a barrier to coherent mobilisation in this way, as PE staff realise their collaborative potential in the wake of implementation which is extensively prohibitive. Although this is a considerable challenge, there is a tenacious proclivity amongst staff to look beyond this, and it is this obduracy which should be harnessed as we approach a critical era for PE teaching.
The consequences of necessary self-protection

There is considerable opportunity for, and evidence of, communality and constructive reaction to a climate of intergenerational mistrust, although it remains important to explore the fractious potential which this environment is capable of creating. There has been reference made in Chapter VI to the tendency of PE staff to encourage a form of mutual monitoring, in which ‘highly charged’ interaction that perhaps requires physical contact is regulated by the confirmatory gaze of another member of staff. This is, on the surface, a supportive action, yet the way that this can allow blame to be deflected when accusations are made, suggests there is ample room for division in a context of interrogative tension. Although there is genuine value in the cohesive collaboration which teachers have displayed, there is perhaps less of an obvious incentive to a mobilisation such as this, when the contemporary landscape places such significance on the avoidance of culpability (Garratt et al, 2013, Sikes and Piper, 2010). It is far easier for a teacher to subscribe to the self-excusing and accusatory atmosphere than mount a credible and methodical, collectively aware resistance.

Teachers are instructed to circumvent any damaging attention and although this is largely enacted in the interests of upholding institutional reputation, any individual interpretation of this engenders a strong requirement for the maintenance of personal innocence. They are made pariahs who must attack any sense of community with a competitive perpetuation of transparency, making unity very difficult. Although not true of every circumstance, as the existence of communality is consistently if not overtly evident, contemporary contexts facilitate the opportunity for such an insidious atmosphere. There has been a dangerous precedent set in intergenerational contexts, not limited to PE teaching, which encourages a culture of reciprocal suspicion to emerge (McWilliam, 1996, McWilliam and Jones, 2005). A general mistrust of unknown,
unregulated elements has engulfed Western social cognition in recent years, thereby disrupting any conceptions that implicitly accept relationships and interaction on ‘face value’, and the difficulty which public opinion has expressed with adult/child interaction in particular, has permeated beyond mere rumour and hyperbole. Such is the potential for defamation and irrevocable damage, the speculation and gossip that would have previously been dismissed or even jocularly maintained is a serious and highly charged source of tension for many adult/child professionals. The communication between colleagues which has sustained and contributed to a well rounded professional experience becomes entangled within confusion over the boundaries of acceptability, and the levels to which trust between staff can be ensured or indeed developed. There are now well established barriers to coherent interaction between practitioners which operate intricately and efficiently, negotiating the independence, reflexivity and responsiveness of PE teachers by consistently redefining the definition of behavioural expectation. It has become irresponsible to reveal personal details, desires or interests to co-workers in an environment which continues to corrode aspects of interaction once taken for granted.

**The feasibility of professional choice**

What we must assess is the extent to which the teacher remains able to assert some sense of communal or indeed individual independence in a complex and paradoxical landscape. Whilst teachers can and evidently have exercised an encouraging professional awareness, accommodating the limitations of environment with pragmatic rationality, there are still significant and deeply troubling tensions which arise when physical contact is required. A fundamental and often unavoidable aspect of practice, touch between adult and child in a PE lesson is the most visible reminder of our existential difficulty with intergenerational interaction. Although teaching staff have developed methods by which fear, suspicion and mistrust are to some extent counteracted, there
will always be discomfort inherent in the processes which facilitate adult/child contact. The self-doubt which has been encouraged by this climate has become a decisive and dominant factor in the practical cognition of a significant number of staff members, as each action is magnified and scrutinised by a penetrative insecurity (See Bauman, 2006, Furedi, 2002, 2004, 2013, Piper et al, 2006, 2012, 2013).

The internal disruption which has been generated by this has been established to the point of convention, as it remains highly unlikely that an adult who comes into contact with a child in a professional setting gives the action no thought or subsequent reflection. Touch has been subject to a generational re-evaluation in which the younger members of the teacher/pupil dialectic have control through a more coherent connection to the dynamism of technological influence. Whereas previous examples have largely placed the adult within a dominant role, youth movement and social change are now inextricably linked and can be increasingly exhibited as a viable marker of collective transition. Virtual interaction is given contemporary precedence and alongside this the relevance of touch has itself been questioned in an era which has seen communicative method take on a far more diverse and in some ways abstract focus. Some reference should be made here to the idea, reinforced by Beck’s work (1992, 1994, 1995), which renders physical touch anachronistic in contemporary social ordering. This, combined with the influence which youth groups have over social behaviour leaves the adult who employs touch, regardless of necessity, in a particularly difficult position. Whilst this is not in itself a revelation, there has yet to be a thorough exploration of the link between new developments in formal and informal interaction and the dissolution of more ‘traditional’ forms of affirmation.

Touch comprises a conventional narrative of greeting, congratulation, commiseration or expression which can all now be conveyed, and with greater
contemporary emphasis, electronically, undermining the handshake, hug or high-five. Indeed it was sport which retained the demonstrative capacity of touch and embrace whilst it was lost in other contexts, as footballers kissed and basketball coaches affectionately patted the bottom of their players, visibly and unashamedly, acceptable as it was within a context of athletic convention. Some PE staff spoken to admitted to using the high-five, a completely acceptable sporting expression which incites only minimal, momentary contact, although little of the embrace which professional athletes have displayed was said to be replicated (see Chare, 2013). There is an interesting tension in sport, between a dominant heteronormativity and the simultaneous accommodation of at times intimate same-sex contact. Although non sexual, the congratulatory kiss between two teammates is deemed legitimate if enacted within the throes of victory or consolation, indicating a blurring of the boundaries of convention during a complex and subversive period of competition. Given that homophobia is still recognised as a latent yet residual aspect of professional sport, it is clear that some attention should be given to the way in which repression and inhibition is at least questioned within an athletic arena.

The presence of intergenerational interaction in PE and its now dubious role in contemporary social order has severely limited the capacity for reinterpretation, which would otherwise be available here. That the high-five has been the only example of the tactile language of sporting expression to remain in PE, is representative of the realities of touch in the current climate and its ultimate redundancy. Far from suggesting that adults and children should embrace in the same way that teammates do, the fact that sport can fundamentally realign the definitions of touch, meaning and intent has been overshadowed once again by a pervasive and restrictive fear. PE will be forced to function without touch in the future, thereby ruling out a number of established activities and facilitating a new direction for sports instruction. Of course we are unable to predict the extent to which this may be either detrimental or beneficial, although the way in
which general academic progress in the UK has been unsatisfactory over recent years (Elliott and Hoyle, 2014) suggests a difficulty with current practice. Is hypersensitivity stifling the development of British pupils? Whilst physical education has not been reflected upon during recent statistical analysis carried out by government intervention (Dept of Education, 2014), there is an evident link between exercise, activity and enhanced academic ability (Lee, 2014). The transition in the delivery of PE and the practical realities of environment over the last decade have undoubtedly affected the experiential capacity of the discipline, negating the empirical, bodily benefits of sporting interaction by adhering so resolutely to narratives of concern and prevention.

The ultimate ‘disembodiment’ of PE has come at a cost which has perhaps not been accounted for by policy makers. The plateau or in some cases fall in standards of literacy and numeracy in UK schooling represents a further cause for distress amongst the population at large, although it is once again not being coherently explored. There is a risk here that the over zealous child welfare systems which have been arbitrarily implemented will betray the failings of a society which consistently struggles to act methodically or rationally. It seems that not only is the ‘choice’ which teachers are exposed to significantly limited within an environment which dissuades physical contact, but pupils and by extension children are also left with diminishing options. The rationality and judgement which is so glaringly absent from the attempts to protect children has been distortedly re-applied to the arenas in which it remains incongruous. Sporting interaction and the behaviour of adults and children within this context have been influenced and indeed stifled by an evolving risk aversion (Jones, 2004, Kennedy, 2006). In addition, this climate is embedded in and legitimated by a contemporary rationality that is a misguided product of a deeper existential anxiety.
The currency of moral panic

The way in which contemporary management of intergenerational contexts capitalises on and subsequently encourages vulnerability has become strongly evident. It is far from cynical to suggest that abuse of any kind is newsworthy and in many instances lucrative, thereby incentivising its perpetuation (see Johansson, 2013, Jones et al, 2013, Piper et al, 2011). There are often helpful binaries in place which allow us to identify any moral repugnance quickly and efficiently, enabling a collective adherence to a standard of cultural acceptability. Man endangers woman in a domestic context, adult endangers child in education and elsewhere, group endangers individual in a gang based environment, and the young consistently endanger the old in what are accountable, clearly challengeable notions of deviance and disorder. Of course there are other examples of the stereotypical profiling of vulnerability (Furedi, 1997, Furedi and Bristow, 2008), although these offer an example of the ease with which assumptions are made and the ‘potential’ for abuse or abusive behaviour is gauged. The way in which the public has regarded the adult who works with children or indeed any non-parental adult who connects with, speaks to or even vaguely interacts with a child, is representative of a swift and in many cases lazy appropriation of fear alongside a problematic disruption of moralistic categorisation.

The notion of moral panic (Cohen, 1972) has been applied earlier and its relevance is significant in this instance. There is a genuine argument here which attends to the notion that these highly deliberative models of abuser and victim are produced and sustained by a public thirst for some distorted perception of justice. There is almost a collective requirement for these traditional binaries of exploitation and vulnerability to be maintained, acting as they do as a moral compass for a population which continues to subscribe to conventional formulae. It is not only acceptable to suspect the stereotypically dominant, but
in many instances expected. Societal membership has often been defined by the visual and active endorsement of opposition, be this political, religious or more generally ideological. This continues to prove catastrophic in a variety of contexts, although the tendency in British settings to be less demonstrative about political, religious or ideological leaning has perhaps been reinterpreted in the collective and almost universal subscription to the ‘fight’ against child abuse. Is the take up of this particular moral panic simply a postmodern reaction to the dissolution of traditional standards? As Empire and conventional interpretations of a class system fall by the wayside, hierarchy is found in the cyclical demonization of a ‘dangerous’ group or subculture, poised to disrupt an equilibrium which is itself only superficially maintained (see Rickard, 2013). Given that this climate has been largely developed from an American model of moralistic litigation (Best, 1990, 1999), we can potentially allude here to a shared international redundancy in Anglo-American terms, leading to an environment which directs suspicion in a more metaphorical, representational sense, unable as it is to be aimed at a definable foe in an increasingly globalised marketplace.

The complexity of modern socio-political landscapes has manipulated normative conception, engendering a scenario in which opposition and support can only be guaranteed in the most obvious, unambiguous of contexts. As ideas surrounding Right and Left become increasingly enveloped by illegitimacy, corruption and egotism, the commitment to child protection remains universally upheld, giving an opportunity for an interpretation of democratic order in societies where this is deemed so fundamental. The collective and in many ways stabilising pledge to protect our children from demonic abusers is perhaps due in part to the banality of political discourse in contemporary settings. Passion and vitriol can be reignited by a public and cathartic outpouring of anger towards the mediums of abuse and, such is the rampant nature of this zeal, many innocent parties will be affected (Staksrud, 2013).
The problems do not necessarily lie here with the desire to challenge child abuse. They are instead embedded within the assumptions and misinformation which a movement perpetuated by collective outrage can invoke. In addition to this is the ease with which a population that holds such a simplistic interpretation of individual moral composition can be mollified and then manipulated. The narrative of ‘good and evil’ will be perpetuated by political bodies as it enables an obvious and almost exclusively favourable position to be adopted, thereby temporarily subduing public anger whilst contributing to self-interested political promotion (McCartan, 2004). The incentive on behalf of the general population and those responsible for policy and its implementation to perpetuate the idea that child sex abuse is an increasing public problem presents a number of complex challenges. Not only do adults who work with children become systematically marginalised, as their proximity to children continues to counter prevailing attitudes, but child abuse itself is often bypassed in favour of a cycle of personal victimisation. There has perhaps been a greater preoccupation with child abusers than there has with child abuse, sensationalising and revering these infamous figures of (inter)national hate. This has come in addition to a call to retroactively investigate instances or accusations of abuse, introducing a further interrogation and ultimate regulation of action alongside contemporary standards.

**Contemporary regulation and retrospective guilt**

There has been an interesting development in the last two years which has seen the revisiting of historical cases with a view to contemporary prosecution. This has in many cases provided ‘closure’ for victims of sexual abuse who have had to endure a protracted period of open ended turmoil, although there are a number of motivations for this sudden, extensive investigation which perhaps raise more questions than they answer. Beginning with the difficult and deeply
uncomfortable reality which points to institutionally entrenched neglect on behalf of a range of bodies, the decision to attempt to atone for the mistakes and wilful ignorance of the past might be seen as something of an affront to those affected (Furedi, 2014b). ‘New’ information about acts which are alleged to have taken place throughout the last four decades will remain partially speculative, as this movement becomes sharply representative of the increasing public angst which the subject of child abuse invokes and the subsequent misdirection of reaction. In addition to the difficulty which the authorities will have with attempting to achieve some semblance of justice, is the way that context is both wrongly applied or indeed ignored completely, in an all encompassing attempt to neatly and reductively prosecute on contemporary terms.

We can begin to discuss the role of state power and the increasing desire to regulate behaviour using methods the invasiveness of which are indicative of a particular and highly relevant urgency (see Garland, 2008, Hacking 1991). Although it may seem as though a retroactive attempt to control the action of individuals is the result of a rather abstract and ultimately superficial need to redeem some sense of diligence, the intensity with which this has been taken up identifies a notable shift in national perception. There has been little opposition to the opening of cases which have been ‘cold’ for many years, as the interrogative nature of social formation in current contexts demands that the ‘truth’ is reached. This has occurred alongside a very public narrative in which men of a certain age are consistently and ritualistically brought in for questioning and reasoned discretion is bypassed. Because these characters, developed and maintained by an exploitative media, are representative of an era in which behaviour of a far more dubious nature could and often did preside, a ravenous general public has been eager to see the transgressions of the 1970s punished. Celebrity figures who have been synonymous with the misogyny and sexual brutishness of a previous climate have been targeted and
pilloried here, their guilt or innocence often relegated to a side issue. There is little doubt that some of the individuals suspected under Operation Yewtree, the official inquiry into retrospective abuse claims, are guilty of acts including but not limited to, child sex abuse, however the mechanistic way in which certain types of people have been brought to the attention of police speaks of a pressure to convict which whilst urgent and categorical, lacks focus and often definition (Furedi, 2013, 2014b). This demonstrates our collective failure to deal with abuse, and its myriad consequences, as we are shown on a regular basis the empirical results of an existential discomfort.

There is a particular incoherence here which would perhaps point to the unmanageable nature of this problem. However what we often fail to recognise on an initial reading of this situation is the way in which the scenario is often carefully crafted by entities which retain an interest in the development of public and private opinion. The usefulness of Foucauldian ideas is clear in this instance, as the link between sexuality, modern power and a docile population becomes evident in the discourse surrounding historic misdemeanour.

Foucault has examined the preoccupation with sexuality (1980, 1988), which has itself been manifested in disapproval and repression, and the subsequent discursive retention of the subject as both a source and indicator of power flow, and it is possible to develop this concept as we interrogate incontestable sexual deviance. Whereas Foucault has explored the perpetuation of sexual narratives in a way which enables an identification of the mechanism of modern power, we are able to do the same in the discussion of the contemporary obsession with child sexual abuse. Outrage has been consistent here, as the idea of sexuality was, from the Enlightenment on, publically and socially suppressed, not welcome in polite circles, yet its ills were constantly articulated and subject to dogmatic denunciation (Rainbow, 1984). This has been reinterpreted yet echoed in modern contexts in the consistent and often sensationalised
dissection of adult/child impropriety, keeping the theme in the public imagination yet offering very little in the way of constructive counteraction. The difference here however, and it is a significant one, is that Foucault refers to sexuality in the legitimate sense, itself a generally positive expression, whereas contemporary preoccupations are focused predominantly on much darker, unacceptable perversions.

The simultaneous repression and perpetuation of a sexual discourse in previous eras has according to Foucault (1988) contributed to a unique and contemporarily exclusive form of individual and collective regulation. Whilst sexuality is overtly rejected, it flourishes in private, allowing populations to benefit from a regular release which offers an opportunity to engage in a (superficially) counter cultural rebellion, which remains no genuine threat to conventional order. Although aligning this with the subject of child sexual abuse seems not only difficult but also irresponsible, there is an inherently regulatory narrative embedded within our perception of and attempts to deal with this particular issue. Outrage has not only been engendered in innocent or well meaning concern, but it has also been deliberately cultivated by a number of pseudo benevolent entities, as the reactionary and rash intention is to rid the population of this menace by any means necessary. That this comes alongside a total disregard for a large number of detrimental consequences is a simple and dismissible aspect of a heavily regulatory practice.

Whilst there were perhaps religious and imperialistic motives to the social demonization of sexuality in previous generations, the bio-political imperatives in a wholesale attack on what remains a minority problem are relatively clear. The way in which those in Western contexts have almost universally subscribed to a categorical communal interrogation of the individuals that are deemed capable of abuse, is reminiscent of a carefully orchestrated yet ultimately opaque system of collective action. We have seen, through Foucault’s expansion
of bio-power and bio-politics (1977, 1979) that populations become motivated not by death, but by a collective consolidation of life, perhaps seduced by the sometimes illusionary notion of betterment. Whereas the public holistically functions in the interests of a controlling elite, this is often enacted under the auspices of some cohesive incentive, what is often overlooked, or indeed hidden from view, are the consequences of these deceptively utopian measures. As Cole et al. state (2004, p. 217) ‘Foucault makes the case that the technology of power concerned with improving the health of the population also produced and inscribed new forms of racism’, it is possible to see how the idealistic manipulation of groups can blur the eventual outcomes in favour of a predetermined yet haphazardly approached goal.

It is possible to convert the bio-political evocation of racism as tacitly evidenced in Foucault’s study of sexuality, to a context of adult marginalisation which has been embedded in the intergenerational discussion. As the bodily categorisation which Foucault discussed has taken place alongside racially divisive lines, emerging as a system of stratification based around social empowerment and submission, the management and control of adult behaviour has also undergone a process of prejudiced motivation. Whilst racial binarism (Cole et al, 2004) has represented the action of bio-politics, engendering suspicion and mistrust through stereotypical depiction, the sports coach or PE teacher in contemporary educational contexts has been similarly targeted. It should be mentioned however that although mistrust and subsequent associations have blighted the contemporary professional practices of teaching staff, there are more immovable systems of discursive manipulation in force here. Just as race has been defined and deconstructed alongside deep seated fears, with difference illuminated and exaggerated in the interests of hierarchical dominance, the restrictions placed upon PE teachers enable a hegemonic and largely representational process of oppression to be maintained.
Mistrust, suspicion and stereotyping are products of an elite need to ensure that convention and traditional interpretations of stratified power are perpetuated (Furedi, 2004).

Indeed, the parallels which can be drawn up between the treatment of ethnic minorities in supposedly ‘liberal’ contexts and the consistent degradation of adults who are forced to make physical contact with children are notable. We have mentioned above the teachers’ recognition of the collective need to adapt and mobilise, omitted as they are from any dialogue which focuses on everyday practice, and this disenfranchisement has been seen the world over in the formative tension between Imperialism and Diaspora (Ben-Rafael, 2013). Mobilisation amongst the oppressed is a visceral reminder of the systematic enforcement of an ideological, political or religious approach and whilst the concern which surrounds adult/child contact is perhaps not as overt as an American Segregationist doctrine, it is arguably as damaging. It is fitting that teaching staff have reacted to a situation characterised by more subtly coercive techniques of management by gradually and intelligently adapting themselves. They have met the challenges of context with an approach which echoes the tactics of the initial domineer. Yet they have not only met the challenges engendered in a reaction to subjugation, but also gone beyond the significant restrictions which have been placed upon them. Just as Dr Martin Luther King Jr. advocated non violent protest (Alvarez, 1988) in an era in which violence and legitimately forcible uprising could have been warranted, the teachers interviewed appear to have simultaneously adopted the rigours and requirements of a preventative landscape whilst maintaining their pledge to offer guidance and mentoring to children. However, this does not include the accused, many of whom have been forced out of teaching, thereby contributing to statistics which encourage a carefully nuanced approach to contemporary professionalism.
**Intergenerational tension and its ‘post’ signifiers**

There are a variety of reasons why the climate of fear which presides in contemporary intergenerational contexts can be seen as ‘alternative’ in both enforcement and reaction. It is a fear unlike more conventional moral panics, as it is a wholesale, evolutionary concern which has risen swiftly to dictate thought and action on an unprecedented level (Bell, 2000, Cohen, 2002). The notion has in addition, engendered a multifaceted and complex retaliation from PE staff, whose survivalist and positively reactionary adaptation has shown a collective intelligence in an arena of particular adversity. Indeed the idea of ‘convention’ when discussing this issue remains misleading, as both the proliferation of preventative measures and the defence of civil liberties in an atmosphere of increasing surveillance and invasion have been forced to adopt strikingly different approaches. Rather than simply subscribing to a nominally ideological socio-ethical position, the population has been influenced by a system of moralistic persuasion (Clapton et al, 2012). This has become untenable, based as it is upon a disturbing and unsettling reality. There are numerous restrictive and illiberal by-products of this, yet they are consistently overshadowed by the existential difficulty which populations have with the idea of child molestation.

The subject is and will remain inherently challenging, although there has been an apparent exploitation of this fear which encourages new systems of dominance to emerge. Referred to above, these illusionary structures are a move beyond autocratic and even democratic rule as they engage subjects with the production of dominance (Brunton, 2003). Child sexual abuse is a theme of particular relevance in contemporary settings as it both intrigues and controls the population in ways that appeal to humanistic concern and individual fear. The parameters are naturally narrow as any transgression carries grave consequences for collectively constructed identities. There has been an entropic process of adherence, as the societal groups which have been exposed to a
narrative of adult/child difficulty have little recourse but to comply enthusiastically and productively with an attack not just upon child abuse, but also its threat, and the fragmented, indirectly divisive results of this.

Whilst there have been oppressive regimes of dominance which have engendered a similarly widespread adherence (see Bauman, 1986, 1989), the dictatorial deliverance and often dubious political agendas which many have supported saw to it that such movements have remained fallible. The significant distinction which can be made between fascism and the climate of intergenerational fear is one of legitimacy. Racial hatred and ideological bent will ultimately be exposed, their irrationality proving too fundamental to disguise. However the desire to combat child sexual abuse is not in and of itself, problematic. The mere fact that contemporary environments have benevolence at their forefront not only distorts any negative consequences, of which we have seen there are many, but also invites the utilisation of the notion for self serving, intelligently exploitative gain.

**The 'status' of touch in contemporary PE**

Given the objective tension between an ability to act without inhibition in the name of instruction and the climate which prevails in intergenerational contexts, it would be easy for a practice as risky and potentially problematic as touch to be wholly eradicated. Physical contact, in its various forms, has however not completely disappeared, as we see its tentative and often awkward realisation played out in the most unavoidable of instances (Caulfield, 2000, Guldberg, 2009, Johnson, 2011). That it has not, or indeed cannot be entirely banished from the practical realities of PE teaching is not only a demonstrative example of the irrationality of modern fears but also reinforces an argument for the counteraction of measures which reduce touch to a clumsy, wholly unsatisfactory aspect of interaction. The intensity of debate surrounding the
requirement for touch in PE has left the action in a state of flux, as teachers, aware of its necessity yet fearful to engage with a pupil freely and without the due care and attention demanded by modern standards, become unable to instruct coherently or clearly. Considering the future of touch remains difficult as the action in a PE teaching context continues to be redefined according to the pressure enforced by an agitated population (Scott, 2013, Sikes and Piper, 2010). Whilst it is unlikely that any official ruling will be made on the subject, unavoidable as it is in many instances, as the weight of public opinion seems to inexorably rise the idea will stay under significant discursive pressure. Touch may be wholly legitimate under the auspices of absent ruling, yet the tacit encouragement to ‘exercise common sense’ when contacting children, the demand to remain ‘aware of gender’ and how contact is perceived by witnesses, constantly undermines the idea that teachers are able to exercise any semblance of individual interpretation.

There are a number of existential crises present within the processing of touch in contemporary settings, and the fact that these are not accounted for in an inherently preventative landscape presents distinct challenges for those attempting to assess the future of adult/child contact. Narratives which either support the avoidance of touch, itself the prevailing and often necessary position, or those which support the freedom of the teacher, the marginal and underexplored alternative, are representative of an inability to explore this tension, as intervention appears urgent on both sides.

A categorical and distanced aversion to touch in a context which demands it is, as explored, overtly counterproductive, yet an approach which advocates an unrestrained, unregulated climate of intergenerational contact would be naive in current settings. Although there is a strong argument which would promote more open teaching styles, the environment that prevails essentially prohibits this and to appeal for the implementation of such an approach would overlook a
number of key factors. With this in mind, there were encouraging references during the interviews to the de-stigmatising of touch through the recognition of its necessity on behalf of both teacher and pupil, as John states: ‘I'll be totally open and overt with that. Because it's a real dodgy state of affairs when you get to a stage where you can't, when someone's feeling down in the dumps, give them a pat on the back and say "Come on, chin up". And Corrine adds: ‘Sometimes you just say "is it alright if I just hold your arm there", and they're like "oh yeah, sure". And they'll say "yeah, sure, not a problem". Because like ... as long as you do it with a couple and they know it's not just them being singled out’.

Demonstrating an awareness of the need to adopt elements of both positions, the teachers and students reinforce the requirement to engage with those directly affected by public outrage and discursive pressure, rather than simply assume that ‘knee-jerk’ intervention (Staksrud, 2013) is the most prudent solution. Many child protection policies consistently fail to address the emotional sophistication of pupils or indeed the complexities which adults face when they are expected to act in a pedagogically effective and professional manner, despite this being made mutually exclusive by the prevailing climate. There is an inherent need to grant teachers and pupils access to this dialogue in a way which benefits from their experiences, as they encounter the often troubling realities of contemporary interaction on a daily basis.

Our collective fixation with separating the two groups, in a sense enacting a form of figurative and literal segregation, has taken place without an understanding of the effects of this at the ‘ground level’. Making children and adults into diametric opposites has however occurred under the auspices of child welfare, placing the notion firmly within a misguided interpretation of progression. If this continues, a likelihood given the dominant narratives in Western media (Best, 1999, Bolen, 2001, Cottle, 2006) and interests of large-
scale, morally entrepreneurial charities (Furedi, 2014a, Piper and Stronach, 2008), there will be little value in a consultation with students and teachers, as their respective consciousness will be too heavily inured in this discourse of separation and prevention. It is then imperative to harness the views and contributions of PE staff in a way which expands upon their insightful yet contextually tentative call for a greater engagement between teachers, pupils and those responsible for welfare and intervention.

There has been a routine failure of child protection measures to gauge the suitability or efficacy of various schemes with even a cursory glance towards the opinions, wishes and empirical experiences of children themselves (see James et al, 1998). Intervention has appeared swiftly and broadly and is largely in the interests of risk and blame avoidance and overshadows any genuine attempt to explore the dangers which children face. The Disclosure and Barring Service (formerly known as Criminal Records Bureau Checking or CRB) is a pertinent example. The approach, a blanket movement designed to extract those with ‘previous’ misdemeanours against their name, is indiscriminate in its exclusion, as any crime which is highlighted prohibits the individual from working with children and indeed a host of other vocations. In addition this measure has been forced upon those with the most peripheral of connections to children. One particularly memorable example comes from the British tree surgeon whose work within the grounds of a school required him to undergo an enhanced check (Appleton, 2012). That he would almost certainly have no contact with children, spending the majority of his time up a tree, is beside the point, he operates within the vicinity of vulnerable young people and therefore his threat must be assessed. It is always possible to draw attention to the ludicrous in this context, although we should perhaps direct more attention at the absolutism which surrounds the attempted prevention of child abuse and furthermore the protection of children in a world where genuine danger is often overlooked.
This terrain is one of significant instability, and there is legitimate call for a move away from the wholesale, alarmist approaches to the management of child protection towards a more understanding environment, itself not motivated wholly by fear. This is generally speaking a relatively obvious proposal to make, however the difficulty with which such a shift will be enacted reminds us of the durability of public opinion and indeed the lengths to which it has been exploited by interests which have lucratively identified this (Furedi, 2014a, Furedi and Bristow, 2008). The cultivation of fear, both deliberate and accidental, goes so far beyond the protection of children that it becomes hard to coherently link policy and intent in many instances. Often methods of pacification, the way in which children have become the focus of various interventions has seen their future fought over and utilised in the name of adult preservation. They are frequently patronised and sheltered, yet rarely engaged with or listened to, giving them a lot more in common with the adults who are viewed as their most potent threat. We continue to separate these two, representative as they are as the groups most inherently affected by a clumsily enacted succession of concern.

There is great potential in a collaborative analysis here although the prevailing systems of thought will continually block such an engagement. The idea of adults and children working together in anything other than a predetermined, proscriptive context presents far too many variables for a society which simply cannot cope under such conditions. Whilst there have been nominal attempts to create a more ‘adult environment’ in state secondary schools (McCafferty, 2010, Morrison, 2010), with the advent of student councils and elected representatives, these efforts divert attention from the increasing reluctance, and furthermore inability, to attempt to understand the processes and pressures which inhabit the experiences of developing adolescents. There has been reference made earlier to the ‘marketisation’ of schools and the transformation
of traditional comprehensives into hothouses for vaguely corporate agendas (Smith and Abbott, 2014). Attention should therefore be given to the paradoxical desire to make children into adults quickly and conveniently whilst failing to treat them as such, as notions of protection, intent and progress are counterproductively mismatched.

The damaging influence of a wholesale approach to child protection, itself based upon a collectively engendered, self-sustaining public fear, has been simultaneously exacerbated by a culture of micro-management in schools and equivalent contexts (Piper and Smith, 2003, Wainwright, 2002). This has had alternatively enacted yet similarly constraining consequences for those in intergenerational professions, as a close and often intense system of scrutiny gives practical reinforcement to a newly streamlined manifestation of previously general concern. The dual process which is in operation here not only gives an indication of the emphasis which contemporary attitudes towards child safety can invoke, but also demonstrates the diversity with which modern notions of constraint are associated. The ways by which an apparently contradictory system of restriction can coalesce here, identifies the unintentional yet often consolidating effect of a socially dangerous interpretation of fear, and its myriad forms of realisation. Difficult as it is to undermine what is a haphazard but organically resilient social process, organised opposition becomes a necessity.
Chapter XI
Concluding Remarks
Aspects to consider

Intervention is required, although the institutions already in place and the cultural systems which support them make an obvious strategy difficult to propose. With this in mind the following suggestions have been devised under the auspices of an inherently changeable environment, although they also attempt to call for a genuinely feasible approach to reformatory provocation in education and elsewhere. The four following suggestions are linked and potentially enable the introduction of an idea, followed by a call for its realisation in empirical terms. It is hoped that rather than simply propose that attitudes and cultural affectation should be fundamentally realigned in a utopian shift, we can suggest with judgement and subtlety the procedures to be followed, to affect contemporary implementation.

(i) Trust in staff should equal commitment to child protection. The disproportionate attention given to the perpetuation of a ‘safe’ environment which is often motivated by self-protection has subsequently positioned all teachers as potential abusers. Trust cannot be fostered in an atmosphere of such vehement prohibition and prevention and genuine steps should be made to reverse this.

The idea of trust in contemporary education is particularly complex. Whereas parents will largely send their children to school safe in the knowledge that they will be appropriately taught by a professional mindful of the behavioural standards of the time, there appears little room for implicit, unconditional trust to flourish in modern settings (Weber, 2009, Young, 2009). It is difficult to simultaneously maintain the obligatory child protection requirements and allow PE staff to function with complete autonomy, as the pressure to remain transparent and free from accusation is far too great. Whereas the teacher may
be granted some nominal liberties, the majority of conduct is closely monitored in various forms, often bypassing trust entirely and instilling a problematic culture which undermines individual choice. Teachers begin to lose an organic sense of distance and instead become inured in a heavily regulated system of procedural interaction. Without trust, the pedagogical aspects of PE teaching and their developmental effect are left out of the process, as teachers entering the profession are forced to perform consistently but without any coherent marker of progress or improvement (Piper et al, 2012). The opportunity to exercise initiative or indeed learn independently is overwhelmed by the implication that PE staff represent hazardous entities whose threat must be extinguished.

It is clear, through the intensity of regulation in its overt and more subtle manifestations that PE teachers are simply not trusted. The public perception surrounding their role has shifted dramatically. Previously seen as adequate parental substitutes, any sense of communal duty or managerial status has been inherently undermined. Levels of responsibility have also notably dropped, as greater scrutiny and the dilution of risk by increasing staff presence create an environment in which room for ‘error’ is categorically diminished (O’Malley Halley, 2007, Piper et al, 2013, Sikes and Piper, 2010). There is real need to stop regarding adult workers as dangerous and allow them the ability to grow into their position on their own terms, without patronising or ‘spoon feeding’ them in order to stay within the narrow parameters of contemporary acceptability. This will however not happen if the existential concern and almost prerequisite doubt is pandered to by a regime of continuous checking, external interference, and the encouragement of divisive methods of internal regulation.

By re-engaging with the narratives which reinforced the teachers position as a leader and mentor whose expertise was to be socially recognised, and also remaining aware of the modern imperatives which surround the notion of
adult/child interaction, teachers and schools have the opportunity to invoke questions about current practice in a bid to alter prevailing trends. Whereas trust in teachers was previously implicit (Kehily, 2010), it has gone from one difficult extreme to another, and this has proved problematic. By combining the collective recognition of the teachers legitimate role as a communally cohesive figure of respect and authority, and an admission that it is not only unwise but also unfeasible to contend that ‘free reign’ be given to contemporary practitioners, there is room for a change in attitudes. However the question over how this will be implemented remains troubling. Attitudes which are motivated by a largely irrational fear are not only hard to remove but also hard to define, and the introduction of policy which for example calls for greater interaction between teachers and pupils is, despite being a positive move, in sharp opposition to the discursive separation which is currently being provoked and upheld.

By positioning this call within a context of child safety it becomes possible to engender change in a way which appeals to the protective nature of a concerned population. The ‘return to the relational’ in physical education should perhaps be encouraged under the auspices of a contemporarily parental narrative, as teachers objectively represent one consistent source of adult contact, physical and otherwise, outside of a familial environment. Developing the idea that it is ‘better the devil you know’ we can begin to promote the value of adult/child interaction by strengthening understanding and debunking the myths which are associated with such a relationship, perhaps linking parents, pupils and teachers together in a heavily communicative, dialogue based appropriation of school sport. This could manifest itself as a suggestion from the NUT and other teaching unions, engaging with parents in a way which accepts their concerns and offers a genuine alternative to the current system of divisive, isolationist suspicion. Whilst the idea of a union led campaign may appear to provide only notional support to teaching staff, the professionalism and focus
which has manifested itself in a union that has been forced to reinvent itself, like many others, (see Stevenson, 2007) speaks to a modern public on a level which reflects and attempts to diminish concern.

(ii) The inevitable discomfort which adult/child contact invokes should be fully confronted by staff, parents, governors and policy makers. The issue is often avoided for fear of accusation, but without recognising that there are tensions inherent in PE teaching there remains far greater danger of misunderstanding and the indirect facilitation of abuse.

An interesting aspect of the situation resident in contemporary teaching is the way in which fear and suspicion are maintained by the public difficulty with adult/child interaction, though this difficulty is itself rarely interrogated. There are pertinent and in many cases revealing questions associated with why we are so driven by intergenerational tension yet, discomfort being as wholesale as it is, any removal from this narrative in the interests of a ‘neutral’ investigation is simply met with further suspicion (Honoré, 2008, Kincaid, 1998). By confronting the problematic methods by which we process relationships, contact, or communication between adult and child, an opportunity arises to increase our understanding of the role which irrationality plays in this, and also attempt to foster a less divisive and more empathetic landscape for adult workers.

Although self-scrutiny has manifested itself in a regulatory context during the development of the current climate, it is important to disrupt this and view our actions and behaviour in a newly educative sense. We restrict ourselves with interpretations of protection and transparency yet by regarding this as counterproductive it becomes possible to highlight some of the problems associated with modern practice in a way that affects our collective consciousness and potentially precipitates some embryonic resistance. The
problem resides in the significance placed upon self-protection. Accusation is a markedly damaging prospect in contemporary environments and the reluctance to expose oneself to this has perhaps distorted a personal commitment to the maintenance of innocence (Garratt et al, 2013, Jenkins, 1998). Indeed it would be unwise to bypass the systems of individual exoneration which have become so established here, as the atmosphere which presides would take advantage of such a cavalier approach, making punishment and its broadcast a priority. The more that this is undermined by the rational discussion of contemporary preoccupations with child sexual abuse, the easier it will be to exercise autonomy in intergenerational settings. However it remains difficult to envisage a strategy by which this dialogue is initiated without provoking misguided furore.

Although this call has been made previously and in additional contexts, collaboration between parents, teachers, governors and indeed children that is aware of and to an extent prioritises the existence of intergenerational tension, will potentially allow a less interrogative environment to emerge. Being chiefly and often exclusively concerned with child safety and the punishment of those who compromise this, has entirely ignored what are far reaching consequences for the wrongly accused (Jones et al, 2013, Kemshall and Weaver, 2012), and although apologies will be frequently proffered, these do little to upset a trend which continues to operate in the absence of any legitimate scrutiny. By encouraging a more measured understanding of the complexities of modern intergenerational contexts there is the possibility to engage with consideration as we process claims and rumour thereby limiting or at least delaying the damage which is inflicted with considerable regularity. It appears that in current settings, the parent, governor, and teacher are all solely concerned with child protection. Whist this remains an important objective, the way in which it manifests itself, often resulting in the profiling of adult workers is evidently contrary to the original intentions of these interested groups. Children remain
unprotected and the incentive to enter professions which are of benefit to them routinely decreases. Whereas there are other factors resident in this, it is clear that a great many of the failings of contemporary child protection are rooted in an inability to approach, let alone confront the issue of child sexual abuse in rational terms, and offer the contention that our preoccupation with its prevention over all else is excessive. As Garratt et al (2013, p. 627) state:

While safeguarding policy and practice may have its genesis in the concept of child welfare and child protection, its recent teleology points to ongoing fear and confusion, in which the collective and individual balance struck by coaches, between caution and safeguarding on the one side, and performance and enjoyment on the other, has been fundamentally affected.

The irony here lies in the way in which each party is so acutely aware of the tension that adult/child contact elicits, yet their time is taken up by the often superficial demonstration of a commitment to the eradication of child sexual abuse. Indeed this knowledge has become so heavily ingrained, difficulty will often arise in the absence of any intergenerational wrongdoing, as a highly charged atmosphere of interactional fragility forces mistakes to be made, fingers to be pointed, and blame to be assigned. Indeed the negative consequences of a system which perpetuates personal fear and public crusade are far reaching. Not only does this create a notable disparity between the legitimacy of child protection initiatives and the instinctive self-interest of those who call for them but it also encourages fear to work on a whole new level. Whilst it functions in an overt sense, manifested in the general difficulty society has with adult/child contact, both innocent and abusive, it also affects individuals in a highly internalised way.

The subject engenders a complex organisation of thought which centres around self-doubt in the first instance and self-protection in the second, whilst all the time keeping this hidden from a society which suffers from the same internal
dilemma. Candid dialogue about the existential discomfort and distortion which is characterised by the notion of child sexual abuse will potentially articulate some of the problems which a tension between public disposition and private anxiety provokes, with a view towards adjusting the way in which we approach this in both a collective and individual sense. Implementation which diminishes the significance of this discussion is unlikely to be facilitated, thereby invoking the displeasure of a society which continues to demand more robust child protection policies, although there is perhaps more value in expressing the genuine risk which is posed by a climate of inhibitory fear.

Making the dangers of a sterile, non-tactile environment visible to parents, politicians, senior members of staff and governors will perhaps enable intervention to be made which offers an outlet for teachers to discuss their restriction under the auspices of a narrative of child welfare. The message that children are endangered by intergenerational reticence, which is an empirical and identifiable truth in modern contexts, will in effect force controlling entities to regard recent discourse on adult/child interaction as problematic. Whilst this has obvious benefits for the pupils, as learning becomes less proscriptive and more conducive to organic development, the internal turmoil which is engendered by the notion of adult/child contact in an atmosphere of suspicion is also significantly moderated. We should take into account the generation of adult/child discomfort here and propose a new method of capturing the attention of a public which may be more malleable than at first glance. Although it will be difficult to launch any sort of ‘campaign’ which calls for greater understanding of a very real process of adult marginalisation, it is possible to address this during the recruitment of prospective teachers. Discussing contemporary difficulties at the earliest stage of staff recruitment will potentially foster the development of an interdependent community of Newly Qualified Teachers which values and furthermore necessitates the breakdown of attitudes
which perpetuate distorted hysteria, making healthy interaction and exchange between teacher and pupil a professional and then societal priority.

Whereas teachers are made aware of the dangers of accusation and the contemporary significance of contact during training periods (Hunter-Jones and Hunter-Jones, 2007, Wainwright, 2002) this dialogue remains wholly within a context of risk aversion. Teachers are therefore more adept at negotiating blame and perpetuating transparency, yet continue to overlook the reasons behind this important aspect of their professional make-up (Owen and Gillentine, 2011). Replacing what has been a pervasive process of conditioning with a programme of teacher education which confronts the realities of modern intergenerational settings, has the potential to shift pedagogical focus from the disciplinary to the informative. Thereby affording the teachers opportunity to both prepare for an environment of intense regulation and also explore and question such a landscape.

(iii) Teachers, who have identified these difficulties by dint of their exposure to them, are in a position to respond to the prevailing climate through collective collaboration. Whilst the base fears which provoke the alarmism surrounding intergenerational touch may be hard to eradicate, teaching staff have credible grievances in contemporary contexts. A clear, methodical broadcast of the inequities which now inhabit the profession should be a priority.

Exposing teachers to the inevitable difficulties which inhabit modern schooling at an early, even introductory stage will encourage a consolidation of the professional collectivism which has been alluded to during the interviewing process. PE staff are by some margin the most qualified to discuss the tensions resident in intergenerational interaction, however their rhetorical status as
potential abusers has largely negated any attempt to express the genuine problems which affect adult and child alike. In combining with each other in an ideological and active sense, teachers are able to disrupt their characterisation as would-be exploiters in the first instance, and then come together to elicit genuine reformation based on the incontestable realities of modern practice. Both steps in this process are equally as important, as rhetorical change brings about an accommodation of ‘truth’ and indeed vice versa (Dreyfus and Rainbow, 1984, Foucault, 1977, 1979). Audiences and in this case a relatively potent general public are far more receptive to the publication of evidence which corroborates their collective opinion. Contradiction is unlikely to be welcomed when the direction of prevalent thought appears to galvanise a sense of communal outrage in such a way. In addition, the way in which PE staff are so heavily influenced in both practical and cognitive senses, can present a convincing argument for the investigation of a climate in which marginalisation has been indirectly enabled. That the negative consequences of invasive regulation are themselves responsible for the exacerbation of danger to children in many contexts will also contribute to the depiction of the contemporary challenges for adult workers, engaging a narrative which (accurately) highlights the disproportionate attention given to child protection in modern education. Drawing focus towards the disingenuous nature of ‘child protection’ in this environment will hopefully provide a more sustainable system for the adult workers and also enforce a necessary examination of the way in which approaches to this ‘child protection’ in macro and micro contexts are devised and subsequently managed. Teachers represent an ideal, and in many ways unique community in contemporary settings, as their consistent and inevitable contact with children offers them unparalleled knowledge and authority. They have the necessary insight to interrogate the way in which child protection has been distorted under current circumstances.
If a credible, organised and coherent movement can be initiated, one that broadcasts the plight of the PE staff in amongst this climate of accusation, there may be a genuine chance to significantly question contemporary practice with regards to safety, conduct and interaction. Indeed the tactical juxtaposition of a population disproportionately preoccupied with punitive ‘justice’ and a reasonable, relatable community of maligned adult workers will enable the interrogation of a rhetorical prevalence which appears to be losing its legitimacy. Not only will this provide a powerful antidote to the rampant dispersal of panic driven narratives, but through a more thoughtful process of dealing with claims and suspicion it also becomes possible to expose real abuse, as the distortion which a ‘knee jerk’ culture invokes is diluted. Whilst it would be fair to describe a great deal of the media reportage and subsequent promotional material utilised by charities and interest groups as propaganda (Bauman, 2006, Cottle, 2006, Furedi, 2014a), the reality of the contemporary challenges which affect PE staff will make interesting, objectively accurate and topically relevant reading. Such is the public obsession with the notion of child abuse, it is perhaps possible to capture the attention of a majority by simply making reference to the subject (Cohen, 2002). Whereas dutiful concern may encourage a first glance, the efficacy of the content matter, in this instance a process of professional disruption, will hopefully begin to realign current thought. Indeed additional integrity is given to this approach by the redundancy of exaggeration and the consistency of argument, two factors which have not been evident in the proliferation of child abuse stories.

The relative inability to directly capitalise out of news which by definition opposes sensationalism does little to incentivise the extensive publication of such a narrative. However as sensationalist moral crusading continues to damage the innocent, and we have seen that this is an inevitability; our collective patience with a communicative atmosphere which facilitates this will wane. As has been discussed by Furedi (2002, 2014b) and others, the manner
in which there is now a tendency to construct crimes rather than report them is a clear and deeply concerning indication that the police and government forces are being influenced by a rhetorical pressure to accuse and then punish. This represents the blurring of the lines between reality and artifice, the consequences of which go far beyond the rumour and aspersion that largely precipitates investigation. The point here is that there is a rational, accountable and productively simplistic alternative to narratives which have varied in accuracy, consistency or balance, and it is one that governing bodies would directly benefit from exploring. That the genuine challenges which PE teachers face are not necessarily newsworthy in the same way as the lurid defamation of a former celebrity, does not inhibit the potency of a message which can be transmitted in the action and movement of PE staff as a collective, schools in a more general sense, and parents who are by now perhaps beginning to tire of an incessant and socially prerequisite position of concern (Curtis, 2009, Garland, 2008).

Rather than do battle with sensationalism in the media, the presentation of a professional solidarity and clear, coherent focus within an intergenerational setting which can offer great benefit to children and adolescents, will provide an obvious and much needed alternative to the process of personal degradation and public fear which inhabits contemporary contexts. Whilst this may be difficult to implement immediately, especially given the current tendency for contradictory curricular trends, the collective voice of the PE teachers will be heard through a persistent and methodical campaign. Calling upon publication in both academic and non-academic terms, union mobilisation, conversation with parents and governors, and greater engagement with those responsible for intervention in education, who themselves have an interest to support this movement, there can at least be a recognition that this issue is of considerable urgency.
Collaboration amongst teaching staff is a welcome development here, as the construction of an atmosphere of mutual support within an environment which is at a fundamental level concerned with the welfare and well-being of children, creates a far more respectful, inclusive and open educational climate. Whilst it would be asserted that these three elements are already present in state schooling, and indeed comprise the bedrock of provision in many cases (Hatcher, 2014, Kenway and Bullen, 2001), the discussion of respect, inclusivity and openness in an environment which checks and regulates with alarming consistency represents a number of hypocrisies. That PE staff are subject to a patronising divesting of responsibility in modern contexts removes any notion of professionalism and actively undermines a sense of teaching identity in a way which makes collaborative effort on behalf of staff members not only highly credible but also a testament to their ultimate commitment to the preservation of a legitimate intergenerational workspace.

(iv) Whilst change is desired, there is also value in a return to previous incarnations of student/teacher interaction, in which the subject was not overshadowed by multi faceted fear. ‘Re-prioritising’ PE may contribute to making touch a benign, accepted aspect of a part of education which is regarded as increasingly significant.

There has been considerable discussion of the existence of and perceived need for change and progression in educational practice (see Davies, 2002, Gillham and Thompson, 1996, McCafferty, 2010); however, the thought of a return to the approaches of previous generations has been largely omitted. This has not in fact been wholly deliberate, as there is the possibility of a debate around the extent to which I have been influenced by modern standards, as a call for change has seemingly overlooked any insight which could be taken from historical practice. Negative association and the ultimate characterisation of an
era which was not beholden to the interactional codes of today has perhaps taken place here, as the thrust of the argument looks beyond both current and previous models in a bid to devise some late-modern solution to the issue at hand. The problem with an attempt to disregard both past and present is engendered in the utopian projection which influences a great deal of deconstruction. We may superficially shy away from the realities which came before, however a complete divorce remains impossible and the ideal scenarios which we describe in minute detail are often inescapably retrospective.

Dealing with this tendency to look back in a way which embraces previous method can encourage a more well rounded contention when we begin to propose alternatives. Freely admitting that there are distinct advantages to the de-stigmatisation of adult/child contact by referencing past practice enables the implementation of contemporary reform to benefit from hindsight. There is great potential for a ‘rose tinted’ perception of the sixties, seventies and eighties, where behavioural lines between teacher and pupil forgave physicality and touch, yet it should be remembered that these years were for many, highly problematic. Accepting the inevitability of tactile interaction is one thing, yet the characterisation of PE during the mid to late Twentieth century paints for some, a picture of violence and brutality (see Gray and O’Carroll, 2013, Kirk and Spiller, 1994).

The discipline has moved on, along with standards of interaction more generally, although the way in which PE was prioritised during previous eras has been lost in contemporary contexts. There is now a disproportionate level of attention given to evasive process, as PE teachers must prepare spaces for a lesson which meets meticulous modern demands in both physical and figurative senses. The tangible action which ‘school sport’ surely promises is routinely delayed by an adherence to the social codes and adult reticence which now prevail. Not only does this frustrate any attempt to encourage a regime of
physical movement for children (who may not otherwise exercise), it also contributes to a ‘de-skilling’ of PE staff. Removal of responsibility through a notion of damage limitation diminishes the potential for PE teaching to become a craft, as the practical approaches which are encouraged from an early stage reduce initiative and independence. There may have been significant failings throughout the latter portion of the Twentieth century, although we cannot remove the PE teachers of this time from a distinctly sporting context, in which athletic engagement and the subsequent development of young people within this was elemental. Sport is however now an afterthought for PE staff, as the necessary safety procedures and other methods of self-protection must be complied with.

Looking back with a view to look forward can perhaps enable a ‘re-prioritisation’ of PE, in which the discipline itself and the athletic motivations which lay at its foundation are once again given the attention deserved. Although this may appear speculative, even utopian given the comment above, engaging with a narrative which places significance on sport, will potentially lead to the demystification of adult/child contact, as the act becomes recognised as a natural and unavoidable aspect of practice, and not the uncomfortable, highly charged aberration that it is currently regarded as (Piper, Duggan and Rogers, 2013).

Whereas I am calling here for a return to the sport driven agendas of the past, I have thus far done so with a residual recognition of the role of progression within all this, and the way in which a balance between previous method and contemporary reform will move the discipline forward. My reluctance to suggest a complete return to pedagogy which mirrors the practice of the past speaks of a tension resident in my own consciousness and indeed the consciousness of the era which I unintentionally represent. Given the changes which have undergone the relational dynamic between adult and child over the time we discuss here, it is perhaps not possible to apply previous approaches to modern
contexts, as acceptability, accountability and the pseudo-parental role have all been realigned. Yet the way in which the complexity and sensitivity which surrounds adult/child contact toady was absent, is surely worthy of some investigation.

My additional unwillingness to accept the past as a viable pedagogical tool is indeed further evidence of the motivations behind such a shift in the opposite direction, towards a culture in which nurture is desired yet rarely attained as the difficulty we have with previous misdemeanour renders us relationally sterile. Whilst we display this collective shame on a practical and deeply personal level, the way in which we judge past action upon the standards of today obscures any constructive educational retrospective and contributes to a widening of the gulf between adult and child in contemporary contexts. It is as if we have identified that past behaviour contained some problematic elements yet our fear and self-disgust has encouraged a reactionary move away from this, without any actual interrogation of the climate which we became so afraid and ashamed of. By confronting the past without the rigorous adherence to modern pressure and the vocal disgust which this engenders, we can explore the adult/child dynamic in ways that are both refreshing and novel.

There may never be an opportunity to return to an atmosphere which circumvents the hysteria that surrounds adult/child interaction, yet steps can be taken to moderate the intensity of role and significance of action in PE teaching, as we attempt to look beyond the manipulation, distortion, and accusation which has enveloped intervention. Indeed one of the main shortcomings of recent approaches to ‘reformation’ in PE and other intergenerational professions is the predominance of fear. How can we be expected to address a climate of suspicion and mistrust if the very methods and materials of modification are themselves the products of such discomfort?
There was earlier reference to the reinterpretation of fear under modern constructs, in which its previous incarnation as a device used primarily in the name of role appropriation has undergone a significant, far reaching transition. The way in which fear now dictates and controls rather than simply illustrates, represents some of the fundamental difficulties which adults face in contemporary environments, as they are doubted and suspected by a population which is beholden to a movable, organic discomfort. Fear has seemingly mutated from a relatively benign source of categorisation into a far more potent vehicle of manipulative change. There is subsequently great value in challenging what is an orthodoxy of alarmism, encouraging teachers, pupils and parents to contribute to the undermining of a fear based climate by disengaging with its composite methods. Previous approaches essentially pandered to fear by dispensing it amongst a hierarchical system of stratification, where teachers, schools, social class and pupils all fell into highly disciplined arrangement, fulfilling the public need for a stable exploitation of emotional fragility. Now the boundaries of role are far more convoluted and inhabited by a fear which remains ethereal and indistinct, yet still holds sway over the population at large with an almost hypnotic influence. It is less visible yet far more invasive, moving transcendentally amongst space, time and population. There is an urgent need to disable this mechanism if we are to address the charging of adult/child contact in contemporary PE, and this can begin with a simple call for rationality and dialogue in an educational climate which need not be so complex.
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Appendix 1: Publication
Appendix 2: Semi-structured interview schedule
Very semi-structured interviews

(Heads of Dept)

1. Introduction and explanation of the research.

2. How the school deals with issues of touch, (don’t want to get too bogged down with issues of force and control which might happen in the secondary setting – many guidelines already available) focussing more on day to day practice including routine and friendly type of touching.

3. Guidelines they are familiar with, guidelines they currently implement (including any informal guidelines).

4. Any critical incidents they are aware of in the setting, elsewhere, the media etc. and whether this has directly informed practice and experience.

5. Personal opinion of current practice in the setting - what’s helping and hindering.

6. Are they happy with the direction things seem to be moving in (ie presumably away from spontaneous touch).

7. Suggestions on how to improve any guidelines/code of conduct in terms of practice.

8. Ask about facilitating access to other staff and for group interview.

(Teachers/Focus Groups)

1. Introduction and explanation of the research.

2. Their understanding of how their setting deals with issues of touch, (as above re force and control) focussing more on the everyday routine, friendly type of touching and sports practice.

3. Guidelines they are familiar with and implement (including any informal).

4. Any critical incidents they are aware of in the setting, elsewhere, the media etc. and how this has affected their practice and experience.
5. Personal opinion of current practice in the setting - what’s helping and hindering.

6. Are they happy with the direction things seem to be moving in (ie presumably further away from spontaneous touch).

7. What would help.

N.B. Focus groups should consider these issues, yet a more free flowing dialogue should be allowed for.