



THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

## PROTECTION OF AUTHOR'S COPYRIGHT

This copy has been supplied by the Library of the University of Otago on the understanding that the following conditions will be observed:

1. To comply with s56 of the Copyright Act 1994 [NZ], this thesis copy must only be used for the purposes of research or private study.
2. The author's permission must be obtained before any material in the thesis is reproduced, unless such reproduction falls within the fair dealing guidelines of the Copyright Act 1994. Due acknowledgement must be made to the author in any citation.
3. No further copies may be made without the permission of the Librarian of the University of Otago.

**'Keeping Ourselves Safe': Investigating  
the development, implementation and  
reactions to the programme**

Christine Mahoney

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Master of Arts in Education

at the University of Otago,  
Dunedin, New Zealand

31 March 1998

## ABSTRACT

This research project examined the development and implementation process of the 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' child sexual abuse protection programme developed by the New Zealand Police in collaboration with the Department of Education. There was an emphasis on investigating the controversy it provoked from the outset.

This was achieved by a thorough examination of all the Police files and documentation pertaining to the development of the programme and chronologically documenting relevant aspects of the process and concerns as a narrative description.

The results indicated that throughout the process of development there were several difficulties that were a consequence of regulations and legal requirements set by the Department of Education and which caused significant delays. These included difficulties regarding aspects of the content and especially the use of precise terminology. In addition there was an ongoing problem trying to raise adequate finances to complete the programme.

Although there were numerous concerns expressed by individuals and community groups over the content of the programme the majority of concerns came from groups and individuals associated with the moral right. These were because of the moral right's perception that the programme would allow the state to intrude into the privacy of family

life. In addition the moral right believed the programme would inappropriately introduce sexuality education to children at too young an age.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the unreserved support of my supervisors Dr Peter Rich and Dr Elmarie Kotzé for their invaluable and much appreciated constructive criticism, guidance, input, moral support and enthusiasm throughout.

I am very grateful to my family, Jan, Guy, Laurie, Peter, Steve, Kes and Emily for their encouragement and especially to Erin, my daughter, who unselfishly tolerated an 'absent' mother over the Christmas holidays and time leading up to submission.

I would also like to thank:

- Teresa Andrew for her willing babysitting at short notice and generous encouragement;
- My friends in Dunedin and Auckland for their support and in particular Pam, Claire, Kate, Pauline and Anna for excusing me from practices as submission date drew closer;
- The New Zealand Police, and in particular, Owen Sanders and Sergeant Graeme Gibbs for their encouragement and financial assistance;
- Brian Young for teaching me the necessary computer survival skills.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Aims of the study	1
1.3 Research report	2
1.4 Method	4
1.5 Defining child sexual abuse	6
1.6 Incidence	7
1.7 Incest	11
1.8 Historical perceptions of incest	13
1.9 Feminist perspectives on children's consent to sexual activity	14
1.10 Effects of child sexual abuse	17
1.11 Summary	19
<b>CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1 Introduction	21
2.2 Essential skills in a child protection programme	21
2.3 Purpose of child protection programmes	23
2.4 Different types of protection programmes	24
2.5 Evaluation of protection programmes	25
2.6 Measures used to evaluate outcomes of programmes	26
2.7 The Children's Knowledge of Abuse Questionnaire	28
2.8 Effects of participation in child protection	29

	programmes	
2.9	'Protective Behaviours' programme	30
2.10	'Keeping Ourselves Safe' programme	30
2.11	Evaluation of 'Protective Behaviours' and 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'	31
2.12	Summary	33

## **CHAPTER 3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 35**

3.1	Introduction	35
3.2	Feminist theory, education and child sexual abuse	35
3.3	The politics of child sexual abuse	37
3.4	Social construction of gender	38
3.5	The family as a patriarchal structure	40
3.6	The Power theory	43
3.6.1	Power theory for casework and prevention of sexual abuse	43
3.6.2	Structural power	43
3.6.3	Personal power	44
3.7	Power/knowledge relation	45
3.8	Exposing the myths	46
3.9	Theories on child sexual abuse	49
3.9.1	Psychoanalytic theory	49
3.9.2	Other psychological theories	51
3.9.3	Family Systems theory as an explanation for incest	54
3.9.4	Feminist theory	56
3.10	Summary	57

## **CHAPTER 4 UNRAVELLING THE CONTROVERSY 1 59 PRE-TRIAL EVENTS**

4.1	Why the need for a new programme	59
4.2	Child sexual abuse seen as a social problem	61
4.3	'Keeping Ourselves Safe' initiated	62
4.4	Regional interdisciplinary approach established	63

4.5	Major legal dilemma	64
4.6	Legal opinion issued	66
4.7	Concerns about the content	68
4.8	Funding - where would it come from?	70
4.9	Pre-trial difficulties	75
4.10	The effect of the Education Amendment Act 1985	78
4.11	Publicity	81
4.12	Support for 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'	90
4.13	Additional, supplementary content/ similar initiative taking place	95
4.14	Staffing requirements	96
4.15	Trial drafts ready	97
4.16	Summary	100

## **CHAPTER 5 UNRAVELLING THE CONTROVERSY 2    101**

### **POST-TRIAL EVENTS**

5.1	Introduction	101
5.2	Publicity	101
5.3	Trial schools' experiences of 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'	104
5.4	Cases of sexual abuse exposed	105
5.5	Submissions on 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'	106
5.6	Ongoing funding difficulties	111
5.7	Final developments of 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'	113
5.8	Implementation procedure	115
5.9	School evaluations	118
5.10	Programme for secondary pupils underway	121
5.11	Summary	123

## **CHAPTER 6 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION                    125**

6.1	Introduction	125
6.2	Negotiations between the New Zealand Police and the Department of Education	125
6.2.1	Differences regarding the content of	126

	Police and the Department of Education	
6.2.1	Differences regarding the content of 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'	126
6.2.2	Differences regarding the implementation of 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'	128
6.3	Difficulties obtaining funding for 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'	128
6.4	Submissions resulting from community concerns	129
6.4.1	General concerns	129
6.4.2	Moral right concerns	130
6.5	The moral right movement in New Zealand	131
6.5.1	History of the moral right in New Zealand	131
6.5.2	Conditions which generated the rise of the moral right	134
6.5.3	Discussion on the ideology of the moral right	135
6.6	Addressing the concerns	138
6.6.1	The role of the Police in educational programmes	138
6.6.2	Introducing children to sexuality education	141
6.6.3	Children could become suspicious of men	145
6.6.4	Reduced emphasis on 'Stranger Danger'	147
6.6.5	No option of withdrawing children from class	149
6.7	Reflections on the study	150
6.8	Recommendations	152
6.9	Further research	154

**REFERENCES 156**

**APPENDIX 172**

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the development and implementation of the Keeping Ourselves Safe (KOS) education programme with an emphasis on investigating the controversy surrounding its implementation. This programme was developed by the New Zealand Police in conjunction with the Department of Education, for use in New Zealand primary and intermediate schools. To date, there have been several research studies on the effectiveness and outcomes of KOS (Briggs 1991, 1996; Perniski 1995; Van Kessel 1990; Woodward 1990) although none have looked at the controversy that it provoked in New Zealand society during its development, commencing in 1983, to its implementation in 1988.

### 1.2 Aims of the study

This research study aims to clarify why certain segments of New Zealand society reacted as they did to what was intended to be a proactive programme to help the most vulnerable members of society, that is, children to identify and potentially protect themselves against physical and sexual abuse. It is difficult to understand why there could possibly be anything other than positive support and encouragement for the good intentions of child protection

programmes, especially in view of the growing knowledge and awareness of the prevalence, seriousness and negative consequences of child sexual abuse. Awareness of the potentially, long term destructive effects of child sexual abuse on the victims, their families and the perpetrators have led to a recognition of the need to develop prevention programmes which can be used collaboratively by those who work with victims and offenders. Most child sexual abuse prevention programmes (CSAPPs) in New Zealand and around the world, are based in schools and therefore have the potential ability to reach the largest possible number of children.

Therefore the researcher intends to:

- Define key terms and concepts relevant to child sexual abuse;
- Study relevant literature regarding the child protection programmes;
- Discuss child sexual abuse from a feminist theoretical perspective;
- Study and document the development process of “Keeping Ourselves Safe”;
- Describe the implementation process of “Keeping Ourselves Safe” as documented in the Police files;
- Study and document the reactions, comments, recommendations and submissions of organisations and members of the public;
- Interview Mr Sanders and Senior Sergeant O’Brien, who were involved with the initiation of the programme;
- Become familiar with the content of “Keeping Ourselves Safe” in order to comment where relevant;
- Discuss the outcomes, suggest further research and provide recommendations.

### **1.3 Research report**

Chapter one of this research report will focus on important aspects of child

sexual abuse including defining key terms, discussing its prevalence and incidence, the effects of child sexual abuse, incest, the historical context of incest and the issue of consent. Chapter two will contain a literature review of school sex education programmes as they are presented in educational settings and will discuss findings about their effectiveness. Chapter three will examine child sexual abuse from a feminist theoretical perspective. As child sexual abuse was largely exposed as a result of work by the women's movement and feminists, it seems appropriate to use feminist theory as the framework for this chapter. It will discuss issues such as the social construction of gender, the family, power, patriarchy and the different approaches of literature around child sexual abuse. Chapters four and five will consist of a narrative description of the process of development and implementation, the result of a thorough examination of the files gathered by the Curriculum Development Department of the New Zealand Police throughout the development and implementation processes of their Law Related Education Programme "Keeping Ourselves Safe". Chapter four will explain the developmental processes of "Keeping Ourselves Safe" that occurred before the draft materials were trialled in schools and will look at issues such as the legal dilemmas, funding difficulties, publicity and content concerns. Chapter five will continue the narrative description though the emphasis will be on issues that occurred after the draft materials had been trialled in schools such as submissions on the draft materials, experiences of the trial schools and ongoing funding difficulties. Chapter six will provide a discussion and summary of findings of the study, including the difficulties that arose between the Department of Education and the Police. It will include a discussion of some of New Zealand society's attitudes to sexuality and sex education in the 1980s, especially in relation to KOS and the audience for which it was developed. It will also provide recommendations and suggestions for further research.



## **1.4 Method**

Throughout the process of the development and implementation of KOS, any pertinent documentation was collated chronologically in the archives at Police National Headquarters. This research project will involve a study of all of these files, commencing with the first document and progressing chronologically through to the last. By a thorough examination of these files it will be possible to select the relevant documentation that elucidates the chronological process of the development and implementation of KOS.

The Police files consist of a large number of letters, memos, newspaper and magazine articles, and other documentation, all of which contribute to the overall picture the development of the programme provoked. These files are usually kept in Police National Headquarters Wellington archives, but for the duration of this project they are being stored in a secure cupboard in the researcher's home. This is with the permission of Sergeant Graeme Gibbs, Regional Co-ordinator, Law Related Educational Programmes, Dunedin, and on completion of the project, the files will be returned to the Police archives. From its earliest development, the programme provoked a large response from the general public, organisations and agencies, the majority of it very supportive but some challenging, questioning and rejecting. The Police files tell the story of the public's response and also explain the other various difficulties the programme's developers experienced along the way.

Of narrative descriptions Manning and Cullum-Swan (1994:465) write, "If one defines narrative as a story with a beginning, middle and end that reveals

someone's experiences, narratives take many forms, are told in many settings, before many audiences, and with varying degrees of connection to actual events or persons". This closely relates to Burns (1994:12) description of qualitative research which he says is to "... capture what people say and do as a product of how they interpret the complexity of their world, to understand events from the viewpoint of the participants." This research describes the experiences of the initiators and developers of KOS as well as the process of the programme itself. The settings and audiences are varied as are the interactions and connections of all who submitted comments or recommendations about the content, structure and implementation of the programme.

Qualitative research methodology emphasises the importance of the subjective, life experiences of people and as such is concerned with processes rather than with consequences and with meanings and realities rather than with behavioural statistics. Reality is not something that is fixed and stable, but rather is a form of variable, the understanding of which is dependent upon an analysis of multiple forms of meaning. Seen in the context of this research, there were different responses to the programme, and these were very much dependent on the different realities and socially constructed meanings of the 'responders'. Eisner (1979:14-15) contends that there can be "little meaning, impact or quality in an event isolated from the context in which it is found". This directs the focus "...towards context-bound conclusions that could potentially point the way to new policies and educational decision[s]..." (Burns 1994:12). An expected outcome of this research project is to document the development process of the programme, the reactions and comments it provoked and get a better understanding why KOS provoked as much disputation as it did, from the inception of its development to its implementation.

The research will also include a structured interview with Mr Owen Sanders the programme's initiator and principle developer. The questions will all be of an open-ended type. This interview will however be preceded by an unstructured discussion with Mr Sanders and Sergeant Graeme Gibbs. Sergeant Gibbs, although not practically involved in the development process of KOS, was very supportive from the outset. The rationale behind unstructured interviews "...is that the only person who understands the social realities in which they live is the person themselves" (Burns 1994:279). From the point of view of this research, it seems appropriate to have an unstructured discussion, prior to the structured interview, with Mr Sanders in order to elicit and encapsulate subtleties and personal interpretations of the development and implementation process of KOS that are not apparent through reading the documentation. This will provide a perspective other than that of the researcher and will possibly facilitate access to events that are not recorded in the files. There will also be an unstructured interview with Senior Sergeant O'Brien who held the position of Co-ordinator, Law Related Education Programmes (LREP) during the time the programme was developed.

By understanding the total context of the development of the programme and why it provoked such conflict among segments of society, it is hoped that future educational programmes, especially those that could possibly be considered controversial, will be developed only after careful analysis and deconstruction of all factors, subtle and obvious, that impact upon them.

### **1.5 Defining child sexual abuse**

Defining child sexual abuse is a difficult, complex and controversial task fraught with considerable diversity and inconsistency. How definitions of child sexual

abuse have been constructed have had implications on research and on discussions of its dimensions and prevalence. Definitions and terminology, such as incestuous and non-familial abuse, child sexual exploitation, contact and non-contact abuse, and child sexual assault amongst others, used by different researchers and authors perhaps reflect a personal stance and opinion about the motivation and politics of child sexual abuse. Even among professional groups such as mental health workers, legal, teaching and social services there is no consistent definition of child sexual abuse to be found. Such inconsistency of definition inevitably leads to discrepancies and variations in the reporting of the incidence of child sexual abuse, ranging "...from 6% to 62% for girls and from 3% to 31 % for boys" (Finkelhor 1986:19). Wurtele and Miller-Perrin (1992) identified the range of incidence of child sexual abuse as being from 7% to 62% for girls and 3% to 16% for boys. Other statistics suggest a similar range, from 6% to 66% of girls and 3% to 31% of boys are sexually abused (Haugaard & Reppucci, 1988; Watkins & Bentovim 1992).

## **1.6 Incidence**

All research into the incidence of child sexual abuse has show that girls are more frequently victims of sexual abuse than boys although how much more frequently is a matter of debate. Finkelhor (1979) found that twice as many girls (19%) experienced sexual abuse than boys (9%) in childhood. Baker and Duncan (1985) found that 12% of girls and 8% of boys experience child sexual abuse. Kelly, Regan and Burton's (1991) study of Higher Education students in England found that young women are 2 to 3 times more likely to have experienced child sexual abuse than young men.

The increasing rates of males presenting for treatment and appearing in random

samples as having experienced sexual abuse, indicate that it is possible the incidence rate of male to female child sexual abuse is very underreported and the rates may be equal to that of girls. Finkelhor (1990) considered that the apparent under-reporting of male child sexual abuse could possibly be due to the gender-associated stigma surrounding abuse, such as its potential implications of homosexuality and also the attitude that boys should be strong and not cry and that boys are more likely to be the aggressor and not the victim. Cohn (1986) suggested that, in addition, because cultural norms contend that males are not abused, or that only weak males are abused, males are less likely to report child sexual abuse because they may consider they are less likely to be believed. Briggs and Hawkins (1997:117) also suggest that "...few male victims identify sexual misbehaviour as abusive when it happens to them".

The incidence rates in New Zealand are comparable to the overseas rates mentioned above. In a 1991 random sample of Otago women, "...20% reported being sexually abused with at least genital contact before they turned 16. A further 6% were touched or kissed inappropriately, and another 7% were subjected to indecent exposure or were asked to do something sexual" (Martin et al. 1991, as cited in KOS Junior Primary manual 1994). Bushnell, Wells and Oakley-Browne (1992) interviewed 347 Christchurch women aged 18 to 44 years and found that 13 % had experienced intrafamilial child sexual abuse and for 20% of those, the experience involved physical violence.

Finkelhor (1986) also notes that when researchers use penetration as criteria for their definition the incidence rate is very low. When, however, the definition is extended to include "...any unwanted touching, behaviour or speech by a person older and bigger which is sexual in its intent..." (Linnell & Cora 1993:130), the reported incidence rate will be much, much higher. Glaser and Frosh (1993:4)

suggest that the most useful definitions of child sexual abuse are those which

...combine a clear specification of what is meant by 'sexual' with participants, sometimes with a clause concerning the experienced aversiveness of the activity and elements which make it abusive.

Saphira (1985) divides child sexual abuse into the following five categories:

- Non-contact sexual behaviour such as suggestive, 'dirty' talk and voyeurism;
- Contact sexual behaviour including touching a child's genitals and breasts, penetration with fingers or an object, masturbating a child and tongue kissing;
- Intercourse, including oral, vaginal and anal intercourse;
- Unusual behaviours such as bestiality, fetishes, urination, being forced to watch others having intercourse, taking sexual photographs of the child;
- Violence, when a child is tortured, tied up, beaten, gang raped, or hit on the genitals.

Many feminist writers do not differentiate between different abusive behaviours, such as paedophilia, child pornography, exhibitionism and rape. Rather, they see all abuse as occurring on a continuum of violence and behaviours on which the abuser fluctuates. Driver (1989:3) discusses this in the following way:

[W]e take child sexual abuse to be any sexual behaviour directed at a person under 16 without that person's consent. Sexual behaviour may involve touching parts of the child or requesting the child to touch oneself, itself, or others; ogling the child in a sexual manner, taking pornographic photographs, or requiring the child to look at parts of the body, sexual acts or other material in a way which is arousing to oneself; and verbal suggestions or comments to the child which are intended to threaten the child sexually or otherwise to provide sexual gratification for oneself. It must be defined by every circumstance in which it occurs: in families representative of all classes, races and social strata; in state-run and private institutions; on the street; in classrooms; in pornography advertising and films.

Likewise, therapists at Dympna House, a counselling and resource centre for families in which children have been sexually abused, and for women who were sexually abused as children, includes a range of violence in their definition, thus:

Incest and child sexual abuse can begin at any age from a few weeks old and includes a wide range of sexual behaviours. It may involve touching the child's body or asking the child to touch the adult's body in a sexual way; rape (oral, anal, vaginal); inducing the child to watch pornography or pose for pornographic pictures; kissing in an uncomfortable way; exhibitionism; peeping or making verbal comments and propositions (Linnell & Cora 1993:129).

Inconsistencies of definition can be found within feminist writings on child sexual abuse. In some feminist writings the term child rape is used in preference to child sexual abuse as it depicts more appropriately the manipulation and violence inherent in child sexual abuse in general, regardless whether any physical violence actually occurs. In this sense the term rape is used to indicate an act of force or violence in a wider sense, rather than forced sexual intercourse.

The definition referred to in the "Keeping Ourselves Safe Standing Up For Myself" Kit (Revised Edition 1997:9), on which the present study is focused, will be the one that is considered most relevant for the purposes of this study. It contains the components Glaser and Frosh (1993:4) indicate as being most useful in a definition of child sexual abuse, that is, a specific description of what is meant by sexual activities in relation to the developmental level of the child and is as follows:

Involvement of a child in sexual activities they do not fully understand and to which they are unable to <sup>give</sup> informed consent. Perpetrators can be peers, older children or adults, who misuse power or trust. They often

use force, threats, bribes or secrets. Examples include indecent exposure, sexual intercourse, sexual harassment, exposing children to pornographic material, penetration of a child's vagina or penis.

One area of considerable variance within feminist writing when trying to define child sexual abuse is with the use of the word incest.

### **1.7 Incest**

Some feminist writers tend to use the word incest as a synonym for child sexual abuse (Linnell & Cora 1993; MacLeod & Saraga 1988; Seng 1986). Driver (1989:18) explains that "some women's groups prefer to retain the concept of 'incest' in their analysis, albeit defined in very wide terms, in order to avoid the artificial kinship categorisations posited in patriarchal law or religion". Bell (1993:vii) has observed that "...within feminism incest has been subsumed under a discussion of sexual violence". Other feminist writers, while certainly agreeing that incest is a component of and constitutes child sexual abuse, prefer to categorise it on its own as a way of emphasising the inherent abuse of parental (usually father) power, position and trust. Herman (1984:4), in support of that stance, writes "It is no accident that incest occurs most often precisely in the relationship where the female is the most powerless. The horror of incest is not in the sexual act, but in the exploitation of children and the corruption of parental love". Brownmiller (1976:281) describes incest as "...a misnamed term that implies mutuality - I prefer the explicit description father rape..." Ward (1984) likewise argues that the negative consequences of incest on its victims warrant the use of the term 'father-daughter rape'. Driver (1989:18), discusses the use of the term incest in the following way:

[T]he use of jargon (such as 'incest victim', 'incestuous family', 'incestuous relationship') that frequently crops up in the academic



literature... suggest[s] that incest is a two-way phenomenon in which the child participates. The word 'relationship' alone is so often used in colloquial language, that this is bound to colour our thinking if we refer to incest with the same word.

Kamsler, (1992:10) a narrative therapist who works also in a consultant capacity at Dymrna House, is another feminist who differentiates between child sexual abuse and incest by emphasising the intra-familial aspect within the context of child sexual abuse as follows:

Child sexual assault is a sexual act imposed on a young person or child by another person (usually male). The ability to engage the child in a sexual relationship is based on the all-powerful and dominant position of the adult (or older adolescent) offender, which is in sharp contrast to the child's age, dependency and powerlessness. Authority and power enable the perpetrator to coerce the child into sexual compliance.

Incest is any sexual act imposed on a younger person or child by another person (again usually a male), taking advantage of his position of power and trust within the family. 'Family' can mean natural parents, step-parents, grandfathers, uncles, brothers and so on.

Incest, or intrafamilial child sexual abuse, is more prevalent than extrafamilial child sexual abuse, although the stereotypical image of child sexual abuse is extrafamilial. Jackson's (1980) New Zealand research found that 89% of children were abused by people they knew, of those, half were abused by a relative other than father or stepfather, a quarter were abused by fathers or stepfathers, and 42% were abused in their own homes. Baker and Duncan's (1985) study found that 49% of abusers were known to their victims and 14% of all abuse took place within the home. Glaser and Frosh (1993:15) write "Girls were more likely to have been abused by parents, grandparents or siblings, while boys were more at risk from people outside the family but known to them". It is possibly easier to believe that a stranger would want to hurt a child rather than a member of the family or a family friend. This was an important

consideration when establishing the KOS programme as an alternative to the previously taught “Stranger Danger” programme. Briggs (1986, cited in KOS Junior manual 1994:5) writes, “The emphasis on ‘Stranger Danger’ causes adults to miss the clues that children give when they are being victimised by trusted family friends, professionals or relatives”.

### **1.8 Historical perceptions of incest**

There are also historical connections associated with the word incest. Viewed from an historical position, incest has been considered as consensual and a common event in some societies. Historical literature which described what was then socially acceptable adult-child sexual behaviour is considered to be sexual abuse today. Rush (1980) describes how under Talmudic law in biblical times, sexual use of girls over the age of 3 years was sanctioned by Rabbis and lawmakers provided that the girl’s father consented and received adequate financial payment from the abuser. Sexual intercourse was an acceptable way of establishing betrothal and the sexual use of both girls and women was governed by complex rules which reflected the status of females as property of men. Sex with girls under 3 years was not controlled by any laws as they were considered too young to be legal virgins. Although sex between men was seriously forbidden, the sexual use of boys younger than 9 years was acceptable.

The development of Christianity did not change things a great deal. Early Canon law maintained that sexual intercourse established possession, and for several centuries, successive Popes upheld rape as an indissoluble marriage contract. Christian law did, however, raise the age of legal sex from 3 to 7, making sexual intercourse with girls under 7 of no consequence or importance to the authorities and sexual intercourse with girls over 7 legally binding. It wasn’t until the 13th

century that the concept of statutory rape was introduced. In early Greek and Roman times, homosexual relationships with young boys were socially acceptable. Boys were sometimes castrated as babies to make them more attractive as prostitutes in boy brothels later in life. In medieval Europe parents of babies and young children would masturbate them to help them settle when distressed. Often, in those times, whole families lived in one room and children would see adults making love. It was acceptable and common for adults to make sexual gestures, jokes and comments to children and touch their genitals. Children would often be married at, sometimes even before, puberty.

Around the 18th century, attitudes changed and it became no longer socially acceptable for children to witness or be involved in any sexual activities. Children slept separately from adults and boys and girls played separately.

An important consideration when looking at incest from an historical stance, is that in these contexts, although the child had no choice it was not carried out in secret and was even often condoned by the society in which it occurred. Today, however, child sexual abuse always occurs in secret, the secrecy itself being an important tactic in ensuring and guaranteeing the continuation of the abuse. This reinforces the powerlessness of the child and increases their overwhelming sense of guilt and fear. The secrecy also serves to reduce the possibility of the abuse being observed or even suspected. Lack of consent by the child is an important issue when defining child sexual abuse.

### **1.9 Feminist perspective on children's consent to sexual activity**

Feminist perspectives on child sexual abuse consider the issue of the consent of the child to be absolutely critical when defining child sexual abuse, as lack of it

very clearly indicates calculated exploitation of a child for an abuser's own purposes.

A chronological age, usually 16 years, represents the standard age of consent for heterosexual activity for girls. Anything younger, according to Driver (1989:4),

...stems from the child's relative ignorance of the implications of adult sexuality...Children lack the knowledge and experience to make a properly informed decision about the subject, and they do not have the freedom, legal or psychological, to give or refuse their consent in a truly independent manner.

Bass (1983:116) also believes that consent from children is not possible and she states that

[t]here can be no equality of power, understanding, or freedom in sex between adults and children. Children are dependent upon adults: first, for their survival; then for affection, attention and an understanding of what the world in which they live is all about.

Most definitions select a chronological age for defining sexual abuse and an age of consent, and these tend to be legally rather than psychologically designated. The age limit for the United Nations definition of a child is 18 years, and this is used in defining consent, especially in American studies, although other studies, for example Russell (1983), define a child to be 16 years or under. The KOS programme does not specify an age of consent.

There are difficulties inherent in 'setting' an age of consent such as 16 years, as there will always inevitably be 17, 18 and 19 year olds who can still be victimised by older adults even though they are legally capable of consenting or declining. When a child is below the age of consent, differentiation needs to be made between abuse, when the abuser is outside the developmental range of the

child (usually 3 to 5 years older) and consensual sex-play with someone close to their own age. Situations can of course arise, when a child is threatened by a boy who is less than 3 years older than she is. In these instances, according to Glaser and Frosh (1993:6), "... the use of coercion in an explicit or implicit way - is indeed a central factor in designating it as abusive".

Incest between siblings of a similar age can be seen as normal sexual experimentation between equals. As discussed previously though, when sexual activity occurs between siblings where the age difference is more than 3 to 5 years, it constitutes child sexual abuse because of a power differential inherent in this age gap.

Driver (1989:6) writes that "[m]any other researchers have treated the abuse of children by each other as unimportant". In this context, the abuser is considered to be a boy. Driver (1989:6) believes that the lack of research into incest by boys is because

...boy assaults make clear the true dynamics of sexual abuse - that it is not based on an adult-child power imbalance, which is a familiar and unthreatening concept for most of us, but is a male-female power imbalance, which is frightening for both sexes to expose.

Finkelhor (1986:73) concludes that sexual activity between children need not necessarily be defined as abusive because "... in relationships with peers, children are uninformed, but at least there is no power differential".

Regardless of whatever difficulties there may be in defining child sexual abuse, there is no dispute over the damaging consequences and legacies resulting from the betrayal of trust, inequality of power and absence of consent.

## **1.10 Effects of child sexual abuse**

Although childhood sexual abuse does not necessarily lead to psychological damage in adulthood, it has consistently been linked to a number of interpersonal and psychological difficulties experienced by adult survivors, with the degree of negative impact varying considerably.

It is not possible to understand the effects of child sexual abuse from anything other than the experiences of the victims themselves, “they are the experts on how they feel” (Saphira 1985:50), although there have been studies which have identified long and short term consequences. In a review of 26 clinically based studies that looked at the long and short term effects of child sexual abuse, Browne and Finkelhor (1986a; 1986b), Glaser and Frosh (1993) and Green (1988) found that the short term (initial) effects included fear, depression, anger, anxiety, post traumatic stress disorder, phobias, refusal to attend school, nightmares, promiscuity, bedwetting, lowered self-esteem, suicide attempts, hostility and inappropriate behaviour, “...the whole gamut of mild, moderate and severe childhood psychological difficulties” (Glaser & Frosh 1993:20), and these occur within two years of the abusive event. The KOS Unit Standing Up For Myself (1997:10) states that:

Abused children find it hard to concentrate at school. Often they are anxious, depressed or hostile and sometimes they behave in sexually inappropriate ways. They may be less developed than peers and show physical signs of abuse and neglect.

The long term effects included many of the childhood effects, with depression being the most commonly identified symptom, poor self-esteem, depression, self-destructive behaviour, anxiety, psychological difficulties such as post traumatic stress disorder and borderline personalities, difficulty trusting others,

feelings of isolation and stigma, substance abuse and sexual maladjustment (Browne & Finkelhor 1988; Glaser & Frosh 1993; Haugaard & Reppucci 1988).

In a study of the impact of sexual abuse on women's psychological health in New Zealand, Mullens et al. (1988) found that child sexual abuse victims were more likely to be identified as psychiatrically classifiable than those who had not experienced the trauma of child sexual abuse. They commented that "the diagnostic classification lay predominantly in the depressive spectrum, with the residuum being made up of anxiety and phobic disorders" (Mullens et al. 1988:842). This substantiates Haines (1987) findings of an informal survey of women patients at Carrington Hospital which showed that nine out of ten women had histories of child sexual abuse.

As each abusive situation is different, however, victims are likely to react in different ways. Tutty (1990) suggested five variables that may affect a victims reaction:

- The length of time over which the abuse occurs;
- The severity of the abuse and the sexual activity involved;
- The developmental level and age of the child;
- Reactions, especially parental, to the child's attempts at disclosing the abuse;
- The relationship between the victim and the abuser.

When the relationship is one based on trust, such as a father, stepfather or close relative, the impact of the abuse will be severe (Conte & Schauerman 1987; Glaser & Frosh 1993; Tutty 1990). When the abuse is perpetrated by the victim's father and involves force and genital contact, the impact will be the most negative (Wyatt & Powell (1988).

Evidence indicates that some victims, boys more especially than girls, are likely to grow up and abuse their own or other children, (Briggs 1995; Goodwin 1981; Sheldrick 1991 as cited in Glaser & Frosh 1993). Glaser and Frosh (1993:21,22) explain this in the following way:

To some extent ...people who have been sexually abused themselves go on to abuse their children: this happens primarily with male victims, who often seem to replicate the desolate patterns of parenting to which they have been exposed, which include an image of children as sexually exploitable.

The KOS unit *Standing Up For Myself* (1997:10) suggests “A very high proportion of child abusers were abused themselves as children”. Often women who have been sexually abused as children have children whom are also abused. Glaser & Frosh (1993:22) suggest this could be because “...the experience of abuse increases women’s vulnerability to sexually exploitive men and reduces their ability to protect their children”.

### **1.11 Summary**

There are inevitably difficulties and impediments present when researching into the effects of child sexual abuse, for instance, the lack of consistency about definition and “...because different studies use different definitions of abuse and are often not based on true random population samples” (Briggs & Hawkins 1997:117). Another serious impediment, is the difficulty in obtaining a sufficiently large and representative sample of children, given the obstacles to reporting child sexual abuse and therefore likely under-reporting. When using children as the basis for a study, it is not possible to compare before and after consequences for obvious reasons. In addition, as different children react to the same situation in different ways, there will be some children for whom the



impact of child sexual abuse is more bearable than it is for others.

Although research certainly does indicate many long term, negative consequences, there is a marked variability in the magnitude of these effects. Even though many victims of child sexual abuse are able to develop healthy relationships and lifestyles as adults, the seriousness of the consequences should never be minimised, as there are many victims whose lives are permanently damaged, or at the very least, affected for years after.

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1 Introduction

Intervention programmes are a key factor in preventing and stopping child sexual abuse and in helping abused children to heal. The growing awareness of the prevalence and seriousness of child sexual abuse has led to an increase in the number of intervention and protection programmes that have been developed for use in schools in countries such as Australia ('Protective Behaviours'), New Zealand, ('Keeping Ourselves Safe') the United States, ('Project TRUST'), The Netherlands ('Right to Security') Canada ('Feeling Yes, Feeling No') and Britain. The first programmes were developed in the United States and were based on the premise of child empowerment, that is, if a child is aware of her/his rights, especially in regard to body ownership, they are more likely to be able to recognise a potentially abusive situation, assert themselves and say 'no' (Tharinger, Krivacska, Laye-McDonough, Jamison, Vincent & Hedlund 1988; Tutty 1990). Prevention programmes are also seen as a way of preventing child sexual abuse by teaching children to recognise and respond appropriately and safely to situations that are potentially abusive and telling a trusted adult if abuse has occurred (Daro 1991; Daro & McCurdy 1994; Warden 1996). When children have personal safety skills, they are in a position more conducive to resisting and saying no, which weakens a perpetrator's opportunity to abuse.

#### 2.2 Essential skills in a child protection programme

In an investigation of the attitude of male abusers incarcerated for the

sexual molestation of children about the effectiveness of prevention education programmes, Budin and Johnson (1989) found the following skills to be most useful:

- that children realise they should tell someone safe if they have been abused;
- that they have the right to say no;
- that they learn about appropriate and inappropriate touching.

The perpetrators also suggested that children should be advised to avoid strangers and other inappropriate people, to fight back, to avoid being alone and to be always appropriately dressed (inferring that the victims are to blame!). Information from perpetrators can be an important factor in designing prevention programmes if they are to be effective in counteracting the methods used by offenders to gain access to their victims and ensuring their silence (Elliott, Browne & Kilcoyne 1995).

In their 1995 study on child sexual abusers, Elliott, Browne and Kilcoyne (1995) selected offenders from treatment programmes, probation, special hospitals and prison, thereby gathering information from a larger more representative sample than Budin and Johnson's (1989) study of only incarcerated offenders, and Lang and Frenzel's (1988) study of only female victims. Elliott, Browne and Kilcoyne (1995) conclude by suggesting that prevention programmes include information for children about the specific ways offenders operate, for example, 'accidentally' touching them, a male family friend, relative or babysitter giving them 'special privileges' or encouraging them to keep secrets. The offenders in this study indicated that the most vulnerable children are those "...who have family problems, are alone, lack confidence, and are indiscriminate in their trust of others... [also those who are] pretty, "provocatively" dressed, young or small" (Elliott, Browne & Kilcoyne 1995:593).

Information acquired from this study is particularly helpful in recognising what information needs to be included and excluded from current School Based Child Protection Programmes (SBCPPs).

### **2.3 Purposes of child protection programmes**

School based child prevention programmes (SBCPP) are necessary because there are many children who have not been taught about child sexual abuse from their parents (Briggs 1994), especially those who are being abused in their own homes by their own relatives. Briggs and Hawkins (1997:192) surveys of some Australian, New Zealand and American parents "...confirmed that children are not taught safety skills at home." They suggest this is because parents tend to trust people they know "...and think that their own families and neighbourhoods are immune from sexual abuse" and they minimise the damaging consequences of sexual abuse, especially if they themselves are survivors of child sexual abuse. In addition, Briggs and Hawkins (1993) believe that schools and preschools should provide protection programmes for their pupils as without them, children will not realise that abusive behaviour is unacceptable, will be vulnerable to strangers whose intentions are to hurt them and will not know to seek out and tell a trusted adult if abuse is occurring, especially if threatened with punishment by the abuser.

Schools are in a unique position to assist with prevention programmes as their staff interact with the largest possible congregation of children for a significant portion of the day (Oldfield, Hays & Megel 1996).

## **2.4 Different types of protection programmes**

Although there are a variety of definitions and activities that constitute prevention, there are three different levels of programmes aimed at preventing child sexual abuse, that is, primary, secondary and tertiary (Giovannoni 1982). Primary prevention programmes attempt to prevent abuse before it occurs, and child safety programmes fall into this category by being aimed at reaching, potentially, all school children. Secondary prevention attempts to interrupt or reduce existing abuse by encouraging "...disclosure of past and ongoing sexual abuse so that children can receive early intervention and protection" (Haugaard & Reppucci 1988:313). Training teachers and other professionals to respond in an efficient and appropriate manner when they suspect a child has been abused is an example of secondary prevention (Bagley & King 1990). Haugaard and Reppucci (1988) suggest that child sexual abuse prevention programmes should include both primary and secondary prevention goals, as they cover a number of imperatives, such as identifying child sexual abuse, increasing public knowledge about the problem, providing information for professionals and parents and providing important personal safety programmes for children. Tertiary programmes are in effect, rehabilitative, rather than prevention programmes, as they are designed to treat those who have already been abused.

Although most school based prevention programmes differ in some ways, such as in the terminology used, the medium through which it is taught and the personnel who deliver the programme, the majority are designed to teach children to do the following things (Briggs & Hawkins 1997; Conte, Rosen, Saperstein & Shermack 1985; Finkelhor 1986; Haugaard & Reppucci 1988; Johnson 1993; Taal & Edelaar 1997);

- Explain what sexual abuse is in language that is age appropriate and that it

happens to both boys and girls;

- Help children discriminate between confusing situations, experiences or behaviours, such as the difference between good and bad touching;
- Teach children about body parts and ownership and their rights in relation to that;
- Teach children about assertiveness in relation to unwanted touching, bullying and other forms of harassment, and other relevant behavioural skills;
- Teach children to identify the difference between secrets that should and should not be kept and encourage them "...to tell adults about a bad secret" (Briggs & Hawkins 1997:191);
- Instil in children the importance of telling an adult if they are touched in a way that is inappropriate even if it means repeating themselves until someone believes them;
- Stress that children are never responsible if an adult sexually abuses them

## **2.5 Evaluation of protection programmes.**

Although all prevention programmes have the common objective of "...equipping children to prevent or stop abuse" (Briggs & Hawkins 1997:190), there is currently no agreement about what constitutes the best approach. It is difficult to evaluate the efficacy of SBCPPs as the ultimate aim of these programmes is to reduce the incidence and prevalence of child sexual abuse, and secrecy, which is a fundamental component in the continuation of child sexual abuse, is not measurable (Krivacska 1990). Fryer, Kraizer and Miyoshi (1987) suggested that other problems associated with evaluating the effectiveness of SBCPP include the issue of confidentiality of the child, inevitable unreported occurrences of sexual abuse and the ethics of predicting and assessing child behaviour in actual situations involving sexual abuse. In addition, the diversity

of measurements used and the lack of standardised assessment tools have led to criticisms about how programmes have been evaluated.

It is important, when evaluating programmes, to bear in mind that the results can only be "...generalized to a similar group of children as used in the evaluation study" (Taal & Edelaar 1997). It is, however, possible to measure some components of SBCPP, such as the learning and retention of knowledge taught on the programmes for example, who sexually abuses children and ways for children to protect themselves, the increased awareness of what abuse is, including whose fault it really is and what to do if touched inappropriately, and an increase in the reporting of disclosures of abuse. SBCPPs are commonly assessed by evaluating children's skill and knowledge acquisition after participation or by assessing their ability to behave appropriately in simulated incidents.

The behavioural focus is considered important as the ultimate aim of any prevention programme is to change behaviour (Fryer, Kraiser & Miyoshi, 1987). Tutty (1995:114), however, believes the problem with such an emphasis "...is that they are only appropriate for testing potential stranger abuse or abduction". Tutty (1995) emphasises the importance of continuing to focus on knowledge acquisition with attention given to including preventative concepts that are relevant to the developmental level and cultural backgrounds of participants.

## **2.6. Measures used to evaluate outcomes of programmes**

Outcomes of child protection programmes has generally, in the past, been done by utilising one or more of the following measures (Perniskie 1995);

1. The Personal Safety Questionnaire (PSQ). This is composed of 13 items and

is frequently used alongside the What If Situations Test (WIST), to assess participants skill and knowledge acquisition (Saslowsky & Wurtele 1986; Wurtele, Marrs & Miller-Perrin 1987). The WIST, originally developed for use with young children, attempts to establish whether children are able to;

- recognise a situation involving inappropriate touch;
- resist the touch by making a verbal response;
- make a behavioural response by removing themselves from the situation;
- tell someone about the incident (Saslowsky & Wurtele 1986).

2. A “Personal Safety Questionnaire”. This involves 29 situational and attitudinal questions aimed at measuring both current knowledge and attitudes related to self-protection and can be used in conjunction with the “Feeling Yes, Feeling No” video (Sigurdson, Strang & Doig 1987). This programme utilises concepts common to most SBCPPs, such as;

- touching can give children good and bad feelings;
- children have the right to say ‘no’, leave and tell an adult they trust if someone touches them in a way that makes them feel uncomfortable;
- sexual abuse is when an adult or older child touched a child’s private parts or asks them to touch theirs;
- children can learn to identify a dangerous situation;
- children can be abused by people they know;
- it is important to find somebody they trust to tell;
- sexual abuse is never the child’s fault.

3. A 13 item questionnaire. This assesses children’s knowledge and belief of sexual abuse and also possible experience and action (Kolko, Moser, Litz & Hughes 1987).

4. A 13 item questionnaire. This assesses children’s knowledge of coping skills and self-protection techniques (Binder & McNeil 1987).

5. The Child Abuse Researchers’ Evaluation (CARE) Series (Gilbert, Berrick,



Le Prohn & Nyman 1989). This material comprises integrated assessment instruments that have been designed to evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of child sexual abuse prevention programmes specifically for preschool children by examining what participants have learnt about the touch continuum, secrets, strangers and identifying who can help them if they are hurt.

6. A 25 item scale “What I know about touching” developed by Hazzard, Webb, Kleemeier, Angert and Pohl (1991). This scale assesses children’s knowledge about sexual abuse prevention by using a ‘Yes’, ‘No’, ‘I don’t know’ response format. It covers most of the concepts described under the Personal Safety Questionnaire.

## **2.7 The Children’s Knowledge of Abuse Questionnaire**

Tutty (1992) questioned the validity of several of these techniques as they tend to use a very limited number of items, especially the most commonly used PSQ and in response developed an alternative, the Children’s Knowledge of Abuse Questionnaire (CKAQ). Tutty further revised the test in 1995 to include 33 items with improved psychometric properties. It utilises a true/false format and is intended to be administered to children aged 5 to 12 years by reading the items to them and allowing them to answer. The CKAQ contains items about nonsexual touch, assertiveness with peers, sexual abuse, attitudes regarding strangers, types of secrets which should not be kept, and the possibility that people known to the children might touch them in ways that confuse or make them feel uncomfortable.

The CKAQ was used to evaluate the effectiveness of Project TRUST, an elementary school-based intervention programme conducted in an American Midwestern city in 1994-1995 (Oldfield, Hays & Megel 1996). The sample

consisted of 1269 children aged 7 to 12 years, 658 in the experimental group and 611 in the control group. Project TRUST attempts to increase children's knowledge of general prevention concepts associated with child sexual abuse, knowledge of difficult to acquire prevention concepts, anxiety and reporting of abuse. Oldfield, Hays and Megel (1996) found that the children who participated in Project TRUST demonstrated significantly greater knowledge of abuse prevention information as well as difficult-to-acquire concepts than control group students. A reassessment after three months showed no loss in acquired knowledge. First time disclosures about sexual abuse occurrences were greater in the experimental than in the control group. There were no differences in anxiety scores between the control group and the experimental group.

## **2.8 Effects of participation in child protection programmes**

Although most research studies on SBCPP have reported significant changes in the knowledge of participants after the completion of the programme (Berrick & Gilbert 1991; Binder & McNeil 1987; Garbarino 1987; Plummer 1984; Saslawsky & Wurtele 1986; Wurtele, Kast, Miller-Perrin & Kondrick 1989), other studies have, however, suggested that children who participate in prevention programmes have only slightly better skills and knowledge than non-participants (Swan, Press & Briggs 1985; Tutty 1992; Wolfe, MacPherson, Blount & Wolfe 1986).

Haugaard and Reppucci (1988) have suggested that in order to reinforce retention it is important to provide children with a follow-up booster or review session. This idea supported the findings of a study carried out by Plummer (1984) who evaluated a SBCPP that had been carried out on 112 ten-year-old children. A significant number of the participants completed both pre-tests and

post-tests that assessed their knowledge and understanding of sexual abuse. These tests clearly indicated that the children's increases in knowledge included that abusers are usually people known to the victims, that boys are also victims and that sexual abuse is different from being beaten up. Plummer (1984) also found that over time the children had reverted to their pre-prevention programme beliefs, such as child abusers are usually strangers.

Finkelhor and Dziuba-Leatherman (1995) suggested that abuse prevention programmes can produce increased fears and anxiety in participants. They found that 8% of participants "worried a lot" and 53% "worried a little" after completing a SBCPP.

## **2.9 'Protective Behaviours' programme**

"Protective Behaviours", the Wisconsin programme adopted for use in some South Australian schools is based on a 'child empowerment concept' and has the following statements as underlying themes; " 'We all have the right to feel safe all of the time' and 'Nothing is so awful that we can't talk about it to someone' " (Briggs & Hawkins 1997:200). Briggs and Hawkins (1997) criticise this programme on the grounds that it assumes all sexual abuse results in 'unsafe' feelings and neglects to acknowledge a possible context in which involves affection and pleasurable feelings. This could result in some children being reluctant to disclose sexual abuse, especially if the abusive situation is the only context in which they receive affection.

## **2.10 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' programme**

When "Keeping Ourselves Safe" (KOS), the New Zealand SBCPP was

developed, the 'empowerment model' was rejected by the New Zealand Police and the Ministry of Education. This is because they believed there was "...no empirical support for its effectiveness with children, it lacked an appreciation of the principles of learning theory in child development and involved misconceptions of the dynamics of child sexual abuse" (Briggs & Hawkins 1997:200).

## **2.11 Evaluation of 'Protective Behaviours' and 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'**

Briggs and Hawkins (1997) evaluation of "Protective Behaviours" and "Keeping Ourselves Safe" involved interviews with 378 5-8 year old South Australian and New Zealand children. A questionnaire was administered before the introduction of the programmes and again a year later. It was designed to find out whether children were able to offer strategies which would keep them safe in a variety of situations. The New Zealand children showed significant gains after taking part in KOS. Briggs and Hawkins (1997:201) describe these as follows:

Three quarters of the children had learned that secrets must never be kept if they involved 'rude' behaviour. More than two-thirds of the children gained the ability to offer several safe strategies in the event of becoming lost in crowded places. More than half now realised that some people might use tricks to persuade them to do things that they would not otherwise do. More than half also gained knowledge about their right to reject inappropriate touching, and were confident that they could report and stop 'rude' behaviour without getting into trouble. Least development occurred in their ability to recognise feelings associated with being safe and unsafe.

In contrast there was very little difference between the pre-test and post-test results of the South Australian children after their participation in 'Protective Behaviours', with only 30% being able to offer safe strategies (Briggs & Hawkins 1997).

Briggs and Hawkins (1994; 1997) summary of the two programmes came out strongly in favour of KOS's effectiveness because of three critical aspects;

- teacher commitment;
- parental support;
- age-appropriate materials used to support the teaching of the programme.

They suggest that teachers have the "...ultimate power over the success of protection programmes" (Briggs & Hawkins 1997:205), and in order for them to teach the programmes as effectively as possible, the programmes should be well designed with due consideration given to the children's developmental level by using age appropriate language and materials. In addition, the teachers should be well prepared and trained in both the psychological and practical components, and be a part of a strong support network.

They concluded that SBCPPs appear to be most effective when they are designed for a particular culture or society by teachers and curriculum designers knowledgeable about the situations in which they would be taught, are incorporated as part of the entire school's curriculum, have parental support and attempt to enhance and develop children's self-esteem and confidence at the same time as teaching the preventative strategies. This conclusion is supported by Finkelhor, Asdigian and Dziuba-Leatherman's (1995) report which contends that support from the parent community is particularly effective in helping children increase their knowledge of sexual abuse issues and promoting disclosures. They also report that parental instruction was more effective than school instruction in helping children to actually thwart possible victimisation attempts. Wurtele, Kast and Melzer (1992) found that children who are taught personal safety skills at school and have them reinforced at home by their

parents are more likely to remember them than those who only receive instruction at school.

One further disturbing conclusion in Briggs and Hawkin's (1997) research, is the importance of the socio-economic status of the school in which KOS is being taught. Although children from any social class are potential victims for sexual abuse, and although children from all social classes benefit from taking part in KOS, Briggs and Hawkins (1997) found that the children from middle-class families gained more than children from lower-class families. They found that children from lower-class families were less likely to believe that their parents would protect them from other adults as they were more likely to have already been rejected after having already approached a parent because they had been inappropriately touched. Children from lower-class families were also more likely to believe they had to keep all adults secrets and that they would be punished if they told an adult they were being sexually abused.

## **2.12 Summary**

This chapter has discussed the aims and objectives of child protection programmes and has outlined the three different levels of programmes aimed at preventing child sexual abuse, that is, primary, secondary and tertiary programmes. Included is a discussion of the various measures used to assess children's skill and knowledge acquisition after participating in a SBCPP and their application to protection programmes.

A comparison between the South Australian programme "Protective Behaviours" and the New Zealand programme "Keeping Ourselves Safe" follows. It is apparent that SBCPPs are effective to some degree in helping

improve children's responses to sexual abuse by increasing their knowledge and awareness of related issues, enhancing self-efficacy and encouraging disclosures of instances of sexual abuse (Finkelhor, Asdigian & Dziuba-Leatherman 1995). However the programmes which appear to be the most effective are those which are taught by committed teachers using age and culturally appropriate materials and that encourage the participants to discuss the programme and its content with their parents. When this reinforcement occurs, children are more likely to retain the concepts they have been taught. This is, fortunately, a goal of many programmes, including KOS.

### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

#### 3.1 Introduction

**F**eminism is a movement that addresses oppression by seeking to gain political, economic and social equality for women. Historical structural arrangements initiate, legitimate and support this inequality and oppression.

Feminist theory looks at the social world through the eyes of women in order to understand their perceptions and experiences of sexuality, family, education and work. This enables women's experiences to be included in discourses of knowledge which in turn have implications for power. All feminist theory, regardless of whether it considers itself to be liberal, socialist or radical, sees the social construction of gender at the centre of feminist inquiry. As such, it emphasises the importance of gender when trying to understand social processes, agency, social structures and action (Delmar 1986; Maynard & Purvis 1994).

#### 3.2 Feminist theory, education and child sexual abuse

As a radical social theory, feminist thought considers that educational processes have two different functions, that is, a conservative, sustaining as well as a radical, liberating function. It does this through regulated structures as well as informal processes. Both regulated and informal structures can be seen reflected in the curriculum, hierarchy of schools, male/female teacher ratios, disciplining



practice and language used.

Viewed from a conservative sustaining perspective, education serves to reinforce and reproduce the existing structures and knowledge that define the social system. It does this by imitating the dominant forms of social roles, expectations and relationships in schools.

In its radical form, education challenges and questions the existing, dominant structures and knowledge, thereby allowing for a particular social system to be redefined and changed. Thompson (1983:4) describes education as offering the following two positions, "Education is a powerful political weapon which serves either to reinforce and bolster the logic of the present system or helps us to engage in the pursuit of freedom." As such, education always has a political dimension to it.

Formal educational systems reproduce a particular understanding and interpretation of the world that is bound to culture and time, and what is learned through its overt or hidden curriculum, constitutes a definition of knowledge.

In its conservative function, educational systems have a very powerful role to play in the perpetuation of child sexual abuse, as many fundamental elements, such as ideology about the family, gender roles, relationships and hierarchical power are transmitted and reproduced therein. In its radical liberating form, knowledge can be used to empower children to challenge existing abusive practices. Feminist theory contends that a radical function of education is to emphasise the way the latter can be used differently to empower and liberate by questioning existing structures and systems.

Education can be considered a vehicle for social changes in attitudes about child sexual abuse. By emphasising and encouraging parental involvement and support, child protection programmes can facilitate changes in parents' attitudes where necessary as well as provide self-protection strategies for children.

Examining, challenging, reassessing and actively changing the nature of patriarchal values about the family, gender construction and the unequal balance of power, and male and female sexuality is also an effective way of preventing child sexual abuse (Butler 1985; Nelson 1986; Saphira 1985). It is possible this can be achieved within the education system.

### **3.3 The politics of child sexual abuse**

Whether child sexual abuse occurs within or outside the family, it needs to be seen as occurring within the context of sexual violence against women and child abuse in general. Almost any analysis of child abuse will emphasise the powerlessness of children in every possible way. Young children are completely dependent on their parents or caregivers for their healthy development, and even survival.

Whether a child is abused sexually, emotionally or physically, there is always the issue of power and control present. By choosing to abuse people who are less equal in almost every way, that is, physically, emotionally, socially and often cognitively, the abuser is usually assured of success. Saphira (1992:26) writes that “[t]he use of threats, coercion and in some cases, fulfilling unmet needs of the victim, further ensure the power of abusers.”

The concept of the continuum of male violence (Kelly 1988) against women has figured prominently as a concern in feminist writings. This concept, according

to Bell (1993:58) has "...enabled feminists to make connections between forms of abuse such as rape, domestic violence and sexual harassment. Less overt forms of abuse have also been placed on this continuum and been analysed as forms of violence against women." Even though physical violence is not necessarily present in child sexual abuse and "... force [is] rarely used as it [is] not necessary..." (Herman 1984:83), the threat of violence is an act of violence in itself and should be placed on this continuum. Edwards (1987:26) contends that male "[v]iolence has come to be seen as a socially-produced and often socially-legitimated cultural phenomenon..." Brownmiller (1976) as well as Hanmer and Saunders (1984) argue that male violence is the basis for men's control over women within society in general.

Feminist analyses of male violence focus on both its gendered and its social construction. From this context they examine the social forces which shape this violence and its implications for the oppression of women.

### **3.4 Social construction of gender**

Pagliassotti (1993) describes gender as being a culturally determined, socially constructed, historically variant description of those behaviours that are associated with 'being male' and 'being female'. The process of socialisation teaches individuals the meanings, values, beliefs and ideas of a cultural group and these are transmitted to the individual through a variety of institutions, including the family, language, the media and education systems. The process also teaches the individual what it means to be female or male within their culture. The social construction of gender commences as soon as a child is born. Szirom (1988:12) suggests that

...[t]he designation of separate colours for each sex during infancy

(pink for girls and blue for boys) is just the start of a long, slow process which teaches girls to be passive, dependent and submissive and boys to be active, independent and dominant.

From birth, a child learns what is appropriate behaviour for a girl or boy, a woman and a man. Stanley and Wise (1993:107) write:

Most feminists argue that at birth all children are assigned a gender which is based on the appearance of their genitals. Gender is then inculcated, at first by their mothers differentiating between children of different sexes through their behaviours towards them. Most feminists also argue that mothers respond differently towards their children on the basis of preconceptions about what biological sex differences are supposed to exist; and these differences include touching, soothing and differential ideas about the autonomy (or lack of it) of boy and girl children.

The work of Chodorow (1978) and Gilligan (1982) influenced feminist thought on gender. These theorists maintain that girls and boys are presented with different developmental challenges originating from the fact that females give most early childrearing and therefore primary attachments are formed with female caregivers. Thus, according to Howes and Cichetti (1995:256), “[w]hile young girls make a same gender identification with their primary caregiver and adult model, boys must shift their identification as they differentiate from their mothers and identify with a male figure, typically their fathers.”

Social construction, or socialisation is the process through which gender identity is learned, therefore a woman becomes a woman by learning the required behaviour that is associated with her gender, and men become men by learning the required behaviour that is associated with their gender. The result is little girls becoming stereotypically feminine and little boys becoming stereotypically masculine. MacKinnon (cited in Bell 1993:24) writes that “[s]ocially,

femaleness means femininity, which means attractiveness to men, which means sexual attractiveness, which means sexual availability on male terms.”

### **3.5 The family as a patriarchal structure**

Traditionally, the family has been considered the basic structural unit upon which other systems are based. Within a patriarchal family unit, the wife and children are seen as belonging to the husband/father. The father is socially sanctioned as the power broker and thus able to maintain control over his wife and children (Driver 1989). Yeatman (1994:80) describes the family as a

...patriarchal-patrimonial model of power, for which a master's authority over his household is the archetype. These models identify power with the prerogative of the lord, master, household head and employer to demand obedience from their subordinates in return for protection.

The family is considered sacrosanct, private and personal and a complex ideology has developed to maintain this. There is also the belief that families exist to fulfil the needs of all its members. Wilson (1989:75) writes that “[f]eminists oppose this view and contend that in reality families exist to meet men's needs, because power is in the hands of males.” She continues to suggest that “...men's needs are being met because the family is viewed as a single entity, without distinction made between its members differing power and differing needs.”

Although child sexual abuse is a personal experience, it is about control and power relations between, mostly men, and, mostly female, children, especially in the context of the family. Personal experiences are a reflection of social factors and as such, the two need to be viewed as interrelated. In other words, a

male dominated family system is a reflection of a social system in which men have the power over women and children.

Within a system such as the family, that is, a social structure dominated by patriarchy, child sexual abuse can occur when the powerful male asserts his power over the powerless child. In this powerful position, "...the man expects to have his will obeyed as head of household, and expects his family to provide him with domestic and sexual services" (Herman 1984:84).

A patriarchal system is one that creates and maintains male control over females, in other words, it is a system of male supremacy. It is a system that differentiates men from women by privileging men. Eisenstein (1981:14-15) describes patriarchy as

... a political structure [that] seeks to control and subjugate women so that their possibilities for making choices about their sexuality, child-rearing, mothering, loving and labour are curtailed. Patriarchy is a set of social relations which has a material base and in which there are hierarchical relations between men and solidarity among them. Its purpose is to destroy women's consciousness about our potential power, which derives from the necessity of society to reproduce itself.

Herman (1984) in "Father-Daughter Incest" states that the occurrence of incest is higher in families where the father is particularly domineering. She maintains that such fathers frequently attempt to further secure their dominant position by socially isolating members of the family, especially daughters, from the outside world. Within this kind of family construction, the mother is usually very oppressed and powerless. She is likely to be very dependent on, especially financially, and subservient to her husband. This may result in her denying a child's disclosure of abuse or even blaming the child. Herman (1984:49) describes this situation as being "...a measure of maternal powerlessness."

Waldby, Clancy, Emetchi and Summerfield (1989:100) elaborate on this when they say “[t]he collusive mother maintains the incest secret for the same reasons that the daughter does; both mother and daughter are powerless vis-a-vis the father.” They continue to describe this collusion as the effect of rape ideology, rather than from choice or power. Ward (1984:194) describes rape ideology as

...that set of beliefs and practices which causes females to actually live in fear of males and maleness. It assumes that male sexuality is innately active, aggressive, and insatiable; that female sexuality is innately passive, receptive and inhibited...War and sexuality are seen as the same battleground.

Rape, actual and threatened, is an effective tool of control that subjugates females - of all ages - and nowhere is this terrorism more insidious than in its application to children; particularly in their own homes.

Ward (1984) continues on to contend that male desire for sexual domination over females is further strengthened by the concept of ownership (of wife and children) that accompanies some heterosexual relationships.

Feminist writings on child sexual abuse focus on the connection between sexuality and structural and institutional power. Driver (1989:1) writes:

[Feminist writers] argue that it is largely an expression of male dominance over ...children, ensuring silence and submission by enforcing the institution of heterosexuality on young girls in order to prepare them for a powerless role in the family and society as adults.

Feminist theory is primarily concerned with the subject of power. Goldner (1995:136) writes:

The question about having, confronting and combating power have been central to the development of feminist theory, to its social ideals, and to its complex practices... feminists [have moved] toward more complex views of power as a relational arrangement, buttressed by the

larger sociopolitical context of gender inequality...

### **3.6 The Power theory**

The Power Theory, is a theoretical framework used at Dympna House, Sydney, and has its roots in feminist theories of child sexual abuse.

#### **3.6.1 Power theory for casework and prevention of sexual abuse**

The Power Theory "...differs from many other theories and perspectives as it provides a conceptual framework which serves as a basis for not only casework but also for socio-political change and prevention as well" (Waldby, Clancy, Emetchi and Summerfield 1989:101). They contend that the Power Theory

...provides a broad based framework that encompasses socio-political factors, familial factors and individual characteristics and thus provides a springboard for a comprehensive approach to both stopping incest and child sexual abuse in the long term and treating it in the short term.

The theory comprises two notions of power, structural power, that is, power over others and personal power, that is, power within oneself.

#### **3.6.2 Structural Power**

Structural power, or institutional power, is power that is given and condoned by society. It enables the powerful members of society to control the less powerful and is evident in many binary situations, for example, the power of white people over black people, men over women and children, adults over children, rich over poor, and is the consequence of factors such as age, race, gender, religion, education, wealth, intelligence etc. Of structural, or institutional power,



Waldby Clancy, Emetchi and Summerfield (1989:102) write:

This form of power is hierarchical, static, public, socially legitimised (it has 'authority'); it is a form of control: the 'power over' model, with all its connotations of competition, dominance and force. This construct is a cornerstone of patriarchal hegemony and, without it, aggression against and exploitation of people who have little or no institutionalised power (e.g. children, females, Black people, working class people, the disabled, etc.) could not be maintained.

Where one group possesses power over another, there is always the potential to abuse or misuse that power. Seen in the context of child sexual abuse, there is a gross misuse of the power that adults, especially men, legitimately have over children. This abuse can be maintained when society perpetuates the myths of sexual abuse and when the legal system makes it difficult for a sexual abuse victim to disclose the abuse in a safe and supportive way.

### **3.6.3 Personal power**

This is the power within every person and is, according to Waldby, Clancy, Emetchi & Summerfield (1989:103)

[t]he inner strength that arises from a strong motivation to survive. Well-channelled personal power enables us to exercise control over our own lives, achieve our own goals and fulfil our own needs while respecting the value and goals and needs of other people. In some individuals, personal power is positive, strong and healthy; in others it is underdeveloped, distorted or neglected. As such, it may be harmful to themselves and to others.

Individuals who operate from a position of fear and anger, in a situation, for example a family, in which they have been granted structural power, are likely to hurt themselves and/or others. In this scenario, sexual desire as the excuse for

sexually abusing a child is condoned because of the powerful position of the abuser. The idea of personal power when applied to child sexual abuse highlights the need for children to grow up conscious of the worth and value of others, with the emphasis on developing and nurturing their own personal power.

### **3.7 Power/ knowledge relation**

Foucault (Gordon 1980:141) explains that "...power is always 'already there' and one is never 'outside it'." Relations of power are already interwoven with other kinds of relations such as sexuality and the family, with which they simultaneously play a conditioning as well as a conditioned role.

Michel Foucault (1980) evolved a description of power to account for modern systems of social control. Townley (1993:7) offers the following description of Foucault's concept of power:

For Foucault, ...power is associated with practices, techniques and procedures. Power is relational: it is not a possession. Power is not something 'that is acquired, seized or shared, something one holds onto or allows to slip away'. It is exercised rather than held, a property of relations, manifest through practices. Finally, power does not have a necessary central point or locus. Rather it is employed at all levels, has many dimensions, and is evident in all social networks.

Foucault (1980) describes an all-embracing, invisible, inescapable power which cannot be opposed as it is a determining part of the society in which people live. In his view, power shapes all members of a society through their social practices, such as religion, medicine, politics and education. It produces reality and determines what people know to be natural, normal and true. As such, institutions of medicine, law, education and the family all produce discourses

about women and child sexual abuse which influences how people live.

### **3.8 Exposing the myths**

Feminist theory has challenged existing theories by exposing the underlying myths that became part of the knowledge about child sexual abuse. Bell (1993:80) describes these myths as "...a complex and contradictory overlapping of several sorts of knowledges with different origins and different targets". Feminists have been able to challenge these myths by utilising knowledge obtained from survivors themselves.

Myths around child sexual abuse have effectively served to minimise, and even deny the existence and incidence of child sexual abuse. These myths "...reinforce the illusion that incest [and child sexual abuse] is an isolated aberration rather than a fundamental pattern of societal abuse" Driver (1989:27),

One of the first myths to be exposed by feminist researchers was that of "Stranger Danger". Until relatively recently, child sexual abusers were presumed to be dirty old men dressed in dark overcoats lurking around children's playgrounds, parks or alleyways. However, it is recognised that most child sexual abuse occurs within the family situation, and is usually committed by men who are well known to the child, usually the father or stepfather.

This debunks another myth, that is the myth that sexual abuse is mainly confined to ethnic minorities. Offenders cross all social, economic and racial boundaries and there is no one racial group that is more highly represented than another. Of this myth, Driver (1989:33) writes that

[a] common racist stereotype is that males of the stigmatised cultural

or racial group are bent on undermining the authority of the dominant group by, for example, seducing and raping the dominant men's women or stealing or murdering their children. This myth is a bitter irony in the light of everyday abuse of ethnic minority women and children by males from the dominant group.

Alongside this stands the myth that sexual abuse is a predominantly lower or working class phenomenon. While it may well be in the interests of middle and upper class abusers to perpetuate this myth and they may be in a better position to hide their crimes there is ample evidence that men in these classes sexually abuse their children as often as men in lower or working classes. Finkelhor (1986:67) writes "The most representative surveys of child sexual abuse in the community have been unable to find any relationship between sexual abuse and the social class of the family in which the victims grew up." Briggs and Hawkins (1997:128) indicate the same, thus "The literature shows that most male molesters ... come from all ethnic, religious, racial, social, professional and educational backgrounds."

Another myth feminists have challenged is that children, and women, lie about sexual abuse. Driver (1989:27) has subcategorised this into the following "... (a) children invent accusations; (b) adult women fantasise about childhood experiences; (c) vindictive mothers for their own purposes cook up stories of abuse to their children". Driver (1989) challenges this myth with the argument that sexual activity is not usually within the range of childhood experience and understanding and therefore they are not able to lie or fantasise about it. Children anticipate 'getting into trouble' if they do disclose sexual abuse and are therefore more likely to deny or minimise abuse to avoid possible negative repercussions. Driver (1989), an Australian theorist, suggests that adult women have little to gain by conjuring up experiences of painful childhood sexual abuse. In New Zealand, however, until 1992, it was possible for survivors of

child sexual abuse to claim up to \$17,000 through Accident Corporation Commission. She states that there are no known instances of mothers creating stories of sexual abuse of their children for personal reasons. Spite and maliciousness have, however, been blamed when marriages have broken down and the wife has cited sexual abuse of the children as the cause. Recently in New Zealand there have been two high profile cases of mothers hiding their daughters from their husbands and the authorities claiming sexual abuse by the father as the reason. One of these is the case of American Dr Elizabeth Morgan who hid her young daughter with her parents in Christchurch to avoid her former husband having access to their child claiming he had sexually abused the child.

The idea of false memory syndrome is a recently new phenomenon within the child sexual abuse field and contends that women 'create' false memories of child sexual abuse because of the questioning techniques and possible 'implanting of ideas' during their psychotherapy sessions (Goodyear-Smith 1993). Finkelhor (1986:66) however suggests that memories of early childhood sexual abuse may be forgotten and repressed "...especially when they occur to children without a cognitive framework for interpreting their experiences".

A predominant theme in literature about the effects of child sexual abuse is one of inevitable long-term personality and psychological deficits and impairment. This has had serious implications for the development of ideas and theory on how treatment and therapy should be conducted, that is, the victim has developed symptoms that need to be diagnosed and then treated. As an alternative to this dominant discourse on the 'inevitable long term negative effects' of child sexual abuse, Narrative therapy, for example, by assisting people rediscover their alternative stories, has helped people who have been abused recognise that "[i]n spite of having experienced something quite painful

and confusing, [they] have many strengths and resources with which to solve difficulties” (Durrant & Kowalski 1992:75).

### **3.9 Theories on child sexual abuse**

There are different categories into which the theoretical literature on child sexual abuse falls. These are theories within different disciplines, for example, the social and medical disciplines such as anthropology, psychology, sociology and psychiatry which have all contributed to these theories. Some of these theories will be discussed briefly and contrasted with feminist theory on child sexual abuse. Feminist theory regard the traditional theories as deriving from a patriarchal society, reflecting and contributing to the power imbalance in society (Waldby, Clancy, Emetchi & Summerfield 1989). These will be commented on briefly.

#### **3.9.1 Psychoanalytic theory**

Theories derived from psychiatric literature stems from Freud’s prolific writings on infantile and childhood sexuality and much of his work “...now forms part of our everyday discourse on the nature of sexuality. Terms ... such as penis envy, biology as destiny, castration complex and Oedipus complex, are integrated into the language...” (Szirom 1988:26). Freud’s writings maintaining that sexuality begins in infancy and childhood, successfully challenged the previously held assumption that sexuality begins in adulthood.

In his early work, Freud found that a large number of his female patients attributed their neurosis and hysteria to childhood sexual trauma. In 1896 he published a paper called “The Etiology of Hysteria” in which he claimed there

was a direct link between childhood sexual trauma and later adult psychiatric difficulties. In 1905, however, he retracted this earlier claim because of general disbelief, especially that of his colleagues, that childhood abuse could be so common. This led to his theory that his patients' hysteria was the result of their own inner conflicts resulting from sexual fantasy, 'penis envy' and sexual desire for their fathers.

Freud's 'Oedipus Complex' was based on the belief that children sexually desire the parent of the opposite sex as the central phenomenon and a normal stage in their development. Initially, usually, the mother is the object of love and affection for both girls and boys as she is the primary source of food, affection and security in infancy. Freud maintained that when children enter the 'phallic stage', at around 4 to 5 years, they become very interested in exploring their own and their friends genitals. This leads girls to discover that neither she nor her mother has a protruding, superior sex organ. She blames her mother for this, loves her mother less and transfers her love to her father because he possesses the highly valued organ. This model sees the "...daughter as...the active, desiring agent and the father as passive, innocent object" (Waldby, Clancy, Emetchi & Summerfield 1989:89).

The Oedipus Complex served the purpose of effectively denying the possibility of sexual abuse by blaming the child for initiating sexual activity in the first instance. When incest actually did occur, mutuality was inferred and the blame was relegated to the daughter, that is, the child-seductress. Nabokov's novel "Lolita" is based on a girl who 'seduces' an adult man and from this grew the term the 'Lolita syndrome'. Freud's theory has "...exerted a powerful, even dominant, influence over conceptualisations of childhood sexuality used by researchers and also by therapists working closely with children... including

those who have been sexually abused” (Glaser & Frosh 1993:39). His theories dominated psychiatric literature from the turn of the century until the late 1960s (Waldby, Clancy, Emetchi & Summerfield 1989).

### **3.9.2 Other psychological theories**

Early ideas regarding the role of the child in sexual abuse suggested the child was a willing participant in these activities. Early research (as cited in Gomez-Schwartz, Horowitz & Carderelli 1990:16) investigated the characteristics of the child involved in abuse. This was driven by the idea that the behaviour of the child ‘as a seducer’ contributed to their victimization and was therefore responsible for her/his abuse.

Researching the characteristics of the child was replaced by studies which aimed to elicit factors that placed children in high risk categories (Finkelhor & Baron 1986:60). These were done by studying various risk factors in an effort to focus on prevention of child sexual abuse.

Different studies of the abuser were summarised by Araji and Finkelhor (1986) and Finkelhor (1986). These empirical studies focused the personality of the perpetrators of child abuse in order to account for their abusive behaviour. According to Araji and Finkelhor (1986:92), most of the approaches they summarised tended to use “single-factor theories”. The different approaches identify one, or sometimes two, explanations for sexual abuse. Their research focused on the following four theories as explanations for sexual abuse:

- Why an adult would find a sexual relationship with a child emotionally gratifying ;
- Why an adult would be capable of being sexually aroused by a child;



- Why an adult would find it difficult to sexually relate to other adults;
- Why an adult would not be inhibited by social and legal restraints.

These theories gave individual psychological or sociocultural explanations for the abuse (Araji & Finkelhor 1986). Explanations about why an adult would find it emotionally gratifying to have a sexual relationship with a child centered around the adult's immaturity and inadequacy. The arousal theory emphasised the likelihood that the abuser had him/herself been abused as a child and considered the offence to be a re-enactment of the offender's own experiences. Explanations regarding the blockage theory accentuate the fact that child abusers suffer from frustration in their love relationships and have problems relating to adults. In trying to explain why abusers were not influenced by social and legal restraints the role of alcohol as a disinhibitor was the most empirically supported theory (Araji & Finkelhor 1986).

Araji and Finkelhor (1986) recommended multifactor explanations integrating a variety of single-factor explanations to account for many different kinds of child sexual abuse.

Psychological studies on incest tend to focus on the father, rather than on the mother or daughter. Waldby, Clancy, Emetchi and Summerfield (1989:96) describe two different approaches found within these studies as being either

...concerned to demonstrate the existence of a specific 'incestuous personality' that is, a series of fixed personality traits in the offender that explains their actions and what differentiates them from other types of sex offenders; or it attempts to find subclassifications within the group of incestuous fathers that indicate a variety of motives.

These theories study various characteristics of sex offenders, though in a way

that takes no notice of the sex offender's relationships with others. However, psychological studies of sex offenders are hindered significantly by the difficulty of identifying a representative population to study. The majority of cases of child sexual abuse are never reported to the police, and those that are, are more likely to have been committed by offenders who are "... unknown to the victim, when he belongs to a minority ethnic group, or when the assault is very violent" (Herman 1984: 78). Although the majority of sex offenders do not appear to suffer from any major psychiatric disorder, a small number "...do meet the diagnostic criteria for the so-called personality disorders. Sociopaths, schizoid, paranoid and narcissistic personality disorders are frequently described in criminally identified offenders" (Herman 1984:79). Meiselman (1981:92) notes a strong desire to dominate their families as an outstanding characteristic of incestuous fathers and writes:

At the one extreme is the father who is sociopathic and is ...treating his ...family as objects to fulfil his desires. At the other extreme, is the father who seems to be over invested in his family and seeks to control all aspects of their lives".

Between these extremes is the abuser who "...cannot be identified by their appearance, their educational level or their status" (Briggs & Hawkins 1997:125). One of the most striking characteristics of sex offenders is their apparent normality and most do not qualify for any psychiatric diagnosis. In these cases, psychologists have focused on aspects of their developmental histories in order to find clues to help understand their behaviours. The most popular hypothesis is that they themselves were sexually abused in childhood. Briggs and Hawkins (1997:128) write "The literature shows that most male molesters were sexually abused in childhood..."

### 3.9.3 Family Systems theory as an explanation for incest

The theory of family systems developed within the concept of family psychiatry. Waldby, Clancy, Emetchi and Summerfield (1989:93) suggest that family psychiatry can be differentiated from traditional psychiatry

...by its treatment of the family as a single entity, rather than a concern for the psyches of family members. Instead of a concern for individual pathology it proposed that the family as a unit could be pathological and that abnormal behaviour was a symptom of overall current family maladjustment”.

Family systems approach aims to view the family as a system with a number of parts interdependent and interacting with each other with each member playing a contributing role. It considers that child sexual abuse and incest is derived from, and is maintained by, emotional deprivation, neglect and disturbances in family relationships. This theory views the dysfunction of the family as being based on three factors, firstly, the mother, as a wife, is dysfunctional and unable to satisfy her husband's sexual needs, secondly, the mother, is dysfunctional in that she is unable to satisfactorily administer to the needs of the children, and thirdly, both the mother and the father are inadequate and dysfunctional as adults and parents and place unrealistic adult-type expectations and demands on their children, including 'wifely duties' for the daughters. Glaser and Frosh (1993:47) describe the dysfunction and conflict within the family that results in incest as follows:

Incest between father and daughter...arises as a more-or-less conscious delegation of the daughter to take over the wife's sexual role, removing a major source of stress and effectively binding the family together in the firm web of incestuous secrecy. No one acknowledges what is happening; the family's self-image and their presentation to the outside world is moral and idealised; the incest effectively removes the pressure from the marital relationship. The girl concerned is both victimised and central, distant from her mother but also

essential to her. Fathers in such families are 'emotionally immature' and threatening; mothers are 'emotionally rigid' and 'over-moralistic', providing practical care but neglecting their daughter's emotional needs.

As a whole, the family is seen as dysfunctional and each member contributes to the dysfunction by repeated dysfunctional behaviours. This theory sees incest not as a problem in itself, but as a symptom of dysfunction and consequently is given only secondary consideration by those working according to this perspective. As such, the focus of analysis and responsibility is shifted completely away from the "...internal individual pathology of the abuser and towards the network of family relationships which allow the incest to occur and continue" (Glaser & Frosh 1993:48). This results in the spotlight being focused on implicating the mother as being partially responsible for the incest, and on the daughter's complicity rather than on the abuser. This theory also emphasises reconciliation of families in order to avoid potentially devastating financial and other such consequences. Lack of reconciliation, even removal of the offender, is considered to weaken family structures further and is perceived as punishing the whole family. Serious attempts are made to discourage the removal of the offender as it can result in denial of the event/s and further retaliation against the victim.

The family systems approach has been severely criticised by feminist theorists for its view of the family as a distinct and autonomous entity and for its lack of gender analysis meaning that family member's roles and power relations within the family itself, the workplace and the community are left unquestioned. The dysfunctional family idea implies that there is a healthy, normal, ideal family system. It also tends to disregard forms of incest, other than father-daughter incest, such as the abuse of children by brothers, uncles, and grandfathers, and makes no attempt to understand or analyse extra-familial sexual abuse.

Gavey (1990) and Wattenberg (1985) further criticise the family systems approach for its tendency to blame incest on members of a family, most especially the mother. It suggests a collaborative role of the mother and infers that the mother is solely responsible for providing sexual satisfaction, childcare, protection, nurturing and emotional sustenance and when failure to do so suggests she is "...either negligent or incapable of this 'duty'" (Bell 1993:84). In this way, systems theory offers the abuser a variety of defences, excuses and rationalisations in order to enable him to avoid taking full and sole responsibility.

#### **3.9.4 Feminist theory**

Feminist theory on child sexual abuse differs from the perspectives described above. Feminist theory focuses on the role and position of the mother and daughter within the family. This is done through studying the family dynamics of incest and accentuating the role that power and power relations play in a family. This theory also comments on the power relationship and the broader operation of patriarchy in society. Feminist theory sees the family perpetuating the inequality of power within society. Feminist theory objects to the three perspectives described in 3.9.1 - 3.9.3 contending they do not recognise the "...displacement of the power relationships involved in incestuous abuse... and all three perspectives maintain the status quo of patriarchy" (Waldby, Clancy, Emetchi & Summerfield 1989:97).

For feminists, this means addressing and examining incest from the point of view of the mother and daughter, recognising that incest is about power relationships and connecting the power relationship within families to the broader operation of patriarchy in wider society. In other words, the father

dominated family system is a reflection of the male dominated social system and this is where to find the answers which can explain why child sexual abuse is as widespread as research indicates. This has led feminist researchers to recognise that gender, that is, the gender of the perpetrator, rather than the gender of the victim, is a central feature of child sexual abuse. MacLeod and Saraga (1988:39) write, "Feminist theory starts with gender. In looking at why children get sexually abused we are not looking at some 'Neanderthal' drive, nor at problem families, but at problematic sexual and adult-child politics."

Feminist theory is very clear in seeing sexual abuse as an act of violence, an act or violation of power, taking advantage of someone in a weaker position. Wilson (1989:74) describes child sexual abuse as "...a function of the predatory and misogynist attitudes of men towards women, which are an expectation and reflection of their socialisation on our patriarchal and hierarchical social structure." However, it is important to acknowledge that child sexual abuse can also be an expression of misdirected sexual urges.

### **3.10 Summary**

In this chapter the researcher has summarised different theoretical frameworks that have influenced different research perspectives, Over time these theories changed from focussing on the child as a willing participant to identifying the characteristics of the abuser or offender. Feminist theory exposed the myths and accentuated the power imbalances in families and in society. The latter theory also challenged research perpetuating and contributing to these power imbalances.

Feminist theory maintains that people's behaviours originate in their social

environment and that through changing negative aspects in the social environment, it is possible to change negative, destructive behaviour in people. For sexual abuse to no longer exist, it is necessary to transform the notion of the patriarchal family as it is a reflection of the patriarchal society in which we live. Many currently existing patriarchal attitudes towards children, childrearing and women need to change for child sexual abuse to be something of the past. Waldby, Clancy, Emetchi and Summerfield (1989:104) suggest

[a] society that, as a whole, nurtures a child's development of self-love and respect for others is considerably removed from our current world as regards childrearing, education, sexual development, sex roles, legal position and recognition of children's rights.

As regards childrearing, the process of socialisation of girls and boys needs to be addressed so they are presented with a wide range of positive role models and options. They require the opportunity to develop the communication skills necessary to express their fears, hopes, thoughts, ideas and expressions of sexuality.

### UNRAVELLING THE CONTROVERSY 1 PRE-TRIAL EVENTS

#### 4.1 Why the need for a new programme

Traditionally, the New Zealand Police had taught school children safety awareness by using a “Stranger Danger” programme. However, they became increasingly aware of inherent serious inadequacies within the programme that required urgent changes. Mr Owen Sanders who was working as a Curriculum Officer with the New Zealand Police in the early 1980s recalls the catalyst for initiating a new programme occurred when

... Police Education Officer Constable Karen Holland stormed into my office, sat down in front of my desk and described with great passion her frustration with ‘stranger danger’ lessons she had been taking in a Wellington high school. “It is just not good enough Owen,” she said, “what are **you** going to do about it?” Karen was in a good position to judge the worth of child abuse prevention strategies. She had been a teacher before becoming a police officer and was also active in the Wellington Rape Crisis Centre. And Karen was right to see that there was a problem to be addressed. What Police were doing was inadequate as an educational strategy (Sanders 1997:1).

Although anecdotes suggest from that time there was a considerable effort from Constable Holland, Ms Denise Black of the Rape Crisis Centre in



and Mr Sanders to formulate an alternative programme, the earliest documented correspondence specifying the Police sought to change this approach and replace the Stranger Danger programme is dated 8 February 1983 and is from Senior Sergeant W. O'Brien, the Co-ordinator of Police Law Related Education to Mr J. Cox, the Director of Curriculum Development, Department of Education (12/3/8/3. Vol.1).

The Stranger Danger approach and the language used led children to believe 'strangers' were sinister men wearing dark overcoats lurking around playgrounds and parks. Films shown to children tended to portray strangers in cars with flashing red lights, accompanied by frightening music. It was considered necessary to utilise clear and simple language if children's perceptions about possible dangers were not to be clouded by myths and fantasies. The traditional approach had always been taught stressing negatives rather than by using a positive approach. The Police were also concerned that the Stranger Danger approach would negatively affect children's independence, initiative, sense of adventure and trust as they were being taught never to play alone, especially in certain places such as parks and never talk to strangers. In addition, there was a distinct possibility that the false impressions created about all strangers would mean that children could be confused or even deliberately avoid approaching any strangers in situations when their help was critical.

The reality was that a covert sexual suggestion or approach was most likely to be initiated by a person exhibiting none of the dangerous or other graphic warning signs that were being portrayed in child protection programmes (Finkelhor 1979, 1980; Saphira 1981).

## 4.2 Child sexual abuse seen as a social problem

Finkelhor (1984) suggests that child sexual abuse began to be identified as a serious social problem by child protectionists and the women's movement in the mid-1970s. In 1980 Miriam Jackson (Saphira) conducted one of the first studies in New Zealand on child sexual abuse through the New Zealand Women's Weekly. The reported findings of this survey, the publication of her book "The Sexual Abuse of Children" in 1981 and a speaking tour of New Zealand increased the general public's awareness of and information about child sexual abuse. The Auckland Help Foundation was established in 1981 to work with adult and child sexual abuse survivors. The media also played an important role in shaping and structuring the public awareness of child sexual abuse and newspaper articles, such as that published in the Wellington Dominion on 29 April 1983, were beginning to highlight a previously hidden phenomenon, child sexual abuse:

Children as young as four are at risk of being sexually abused by members of their family, according to a survey published yesterday ...more than a third (36 per cent) said they had been attacked as children or adolescents; one-sixth by family members. One in 12 was a victim of incest before reaching puberty. The majority of the victims were girls. One was only four; the average age was 10. The attackers ranged from 14 to 70, though the most frequent age group was 17. Fathers were the most likely relative to abuse children.

Finkelhor et al. (1986) listed 15 studies published to that date which altered the traditional views on the dynamics of child sexual abuse, such as the age of the victim, the effects of child sexual abuse, prevalence and incidence rates, at risk groups, the identity of the abuser and type of abuse perpetrated. The information clearly indicated that children were most often abused by family members, or family friends or acquaintances and the abuse occurred in interfamilial

situations. Publicity such as this supported the Police Curriculum Development team's belief in the need for a new programme.

### **4.3 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' initiated**

In order to overcome shortcomings of the "Stranger Danger" programme, the Keeping Ourselves Safe (KOS) programme was initiated by Mr Owen Sanders of the Curriculum Development Office, New Zealand Police in collaboration with Ms Black and Constable Holland (Cox/O'Brien 8/2/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1). Mrs Helen Shaw, Health Education Curriculum Development Officer, was suggested as an appropriate person from the Department of Education to work on the new programme in collaboration with Mr Sanders (O'Brien/Cox 8/2/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1). This was initially intended for Standards 2 – 4 children and was

...aimed to educate children, school staff and parents about all aspects of safety, including the dangers of sexual and physical abuse. The teaching material for children was to consist of four units on how to keep safe:

1. As we grow up,
2. With objects that might be dangerous,
3. In situations that may become dangerous, and
4. When meeting other people (undated draft document. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1).

Unit 1 was to cover the concept of safety and keeping safe in general and units 2 and 3 were to look at some specific examples of how to keep safe, for example, when using fireworks and how to keep safe around fires. Unit 4 was to contain material that related to physical and sexual abuse (Sanders/Geddis 13/6/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1). This arrangement of the content was deliberate, the intention being that children would perceive safety from abuse as being a normal aspect

of safety awareness they needed as they grew up. An integrated approach involving helping children keep themselves safe from dangerous objects, situations and people was also considered to have much merit.

By October 1983 units were being developed to include junior classes (Sanders/Sankey 18/10/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1). A decision to extend the programme to incorporate Form 1 – 2 classes was made in March 1984 (O'Brien/Director:Public Affairs 12/3/84. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1).

#### **4.4 Regional interdisciplinary approach established**

Publicity such as this brought the phenomenon of child sexual abuse out into the open and led to various agencies and groups actively working towards establishing a regional interdisciplinary approach for dealing with the problem. On May 16, 1983, a meeting was held in Auckland to discuss such a regional approach for the management of incest and child sexual abuse. It was called by the Child Sexual Abuse Co-ordinating Committee and was attended by representatives of the Health Department, Social Welfare Department, Auckland Hospital Board, Justice Department, the New Zealand Police and other agencies and groups working with the effects of incest and sexual abuse. The aim of the meeting was to establish practical ways to increase detection of child sexual abuse and to improve treatment effectiveness. Although the National Advisory Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse was established in 1981 and a National Symposium on Child Abuse Prevention took place in Palmerston North in 1982, the meeting in Auckland was the first of its kind to be held in New Zealand. These organisations and agencies were aware of the need for the development of child protection programmes and consequently offered very positive support for the development of the Keeping Ourselves Safe programme

(Dr Newman press release 17/5/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1).

Mr Sanders, Curriculum Development Officer for the New Zealand Police, maintained very regular contact with the above organisations and in particular, with Dr M. Abbott of the Mental Health Foundation. Other early encouragement for the development of a preventative educational programme for children was received from Mr P. McQueen lecturer in Health Education at Auckland Teachers' College, Catholic Teachers' College Loretto Hall, the General Manager of the Auckland Education Board, Ms Miriam Saphira, School Inspectors, representatives of the Principals' Association and representatives of the New Zealand Educational Institute (NZEI) (undated document 12/3/8/3 Vol.1).

#### **4.5 Major legal dilemma**

By April 1983 a considerable amount of time had been spent on the content of the standard 2 – 4 unit. The first draft of the teaching materials was complete and had been shown to community groups, for example, Auckland Education Board members all of whom were supportive (undated document 12/3/8/3 Vol.1). Of the content to date, Dr Abbott wrote that after having consulted with colleagues, including psychologists and counsellors, he considered it “a matter of some urgency to get the course running in schools” (Abbott/Sanders 1/5/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1).

On 26 April 1983 Mr Sanders and Senior Sergeant O'Brien had a progress discussion with Mrs Shaw, Mr Cox Director of Development, Department of Education and Mr Aitken, Assistant Director of Development, about the content of the programme. Although Mrs Shaw, Mr Cox and Mr Aitken were supportive

of the programme and could see a need for the intended instruction as described by Mr Sanders and Senior Sergeant O'Brien, "... Mr Cox was adamant that as things stood now, what we propose now would contravene the primary schools' regulations on sex education" (O'Brien/Director:Public Affairs 2/5/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1). Those associated with the Department of Education gave clear instructions that any specific mention of sex abuse would have to be legally cleared, as the then current Health Syllabus (1954:2) stated "There is no place in the primary school for group or class instruction in sex education".

If the programme did contravene the prohibition of sex education in primary schools, the Department of Education would be forced to dissociate themselves from it, which would effectively prevent the programme that was being developed being implemented into schools (O'Brien/ Director:Public Affairs 2/5/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1). This situation caused great concern to Mr Sanders and Senior Sergeant O'Brien as the consequences of not being able to proceed with the programme's development meant children would continue to not receive any self protection strategies.

In order to facilitate a resolution between the Department of Education and the Police a meeting was scheduled to be held on 15 July 1983 and was attended by Dr Abbott, Mr Wellington Minister of Education, Mr Couch Minister of Police, Senior Sergeant O'Brien and Deputy Assistant Commissioner Davies. Dr Abbott, who wished to discuss the issue of child abuse generally, initiated this meeting and saw it as an opportunity to discuss the Police programme. Thus, "...recent discussions with senior Education Department staff have concerned me greatly on this matter. It appears that they have blocked the Police programme on the grounds that it is 'sex education'" (Abbott/Couch 21/6/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1). The consequence of this meeting was an agreement between the

Ministers of the two departments that their staff should work co-operatively and the programme should proceed. This arrangement was explained in the following letter to Dr Abbott:

You will now be aware that officers of the Police and education Departments are working together to find a suitable form of presentation for the "Keeping Safe" programme in schools. Because teachers and Police Department education officers will jointly present this material, you understand that it must be one which conforms to the policy positions of both Departments (Wellington&Couch/Abbott 9/8/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1).

#### **4.6 Legal opinion issued**

In the meantime, the Police National Headquarters Legal Section issued a written opinion that included statements on the legal position. The legal position was formally clarified in the following statement (Bates/Director of Public Affairs 24/6/83. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1):

- 1). I have studied the material in question and am firmly of the view that it should be classified as 'crime detection and prevention' material. The fact that it incorporates references to unlawful sexual interference with children and young persons does not take it into the realms of 'sex education'; this latter term I understand to be directed towards instruction in human physiology, procreation, and emotional development.
- 2). The reality is that sex related crimes are defined and proscribed in the Crimes Act 1961, such crimes do occur, and the Police are statutorily charged with the duty of preventing crimes qua offences (see s.37(1), Police Act 1958, the Oath of Office). The particular material in issue in the "Keeping Ourselves Safe" project is directed (sensibly and moderately) to this end. It is recommended that the project be proceeded with.

The formal legal statement prompted Mr Thompson, Deputy Commissioner, to send a draft copy of the programme to Mr Cox, Director General of Education

asking for his approval of the programme. His reply, dated 30 August 1983 suggested that there were still reservations about some aspects of section 4, though he was sure

... that it would be possible to modify those aspects in ways that overcome our concerns and still remain acceptable to your officers. I would like to suggest therefore, that your officers make contact direct with Mrs Helen Shaw, Education Officer (Health), so that discussions can be held and mutual agreement reached (Cox/Thompson 30/8/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1).

Prior to this formal opinion being issued, Mrs Spence from Loretto Hall Catholic Teachers College offered to assist with any developments and trials required. As Catholic schools operated independently, they were not restricted by Department of Education regulations regarding sex education and in fact, included some sex education as a part of their religious instruction programmes (Director:Public Affairs/O'Brien 2/5/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1).

An article published in the Wellington Evening Post on 21 September 1983 describing the intentions of the new safety programme, was the catalyst for a large number of requests for information about "Keeping Ourselves Safe". These came from a variety of organisations and groups, such as YWCA, women's refuge, school guidance counsellors, psychologists, public health nurses, teachers and others, from both within and out of New Zealand.

Throughout the early period of development, Mr Thompson, Deputy Commissioner, wrote to Police Departments in Germany, Australia, Canada, England and America describing the proposed new programme and requesting any relevant information, resources or similar educational programmes they had access to or were using. Responses received were of a thoroughly supportive nature and indicated that around the world, similar programmes were being



developed. The responses also included requests for any new ideas on child protection that might be formulated in New Zealand. (Holmes, Canada/Deputy Commissioner 10/7/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1; Scott, Australia/ Deputy Commissioner 16/9/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1). Later in the development this role was taken over by Mr Sanders who maintained and initiated contact with many overseas agencies and organisations.

#### **4.7 Concerns about the content**

It was crucial that the Education Department and the Police Department work collaboratively as the programme had to include material that conformed to the policy position of both departments. It was the task of the Education Department to formulate a set of guidelines to assist teachers and principals to respond appropriately and with sensitivity to any child revealing they had been sexually abused or to any other information concerning child sexual abuse.

At the first meeting of the KOS joint working party consisting of teachers, Department of Education and Police representatives, further concerns were expressed about the implementation of the programme from three sources (as cited in minutes of meeting of KOS working party held on 10/11 October 1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1):

1. NZEI did not want to risk teachers being placed in a position where they were subject to disciplinary action by attempting the units and being drawn into sex related discussions by pupils.
2. The member representing the Department of Education Psychological Services expressed reservations that some teachers would feel uncomfortable with the topic while others would be over zealous and 'salacious' in their approach.
3. One teacher expressed doubts about feeling uncomfortable dealing with the sexual abuse in the home topic.

However, a decision was made to carry on and complete the units. After this task was completed, the Police would liaise with the Department of Education, NZEI and other interested parties to ensure proper guidelines were formulated to protect and respect the feelings and ethics of all teachers involved in the programme.

By 7 November 1983 the joint working party had revised and edited the earlier draft units developed by Constable Karen Holland, Ms Black and Mr Sanders (Sanders/Ash 9/11/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1). Although the basic principles and content had remained, the teaching activities had been improved and extended so the layout was easy for classroom teachers to use. The structure had been altered a little to allow the material to fit naturally into the draft Health Syllabus, though did not necessarily need to be part of it.

Changes from the initial to the final draft included a father/daughter sexual abuse situation rather than an uncle/niece situation and using specific names for genitals rather than referring to them as 'private parts'. Using clear direct language a child could understand rather than 'beat around the bush' was seen as crucial in order to avoid the same misconceptions arising that made the Stranger Danger approach so inadequate. There was also concern that 'watering down' the language used too much would result in the aims of the programme being difficult to achieve.

At this stage, the units were sent to the Education Department senior advisors for formal consideration and comment. The response received from the Education Department was favourable, the units being cleared for further development (Shaw/Sanders 10/3/1984. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1). Further development

meant preparing a teacher's guide, notes for parents, producing accompanying videos, trialling the units and convening a working party to develop the units for Forms 1 and 2.

A meeting of the working party to write the Form 1 and 2 unit was called for 12, 13 and 14 June 1984 and included representatives from the Department of Education, Police National Headquarters, Police Education Officers, Psychological Service and teachers. Ms Denise Black, from the Wellington Rape Crisis Centre, was also included because of her expertise of the age group being written for (Sanders/Co-ordinator LREP 29/5/1984. Vol.3).

#### **4.8 Funding – where would it come from?**

The Police Department was able to provide funds for script development but securing funds to produce two videos that would accompany the programme was the next major obstacle to be overcome. These two videos were integral parts of the programme, the first being an animated film using the “Pete and Penny” characters to support the J1-J3 units. The second video was planned as a teaching resource for use with Standard 2 to Form 2 children. It was to portray a range of potential abuse situations that could be used as a springboard for class discussions to identify what appropriate coping skills might be required.

On 24 April 1984 an application to fund the production of the Standard 2 to Form 2 video was submitted to the Accident Compensation Corporation (Application grant 12/3/8/3 Vol.2). As a consequence of the application, Senior Sergeant O'Brien, Mr Sanders and Mrs Shaw were invited to an informal meeting with members of the financial grants committee of the ACC (Sewell/O'Brien 19/6/1984. 12/3/8/3 Vol.3). The purpose of this meeting was to

discuss the role of the ACC in relation to educative endeavours designed to reduce the incidence of all forms of sexual abuse. Representatives from the ACC acknowledged its statutory responsibility in the area of sexual abuse although they also believed other Government departments also had a role to play. The application was eventually declined with no reason given, as were other applications for funding from several agencies working with abuse, such as Wellington Rape Crisis and Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand (Sewell/O'Brien 14 /9/1984. 12/3/8/3 Vol.3).

This left the problem of finding sponsorship, either private and public, to raise the \$47,000.00 needed to produce the Standard 2 - Form 2 video in addition to \$80,000.00 required for the J1 – 3 Pete and Penny film.

A submission was made to the Minister of Police for additional funds to cover some of the costs of the two major priorities, that is, the teaching video and associated printed material (Thompson/Minister of Police 22/11/1984. 12/3/8/3 Vol.3). Two other possible sources for funding at this stage included the Department of Social Welfare and Johnson and Johnson and a letter was sent to the Managing Director of Johnson and Johnson suggesting sponsorship of the teaching video (Templeton/Friedlander 10/9/1984. 12/3/8/3 Vol.3). A formal request was made to the Minister of Social Welfare for consideration of \$97,000.00 towards the funding of the two video presentations (Thompson/Minister Social Welfare 22/11/1984. 12/3/8/3 Vol.3). A sum of \$48,000.00 was made available from the Social Welfare vote and this sum made it possible to accept one of seven quotes submitted for the production of the Standard 2 – Form 2 video.

After careful consideration, the Gibson Group was selected as it was felt that Mr

Dave Gibson offered an acceptable quote (\$49,500.00) and the best all round production proposal along side well established credibility. This production team was able to guarantee a well produced professional product that would supplement the high quality of the programme (O'Brien/Director:Public Affairs 23/1/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4).

One of the intended vignettes on the video related to an abuse situation brought about through peer group pressure. As a result of negotiations with Rotary International, the New Zealand Police decided to produce a complete, separate programme covering peer group pressure which would enable inclusion of more information at greater depth. This meant this situation no longer needed to be included on the "Keeping Ourselves Safe" video. The necessity, however, to include a short vignette describing the purpose and background to "Keeping Ourselves Safe" soon became apparent. Even though there would be some funds available due to not including the peer group pressure vignette, there would be a shortfall of some \$4,000.00 if this new change was proceeded with. A request was made for additional funds from Social Welfare.

Mr Sanders considered an integral component of the programme was an American video called "No More Secrets". This was intended to supplement the "Pete and Penny" and the "Keeping Ourselves Safe" teaching videos. In order to present the programme as planned, 50 copies of "No More Secrets" were necessary. The price quoted by ODNproductions, America, for 25 copies was US\$6,375. Obviously legal requirements to purchase the rights to make copies in order to show the video placed a further burden on the already stretched budget. Senior Sergeant O'Brien, who was corresponding with the Marketing Director of ODNproductions, replied asking them to review their quote in view of the fact that the video would only be shown in schools to children at no cost.

The quote was reviewed and the new price offered was A\$7,500 for 50 copies, which represented a 50% discount. This was renegotiated and a contract was drawn up finalising the cost at A\$4,125 for 25 copies (Wachter/O'Brien 17/9/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.6).

The same situation applied to the Australian video "A time for caring: The schools response to the sexually abused child", also considered a vital component of the programme. The quote received for 25 copies was A\$2025. A letter was sent to Educational Media Australia, the agents for the video, asking them to reconsider their quote. An amended figure of A\$1725 for 25 copies was received and accepted (Griffith/O'Brien 9/10/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.6).

Although there is no record of any approach being made to the Family Information System Inc (FIS Inc), Washington America, there is a telegram from them offering the New Zealand Police rights to make unlimited copies of a video "Some Secrets Should Be Told" for a total cost of A\$100 for use with "Keeping Ourselves Safe". The reason given for the minimal cost was "...very supportive over recent political incidents involving New Zealand and a fair recompense..." (Telegram from FIS Washington 3/9/1984. Vol.4).

As the time involved in developing "Keeping Ourselves Safe" stretched out, the need for further funds increased. In August 1985, two and a half years after the commencement of the programme's development, Mr Thompson, Commissioner of Police submitted an application to the Child and Youth Development Trust for funding of \$87,000.00 from the proceeds of that years Telethon Appeal (12/3/8/3 Vol.5). The appeal was accompanied by endorsements for support from Mr O'Connor, Director-General of Education, Dr Max Abbott, Director, Mental Health Foundation of NZ and a commendation

for "Keeping Ourselves Safe" from Dr Karen Zelas, Child and Family Psychiatrist (12/3/8/3 Vol.5).

A sponsorship proposal was sent to Trustee Bank, Southland in August 1985 asking that they fund the \$50,000.00 development of the "Pete and Penny" video for use with J1-J3 children (Sanders/Shaw 30/8/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.5). The Trustee Bank was approached because of their general philosophy of putting money back into the community, though specifically, it would add support to the Trustee Bank money already spent in schools fostering safety. This request was declined with the primary reason given being "... a researched need to divert our marketing resource away from this younger market to a more mature group". (Shaw/Sanders 24/9/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.5). Yet another appeal for funds was made to Johnson & Johnson (NZ) Ltd and was once again declined.

By November 1985 the total budget was estimated to be \$169,100.00. Of this, there was a shortfall of \$109,100.00 which was required for the teaching kits and the trial kits (\$34,100.00), the Pete and Penny supplementary video (\$50,000.00) and videos for use by Police Education Officers (\$25,000.00) (Thompson/Minister of Police 4/11/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.6). Mrs Hercus Minister of Police arranged for funding of \$48,000.00 of the Social Welfare vote to assist in the completion of the programme (Hercus/Geddis 27/11/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.5) and the Police vote had also made provision for funding the scheme \$25,000.00 each year for the following two years.

A summary of the budget for production of KOS on 4 November 1985 was

* Trial Kits	\$7,000.00
* Teaching Kits	\$27,000.00 (to be produced in June 1986)
* Teaching Video	\$52,000.00 (KOS completed and paid for)

* Supplementary Video	\$53,000 (Pete and Penny video to be completed)
* Videos	\$30,000 (A Time for Caring, KOS, No More Secrets, Neighbourhood Support to be Duplicated and held by PEOs).
<b>* Total Budget</b>	\$169,100.00
Already paid	\$60,000.00
Finance still required	\$109,000.00

In the meantime Mr Sanders wrote to several authors requesting stories that might be suitable for use in the programme or adaptation as video vignettes. The authors included Natasha Templeton, Grace Richards, Patricia Wilson, Beverley Dunlop, Margaret Mahy and Kay Mooney. Stories and vignettes that were submitted were sent to School Publications Branch, Department of Education for editing and then returned to the authors for approval. Permission was also applied for and received from Ms. Magazine to reprint and use the story "I like you to make jokes with me, but I don't want you to touch me" written by Ellen Bass and published in Ms magazine, October, 1982 (Sanders/MsMagazine 4/11/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.6).

#### **4.9 Pre-trial difficulties**

Before trials began, there was a desire expressed by some school principals that teachers should be protected against possible complaints regarding 'specific sex terms' (Co-ordinator: Youth Aid/O'Brien 9/8/1984. 12/3/8/3 Vol.3). The NZEI wanted written assurances that no disciplinary action could be taken against teachers. This led to a meeting with representatives from the Wellington Education Board, the NZEI, the Department of Education, Mr Sanders and



Senior Sergeant O'Brien on 17 September 1984. It was hoped that the representatives from the Wellington Education Board would be able to reassure the NZEI that disciplinary action would not be taken against teachers in the event of a parent complaining about the content of the units. However, the representatives from the Wellington Education Board, Messrs Hesketh and Lelliott "... looked at the last page of all units. They spent the best part of two minutes looking at material that has taken years to prepare and said they believed it was too sensitive to allow in schools" (KOS Progress Report O'Brien/Director:Public Affairs 19/9/1984. 12/3/8/3 Vol.3). Messrs Hesketh and Lelliott then suggested that the units be trialled without reference to what they considered contentious issues, that is, teaching children the programme without making reference to the dangers of sexual abuse as it might encourage them to "start playing around with each other!" (Progress Report 19/9/1984. 12/3/8/3 Vol.3).

After all the careful preparations and thought provoking work that had gone into developing the programme these comments caused considerable concern and frustration to Mr Sanders and Senior Sergeant O'Brien. Their first alternative was to present the whole programme, not just isolated pages, to the Wellington Education Board at a later date and hope they agreed to allow trials to go ahead in the following term. The next alternative was to approach another Education Board, possibly Auckland Education Board to see if they would be amenable to having trials take place in their schools. The final alternative was to wait for the introduction of the new Health Syllabus (Progress report 19/9/1984. 12/3/8/3 Vol.3).

The new health syllabus contained revised sections on human development which would remove from the old syllabus the stipulation that there be no sex

education in classes. There was a possibility that the Minister of Education would approve the trialling of the Health Syllabus in selected schools before information about it was published in the Education Gazette. This would enable the “Keeping Ourselves Safe” trials to proceed in those selected schools. Ann Hercus, then Minister of Police and Minister of Women’s Affairs, wrote to Russell Marshall, then Minister of Education in response to his request for an update on the progress of “Keeping Ourselves Safe”. In this letter she outlined the difficult situation the reaction of the Wellington Education Board had presented to the programme’s developers and strongly stated her concern about the unnecessary obstacles to the intended school trials (Hercus/Marshall 22/11/1984. 12/3/8/3 Vol.3).

The uncertainty continued until 13 February, 1985 when Senior Sergeant O’Brien and Mr Sanders addressed the Executive and members of the Wellington Education Board about the development of ‘Keeping Ourselves Safe’ and the anticipated trials. After questions following the address, the Wellington Education Board unanimously agreed to support the programme and to allow trials in schools in the Wellington area with one proviso. That was that the trials should only go ahead once legislation was passed allowing the new Health Syllabus, of which KOS would be a component, to proceed in schools (Lelliott/O’Brien 27/2/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4).

This was obviously reason for more concern given the lengthy process involved in passing new legislation in Parliament. Ann Hercus, Minister of Police, voiced this concern to Russell Marshall, Minister of Education who was aware of the potential problem (Hercus/Marshall 28/2/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4).

In order to have the legislation passed through all stages in the current session, the amendment was drafted as a single clause Bill, although debate on the Bill

would not be completed before Easter (Marshall/Hercus 7/3/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4). Therefore it was inevitable that there would be yet another delay, until the third term, before the programme could be trialled in designated schools in Wellington.

#### **4.10 The effect of the Education Amendment Bill 1985**

The Education Amendment Bill, introduced in Parliament on 21 March 1985, set out the conditions under which health programmes based on the revised Health Education Syllabus would be taught. It laid down formal procedures for the development of a school programme and provided parents with opportunities to be involved in consultation about the programme. It also set out ways in which parents would be consulted on sex education programmes for Form 1 classes and above and made provision for parents to have the right to withdraw their child from planned sex education classes.

There were three issues concerning KOS that arose from the Education Amendment Bill 1985 that needed clarification from the Director General of Education. These were outlined in a letter from Mr Thompson, Commissioner of Police to the Director of Education on 28 March 1985 (12/3/8/3 Vol. 4):

- a. The Minister of Education has indicated "...it is likely to be the third term of this year..." before trialling can begin. Can we be sure it will be no later than that date? The police have been working on 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' for three years and are under pressure from many community groups to proceed with releasing it as soon as possible. Trials were to start last year. Any delay beyond the third term this year would be unfortunate.
- b. Section 105D of the Bill states that "parents may require students to be excluded from classes". Can you confirm that this will not apply to 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'? We will certainly inform and consult with parents, but cannot allow children to be withdrawn as the victims of

abuse will be the first to go.

c. The Minister and the Bill indicate the Health syllabus will be introduced over five years to designated schools only. We would hope schools do not need to be designated to operate 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'. We would find it most unfortunate if schools approached us for access to the programme and we had to refuse because they had not been formally designated by the Minister of Education.

The reply a month later confirmed the trials would be able to commence during the third term. While clause 105D of the Bill did cover provisions for withdrawing students from lessons that included elements of sex education, the Department viewed 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' as a safety programme and did not expect clause 105D would be invoked. The explanation offered for the third concern, relating to the period over which the Health Syllabus would be introduced, was to allow for schools to opt into the programmes as they were ready and willing to undertake the necessary consultative procedures. It was thought that spreading the implementation of the syllabus over several years would enable the inservice training of teachers to take place on the same basis.

The Department assured the Commissioner of Police that full details of the 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' materials would be published in the Education Gazette which should ensure teachers did not request the materials before consultation had taken place with parents in their community (Ross/Commissioner of Police 30/4/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4).

This third explanation caused considerable frustration and concern to the programme's developers. By linking 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' to the designated schools provisions of the Education Amendment Act effectively meant that many schools would be unable to use the programme until the 1990s as the Health Syllabus was being introduced on a 'drip feed' basis. This would mean a total of nine years from the initial development to the full implementation

of the programme, a situation seen as illogical, irresponsible and ludicrous by the Police (O'Brien/Director:Public Affairs 8/5/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4).

Any additional delay would place some children in danger of abuse as there was a void in information Police Education Officers could pass on to children since the Stranger Danger programme had been dropped as unsuitable. This created an impossible situation for Police Education Officers who were asked for help with sexual abuse safety and were not able to respond as an alternative was not yet in place. Senior Sergeant O'Brien suggested consultation with the Assistant Commissioner Crime and Operations in order to prepare an appropriate argument to submit to the Department of Education concerning their linking of 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' to schools designated to use the new Health Syllabus only. Consequently, Ann Hercus wrote to the Minister of Education outlining the Police's concerns and included an urgent request that non-designated schools be able to use the programme on conclusion of the trials and after necessary revision of the material had been completed (Hercus/Marshall 13/5/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4). The request was declined, the Minister of Education replying "...that the position as stated earlier was unchanged" (Marshall/Hercus 22/5/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4).

An interim measure was suggested by Mr Cooper, Director of Public Affairs, New Zealand Police, to Mr O'Connor, Department of Education in a letter (17/10/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4) to allow Police Education Officers to respond constructively to all requests for assistance made by schools regarding abuse. This was:

That we release for immediate use by Police Education Officers the two videos for children;

- a. No More Secrets; Intermediate and Standard classes,
- b. Some Classes Should be Told; Junior and Standard classes,

c. A Time for Caring; video for teachers

These videos would not be promoted as 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' and would not be shown in such a context after 1989 when all schools would be able to use the revised health syllabus.

#### **4.11 Publicity**

Throughout the development of KOS there was some inevitable 'leaking' of information about the programme, which led to misinformed comments and oppositional lobbying among various groups. This caused the initiators of the programme considerable concern as they realised that much of the opposition was due to a lack of knowledge.

An early mention of "Keeping Ourselves Safe" was contained in the October-November 1983 Newsletter (12/3/8/3/Vol.2) published by the Concerned Parents' Association (CPA) under the heading 'Child abuse, rape, latest thrust for sex education'. The Chairman of the CPA introduced the article thus:

Unless parents take informed actions, even more of their rights and responsibilities in the upbringing of their children could be taken from them. Sex education is only one very intimate and private aspect of parents' responsibilities – there are many more. This Newsletter aims to unfold how intrusion into family life is increasingly undermining parental responsibility.

The newsletter contains a direct reference to 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' describing it as a new educational package developed in conjunction with the Mental Health Foundation to warn children about sexual abuse. It states "A danger in this approach is that it could make all children mistrustful of parents and relatives" (CPA Oct/Nov Newsletter 1983:2. 12/3/8/3 Vol.2).

In a major article in the NZ Listener entitled “Sex education: its place is in the home” on 15 June 1985, Martin Viney claimed that ‘Keeping Ourselves Safe’ was “... a mockery of parental rights to withdraw children from sexual instruction” and suggested the programme was “... clearly sex education (p27). Viney’s comment, “...the children talk about how they feel when they are touched in different ways” (p 27), incorrectly implied that all touching is sexual.

In a letter to the Editor, NZ Listener, on 24 June 1985 Mr Sanders clearly outlined the legal situation regarding whether information on sexual abuse constitutes sex education in the following way:

Sexual abuse of children is a serious crime and the Police are charged under the Police Act 1958 with preventing such offences. Keeping Ourselves Safe is classified as crime prevention and detection. It has no instruction related to human physiology, procreation and emotional development that could make it sex education.

Shortly after the Listener article was published, the CPA published a “Special Edition – Urgent” copy of their newsletter which contained the headline “PARENTS’ LAST CHANCE. Sex Education manoeuvred into Primary Schools?” (June 1985:1. 12/3/8/3 Vol.2). This was a reaction to the Education Amendment Bill 1985 with which KOS was linked and it stated that passing the Bill would result in:

- Your primary school children’s teacher telling them all about sexual abuse and incest, and warning them that their home is the most likely place for this to occur.
- Homosexual and lesbian teachers giving sex education to your primary school children, and being free to say that their life-style is as normal as ordinary family life.
- Contraceptive instruction for 5 – 12 year olds in primary school being legalised, and no parent consent would be required.

The newsletter concluded with a plea that parents write to their MP and Mr Marshall asking "...that sex education should not be introduced into primary schools...that the present prohibition on primary school sex education be written into the Education Act".

Coinciding with this newsletter, the CPA sent an urgent letter to school committees around the country drawing their attention to the "...serious implications of introducing the new Health Education Syllabus and of passing the Education Amendment Bill..." (Letter, 25/6/1985, 12/3/8/3 Vol.2). The letter further discussed the

...consequences of removing the prohibition on primary school classroom sex education is that it would make possible the introduction of a new anti-child-abuse and incest programme "Keeping Ourselves Safe"...This experimental programme takes the approach of giving children details of sexual molestation and incest, and warning them that this is most likely to be done in their own home. This would be a compulsory part of the new Health Education Syllabus: parents would not be able to withdraw their children from it, nor would school committees have any say as to whether it should be given. This could cause considerable misunderstanding in school communities.

Other community organisations which openly opposed the Education Amendment Act included the Integrity Centre, Christchurch which published a petition in The Press on June 20, 1985 (p11) saying no to

1. Primary classroom sex education,
2. Abortion for girls without parental approval,
3. Contraceptive instruction against parents wishes (12/3/8/3 Vol.4).



The CPA and the Integrity Centre were under the impression (mistakenly) that if the Education Amendment Act was passed "...contraception instruction for 5 – 12 year olds in primary schools [would be] legalised and no parent consent would be required" (CPA Newsletter June 1985:1. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4).

The New Zealand Family Planning Association, while endorsing the intent of the Education Amendment Bill believed that the Bill

... by giving a school's managing body power to totally exclude the sex education component of the health syllabus, singles out sex education unfairly and discriminates against parents who want their children to benefit from school programmes.

Bearing in mind that the sex education component is the only topic in the school curriculum which can be vetoed, it seems hypocritical to ask teachers to attempt to convey that sexuality is a normal and healthy part of human development.

The June Newsletter 'Focus' discusses the organisation's submission on the Education Amendment Bill and stated the NZFPA request that teachers be given the right to choose not to teach sex education if they felt uncomfortable, ill prepared or unsuitable (Focus June 1985:1. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4).

In response to concerns such as these, the Minister of Education prepared a standard reply to be sent to organisations and individuals in order to clarify misunderstandings and reassure them of the true intentions of the new Health Syllabus, the Education Amendment Bill and "Keeping Ourselves Safe" thus:

...let me reassure you that no formal sex education is provided for students below form 1. For Form 1 and 2 students, an understanding of the changes associated with puberty is the sex education element identified in the revised health syllabus...Resource material for the "Understanding Changes at Puberty" topic is being developed by the department for trial in a small number of schools in the third term this year... Any parents who wish to withdraw their sons or daughters

from the few lessons involved may do so... The Education Amendment Bill at present before the House addresses these provisions. It also contains a requirement for schools to consult parents as health education programmes are developed.

... you refer to the safety education programme being developed jointly by the NZ Police and the department. I can assure you that this is a primary prevention programme that focuses on the coping skills children need to keep themselves safe in a range of situations. The programme is positive in its approach, and does not centre upon specific problems as such. Furthermore, information about incest and child abuse would not be presented as part of a classroom programme for children (11/7/1985. Vol.6).

A copy of this letter was sent to a concerned couple in Christchurch who wrote to the Commissioner of Police, Mr Moore MP for Christchurch, Mr Sanders and the Department of Education on several occasions with a variety of concerns such as "...we are concerned that such instruction would do more to harm healthy relationships than it would to aid in correction or prevention" (parents/Sanders 12/9/1985. 12/3/8/3 1985). Another of their concerns was:

The author of the programme, Mr Owen Sanders, states that nine and ten year old children will consider specific examples of sexual abuse, while eleven and twelve year old children will consider a specific case of incest. I understand that sexual intercourse is not to be a part of the syllabus for primary or intermediate school children. How is it possible to discuss an incest situation apart from sexual intercourse?

Following a request by Mr Moore, MP, Mr Sanders eventually arranged to meet this couple in their home to discuss the programme and clarify any further concerns. As a result of meeting with Mr Sanders, they went from a position of serious opposition to the programme to being strong supporters and arguing its value in appropriate places. Their eventual submission on KOS contained several constructive recommendations (7/3/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.7).

Another concerned parent who, after receiving the above letter from the Minister of Education, wrote passionately about the “deep alarm” she still felt about the programme and in particular, the input from “feminists and lesbians”. Thus:

I cannot tell you how sick at heart I feel at the thought of my children being confronted with a programme such as this knowing full well that the Lesbian Community are fighting for this particular teaching... Mr Sanders, this has gone far enough and as a concerned parent I look forward to talking with you and present an alternative programme to tackle this problem (concerned parent/Sanders 19/9/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.6).

The references made about lesbians and feminists were directed at Miriam Saphira who was a very staunch supporter of the programme from its inception and who maintained contact with Mr Sanders throughout the process. Once again, Mr Sanders offered to meet the parent and talk through her concerns when he visited Invercargill to address the Education Development Association Parents' Council AGM (Sanders/concerned parent 9/11/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.6).

Because of the serious nature of misunderstandings about KOS the Police wanted to make accurate information about the programme's aims, objectives and content available to the general public. There was some disagreement between the Police and the Department of Education over this with the Department of Education wanting to withhold information until all resources and materials were completed. The position of the Police was that there was nothing in the programme that couldn't be responded to in general terms. It was felt that keeping the programme under wraps completely could lead to more misconstructions (Co-ordinatorLREP/Sanders 23/7/1985, 12/3/8/3 Vol.5).

In order to respond to requests for information about the programme and to inform the public of its content and intention, Mr Sanders suggested

writing a major feature for publication in the New Zealand Women's Weekly. He also suggested sending copies of a feature to be published in the Evening Post, 26 August 1985, or the paper presented by Freda Briggs on child sex abuse at the Mental Health Conference in June 1985 to the many individuals writing requesting information. In a letter to the Director General of Education on 12 August 1985, Mr Thompson, Commissioner of Police suggested "...a more informative response to the many queries we have received and countering bad publicity with suitable press releases appropriate". He concluded with the following opinion, "Although this project is a joint effort I am strongly of the view the time has arrived to react more positively to requests from the public and the media" (12/3/8/3.Vol.5).

A letter from a member of the public dated 12 July 1985 to Minister of Police, Ann Hercus, containing several glaring inaccuracies for example, stating that the programme, given an incorrect title, had already been taught in schools with negative results. This letter clearly highlighted the need to educate the public without further delay. It reads:

We wish to strongly protest against the proposed unit for teaching to 5+ year old; "Safety in the Home" related to incest.

This in an insidious attack on the Family which will bring about the destruction of Family relationships, and we have heard of situations where it has already done so, in schools where this unit has already been taught. Instead of guarding against incest, this unit is bringing fear and distrust to the majority of families which are normal and wholesome. It is unbelievable the damage which your government is doing. (12/3/8/3. Vol.5).

This letter received a personal response from Ann Hercus clarifying the intention and content of "Keeping Ourselves Safe" (13/8/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.5).

A concern of a number of individuals was whether they would have the

opportunity to view the programme before it was released for trialling in schools. In a letter to Mr Sanders dated 30 September 1985, a parent from Christchurch wrote:

As parents will be encouraged to play an active part in the implementation of the programme in schools surely there would be no objections to parents viewing that programme before it reached the schools. I feel that it is very important to release it for public scrutiny before it is trialled in schools as this did not happen with the sex education syllabus, especially if the Dept of Education wants the full co-operation of parents (12/3/8/3 Vol.5).

She also raised several other concerns in her letter, which were comprehensively answered by Mr Sanders (Sanders/parent 12/10/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.5).

Once the trial drafts were completed, copies were sent to all Public Libraries and their branches at the suggestion of Mrs Hercus. She considered this fulfilled government commitments to public consultation and it enabled all interested members of the public access to inspect the drafts and make submissions before 30 April 1986 if they so desired (27/10/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.5).

Another parent from Invercargill rejected the programme on the grounds that "...public display of evil does not defeat it but rather tends to condone it. The videos [teaching vignettes] shown in Invercargill 19/3/86 gave public display to obscene and abnormal scenes" (parent/Sanders 31/7/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.6).

Throughout the entire developmental process members of the CPA wrote numerous letters, many of which contained inaccuracies, expressing a variety of concerns, such as the possibility of children falsely reporting sexual abuse.

These concerns were addressed by Mr Sanders and occasionally, by Mr Jamieson, Deputy Commissioner of Police.

In September-October 1986, the CPA published a special issue to inform its members about the objectives and content of KOS. This article was very harsh in its condemnation of the programme and contained a number of bizarre and inaccurate or misleading statements, such as:

- a. Linking KOS with Neighbourhood Support for the purpose of eliminating the physical punishment of children;
- b. Declaring KOS to be a "...particularly insidious and distasteful form of sex education" (CPANewsletter, Sept/Oct 1986:1. 12/3/11 Vol.);
- c. Suggesting that KOS introduced children to 'bad sex' before they were old enough to understand 'good sex.'

This issue of the CPA magazine was brought to the attention of Mrs Hercus, Minister of Police, by a resident of Christchurch who wrote on 29 October 1986, "Madam, I am concerned for the welfare of children in fundamentalist families. Their attack on this programme may be designed to conceal a high incidence of child sexual assault and possibly also battery" (12/3/11.Vol.1). Mrs Hercus wrote to the Editor, CPA Newsletter on 28 January 1987 explaining the aims and objectives of KOS and pointing out and correcting the inaccuracies (12/3/11 Vol.1).

On 19 May 1987 the Manukau Courier carried an article in which Papatoetoe's National candidate Howard Martin described the programme as "shocking". He claimed that its "...contents are basically sexual not safety. Further, the emphasis is on the negative aspects of sex rather than a normal healthy family relationship". Mr Martin promised to do everything he could to modify KOS to

a form acceptable to average New Zealand parents if elected and he recommended that Papatoetoe residents demand an investigation in the contents before irreversible damage was done. It was decided not to respond to this article as it could lead to 'trial by media' (Cheer/Davey 20/5/1987. 12/3/11 Vol.1).

The death of Teresa Cormack in Napier in June 1987, led to further correspondence by CPA members in various newspapers which asked "...what the Police programme "Keeping Ourselves Safe" could have done toward keeping her safe, which the other Police programme 'Stranger Danger' could not" (30/6/1987. 12/3/11 Vol.1).

Soon after, CPA members became engaged in further correspondence regarding false accusations of sexual abuse. Mr Jamieson, Deputy Commissioner assured them that

Police have carefully established procedures to ensure that if a false complaint was made, by a child, it would be quickly discovered. All the experience Police have suggests that young children do not make false complaints about abuse, especially sexual abuse" (CPA/Jamieson 15/7/1987. 12/3/11/ Vol.1).

It is important to note that all queries about KOS received personal replies from Mr Sanders.

#### **4.12 Support for 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'**

Although there were many difficulties, set backs, irritations and frustrations experienced by the team developing the programme there was also tremendous support from a variety of sources. In addition to the support mentioned earlier in

this chapter, that is, Dr Abbott of the Mental Health Foundation, school guidance counsellors, Rape Crisis, psychologists and teachers, there was support and encouragement from individuals and agencies from all over New Zealand.

Ann Hercus received a letter from the Waikato Child Abuse Project dated 12 June 1985 which reads:

We have been fortunate to have been addressed by Senior Sergeant O'Brien, National Co-Ordinator of Police Law Related Education. In our understanding, the "Keeping Ourselves Safe" programme is such that we support it completely and ask that it be implemented as soon as possible (12/3/8/3 Vol. 5).

The New Zealand Board of Health Committee on Child Health wrote to the Police Commissioner on 27 June 1985 with a similar theme:

At the last meeting of the Child Health Committee the resource package "Keeping Ourselves Safe" was discussed. Those members with knowledge of this considered it to be a much needed resource, but noted that it is not generally available yet. We would hope that this resource could be released to the general public in the near future. The committee would be interested in receiving a copy when it is available (12/3/8/3 Vol.5).

In addition to the support and encouragement received from individuals and community groups, many primary schools throughout New Zealand were all anxious to obtain copies of the programme as soon as it was available.

Mr Sanders maintained contact with all interested groups throughout New Zealand and encouraged their input and suggestions from the inception of the programme. An example of this can be seen in a letter dated 7 November 1985 to Mrs Aretu Koopu who was Chairperson for the NZ Committee for Children:



Thank you for your letter indicating that the August meeting of the Maori Women's Welfare League Executive discussed the 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' programme. I found the comments from your meeting helpful as I try to determine how different groups in New Zealand will react to it (12/3/8/3 Vol.5).

Freda Briggs, Lecturer at the South Australian College of Advanced Education, kept in regular contact with Mr Sanders about the progress and content of "Keeping Ourselves Safe" and offered her support and assistance as required. She was seriously committed to establishing a similar safety programme for school children in South Australia and was keen to enlist the support and knowledge of Mr Sanders for this. Loueen Scott, Senior Education Officer for the Director-General of Education, South Australia was supportive of Freda Briggs's intention and studied thoroughly the draft copy of the programme sent to her by Mr Sanders. Of 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' she wrote:

The approach you have taken, with a general study of hazards that might be faced by children and the natural progression to the issue of child sexual abuse, minimises unnecessary concern or family tension... At the same time, the issue is treated with a sensitivity which removes emotionalism and threat and presents the problem in its proper perspective... (Briggs/Sanders 15/11 1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.5).

After the article describing 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' was published in the NZ Womens Weekly (June 15 1985) an unsigned letter was received from a 15 year old girl who wrote that she had been raped at the age of 10 years. She finished her letter by saying that if she had been taught a few facts at school and not been so innocent, she might have been able to avoid the situation.

Responses after viewing draft copies of KOS were very encouraging, for

example, the following letter from the Education Unit of the Family Planning Association, Auckland (FPA/Sanders 26/2/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.6):

Thanks for letting us view the KOS material. All of us who have seen it here have been very impressed with its honesty and clarity. We particularly liked that in the vignettes in the video, care was taken to present people in non-stereotyped ways. Would you pass on our congratulations and support to those who worked on the material.

After examination of the programme, Mr George for District Inspector of School, Wanganui, wrote "Thank you for the draft materials... This should provide teachers with much useful material and programmes across the curriculum. You are to be congratulated for producing such excellent material which teachers will find valuable" (George/Sanders 10/3/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.6).

In contrast to the letters containing serious criticisms and condemnations about the programme written by members of the Concerned Parents Association and published in a number of community newspapers, there were others published that were enormously supportive and enthusiastic and refuted their claims. The following, published on 17 February 1986 by the Taranaki Daily News, is typical of the letters published endorsing 'Keeping Ourselves Safe':

Parents should contact the head teachers and parent-teacher associations of Taranaki schools and insist that they include in their safety curriculum, the excellent programme being promoted by police called 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' (12/3/8/3 Vol.6).

The video component of 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' won the Silver Reel Award in the Public Service section of the 19<sup>th</sup> Annual International Television Association Video Festival in Washington in April/May 1986.

The Salvation Army, in their official newspaper, **The War Cry**, published an article written by Mr Sanders for this purpose on 21 February 1987. The article contained the following opening remarks:

The Salvation Army commends the NZ Police LREP on the initiative in constructing this material. If it saves one child from abuse it will be worthwhile. We believe it will save many more by heightening community awareness. **The War Cry** is pleased to be a vehicle of information (12/3/11. Vol.1).

The Salvation Army continued their support for KOS after its implementation by encouraging member parents to ask for it to be included in the health programme of their local primary and intermediate schools.

After viewing the video components of KOS in March 1987, the Executive of the Christchurch Diocesan Federation of Catholic Parent-Teacher Organisations wrote to Mr Sanders that "They... found the programme excellent and would recommend it to all PTA or other parent orientated groups". Three of their members identified areas of concern within their own families that they were able to correct as a result of viewing the videos, for example, one member intended to choose her babysitters more carefully. They did wonder, however, whether it might be better to show the videos to parents rather than the children, as then parents might be able to identify possible dangerous situations they could keep their children away from (CatholicPTO/Sanders 9/3/1987. 12/3/11 Vol.1). Mr Sander's reply assured the Executive that all parents would get the opportunity to view the videos and that an imperative aspect to the success of the programme was follow-up discussions at home between children and parents (Sanders/CatholicPTO 16/3/1987. 12/3/11 Vol.1).

In March 1987, Mr Sanders discussed the programme and showed the videos to

members of the Board of Management and Convenors of the various Standing Committees, National Council of Women (NCW), New Zealand. This organisation had been sent several letters criticising KOS and in particular the video component and wished to better inform themselves of its content in order to respond to criticisms. Their response, as recorded by the secretary Mrs Hesketh was, “We were very impressed with the care and sensitivity with which they [videos] and the whole programme had been prepared... and will look for ways in which we can assist [its] promotion” (Hesketh/Sanders 2/4/1987. 12/3/11 Vol.1). Following this meeting, Mrs Hesketh also wrote to the Minister of Police, Mrs Hercus, on behalf of NCW commending the programme and seeking assurance that its introduction into schools would not be hampered by lack of funds or trained personnel (Hesketh/Hesketh 27/5/1987. 12/3/11 Vol.1).

Commendations and praise were received from various parts of the world including England, Wales, Australia, Canada and America, as Mr Sanders kept in touch with those interested in the development of KOS.

#### **4.13 Additional, supplementary content/similar initiatives taking place**

In 1985, the Department of Social Welfare (DSW) produced a video “Seen and not heard: Child abuse as a social problem”. The video was accompanied by written introductory material, a relevant reading list of key books and articles and a discussion sheet. It was intended that the material in the package would introduce to appropriate audiences, such as social workers and other specialist workers in the area of child abuse, intervention and prevention, the types of child abuse, how to recognise the signs of child abuse and what to do when child abuse was suspected. On completion, an interdepartmental group with

representatives from Department of Social Welfare, Department of Health and the Police, including Mr Sanders and Mrs Davies, was set up to discuss a re-edited version of the video. It was to be used by all departments and could be used as an additional audio-visual resource for KOS.

The National Executive of the NZEI during their "Report on Teaching and Learning: The School Climate" Annual Meeting 1985 considered the matter of child abuse and carried the following recommendation: "That guidelines for reporting various forms of child abuse be developed" (Branch Circular 1985/87 21/11/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.7). Guidelines were established by a subcommittee of the NZEI, and after approval, were sent to schools for staff discussion. It was thought that proposed amendments to the Children and Young Person's Act could lead to mandatory reporting of child abuse. It was also the Executive's view that "...the reporting of suspected child abuse is consonant with the Institute's Code of Ethics and membership's commitment to that code" (Branch Circular 1985/87, 21/11/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.7). The guidelines were sent to Mr Sanders for comment.

Following the sexual molestation and murder of Teresa Cormack in June 1987 in Napier, a charitable trust to promote the safety and well being of children was established on 24 July 1987. Its intention were to raise \$100,000.00 to support projects and educational initiatives that were intended to reduce violence and its effects on children (12/3/11 Vol.1).

#### **4.14 Staffing requirements**

By October 1985 it was apparent that adequately implementing and supporting KOS in primary and intermediate schools throughout New Zealand would not be

possible given the current numbers of LREP staff. In order to allow KOS to be accessible to all schools a request was placed with the Officer in Charge, Organisation and Methods for 6 additional LREP staff members for 1986. Because of delays in the development of the programme, these were not necessary until 1987. The minimum additional staff required at that stage was six additional LREP constables and one sergeant. These staff would be allocated to guarantee a LREP presence in all Police Districts, to expand a presence into several important rural areas such as Thames, and to increase the single staff presence in such urban areas as Wellington, Dunedin and Porirua. In addition to assisting schools implement the programme, they would assist schools that had not been designated but wanted information about KOS. The duties of these additional staff members would be completed by 1989 when all schools would be designated. It was suggested that they then become absorbed into the general planning staff of LREP (Cooper/Assistant Commissioner 5/11/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.6).

Before any Police Education Officers were able to help with the implementation of KOS, they were required to undertake a one-week special intensive training course at the Royal New Zealand Police College.

#### **4.15 Trial drafts ready**

Editing of the written component of the trial drafts of "Keeping Ourselves Safe" was completed by the third week of September 1985. This coincided with the completion of the teaching video for the Standard 2-4 unit made by the Gibson Group. Although the written material for the J1-3 unit was ready to be trialled, the Pete and Penny video intended to accompany the unit remained had not been produce.

Mr Sanders suggested showing the first copies to the Ministers of Police and Education and requested a presentation of the programme and the video resources be arranged for MPs. It was held at the Executive Wing Theatre and would enable any MP who attended to learn exactly what was involved in the programme before it was trialled in any schools. This was set up for 7 November 1985 and was presented by Mr Sanders (Hercus/allIMPs 18/10/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.5).

From the time the likelihood of the trials of 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' occurring was publicised, Mr Sanders received a barrage of requests from schools throughout New Zealand for copies of the programme on its completion. Although undesignated schools were unable to teach the programme, all interested members of the public were entitled to examine it in order to make submissions. Accordingly, Mr Sanders sent copies of the final draft to all schools requesting it for examination. Copies were also sent to many interested individuals, organisations and agencies that wrote requesting them from Police National Headquarters until stocks were depleted.

Trials were scheduled to commence in a group of ten schools from Wellington, Christchurch and Whangarei in February 1986. Although the draft materials were completed earlier, there was a delay in commencing the trials until February 1986 as it took the Department of Education some time to select the trial schools. Mr Sanders sent a letter to schools selected by the Department of Education on 5 December 1985 requesting they study the enclosed draft material. He offered to meet with each school's health co-ordinator to ensure they fully understood the approach that had been adopted and had all the resources needed. To facilitate meeting the health co-ordinators from the trial

schools a conference was scheduled in Wellington for 24 February 1986 (Sanders/Shaw 14/1/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.6).

Mr Sanders also offered to help each school develop clear procedures for dealing with cases of child sexual abuse that were exposed as a result of the programme. To facilitate this, Mr Sanders visited each school to meet the staff and principal to answer any concerns or queries. Representatives from the School Inspectorate and Department of Education Psychological Services were also invited to attend the meetings at the trial schools (Sanders/Cooper, 23/1/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.6). All trials were preceded by consultation with parents and inservice teacher training. Mr Sanders asked that the trials be conducted within a time frame of 2-3 weeks before the end of April 1986.

The trial schools selected by the Department of Education were Whangarei Intermediate School; Glenbervie Primary School, Whangarei; Otangarei Primary School, Whangarei; Postgate Primary School, Paremata; Discovery Primary School, Paremata; Corinna Primary School, Porirua East; Rangikura Primary School Porirua East; Manning Intermediate School, Christchurch; Christchurch South Intermediate School and Oaklands Primary School, Christchurch. (Shaw/Sanders 14/1/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.6).

In addition to visiting each of the trial schools, Mr Sanders travelled to several other locations around New Zealand, such as Blenheim and Invercargill, to explain the programme when invited (Hutchinson/Sanders, 3/4/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.7). These invitations came from schools that had been designated to teach the new Health Syllabus in 1986 and were anxious to fully understand how 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' could be used alongside it.



#### **4.14 Summary**

This chapter has shown the processes involved in developing “Keeping Ourselves Safe” to the time the draft material was trialled in schools.

It commenced with a discussion of the reasons for the Police Curriculum Officers’ decision to abandon their “Stranger Danger” programme in favour of developing a new SBCPP that would provide children with essential safety knowledge. The legal dilemma encountered, that is the problem of whether material contained in the programme would constitute sex education or not and the on-going disagreement between the Department of Education and the Police which was finally sorted out by Ministerial intervention. Other concerns about the content such as the need to use precise terminology rather than indirect language are also covered. The efforts and difficulties of acquiring adequate funding to produce the teaching materials and videos are described. The Education Amendment Act 1985 and its impact, which was a frustrating delay before the draft units could be trialled in selected schools is discussed. Publicity and correspondence received by the Police, both negative and positive is discussed extensively. Finally, the process involved in preparing selected schools to participate in the trials of the draft materials is also shown.

## UNRAVELLING THE CONTROVERSY 2 POST-TRIAL EVENTS

### 5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the major events and issues that were associated with KOS after the trials of the draft programme took place.

### 5.2 Publicity

In early April 1986 TVNZ expressed interest in including information about 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' and the trials taking place at Discovery School, Whitby and this was shown in their 6.30 News broadcast on 24 April. A longer sequence of five minutes was taken at Postgate School on 30 April and was shown on Video Dispatch, a programme for young people (Sanders/Director:Public Affairs 18/4/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.7).

A lead article written by Stephanie Mills was published in the NZHerald on 17 May 1986. The article fully explained the background and intention of KOS and focused on the experiences of two of the Whangarei trial schools, Otangarei Primary School and Glenbervie Primary School. The principal of Otangarei Primary School, Mr Rata was quoted as saying:

The meeting of parents called before the programme began was one of the largest ever held at the school... although there were some initial queries and uncertainties, the parents were all very supportive when the programme had been explained" (12/3/8/3 Vol.7).

Mr Widdup, principal of Glenbervie Primary School although happy with most aspects of the programme, felt there should be more parental involvement, possibly in the form of a booklet that could be sent home. He also believed that "...teachers need[ed] more training, both at training college and while in service". He further commented that "...this particular study would highlight any lack of control or rapport between teacher and class. I think it would be extremely difficult for any teachers who didn't have a very good relationship with their class". Above all, however, he was concerned "...that the programme gives information only a minority of children will need ...also the programme could almost be interpreted as anti-male". Stephanie Mill's article also included a reponse by Mr Sanders who explained:

What we have tried to do is encourage children to recognise an action or approach that is inappropriate, no matter who the person is. We have been careful particularly in the video clips, to portray men in warm, loving and helping situation as well as being the perpetrators of abuse.

A discussion and talkback show, on which Mr Sanders was a guest, aired on Radio 3ZB on 18 June 1986 and led to a large number of requests for copies of the draft programme. One correspondent explained the reason for her request because "... as a child I was sexually abused by my grandfather... my main terror was that my mother would find out and because of my 'badness' wouldn't love me anymore" (12/3/8/3 Vol.7).

On 2 July 1986 the Otago Daily Times published an article with the headline "Syllabus may lead to fear of parents". The article focussed on comments by Mr Scanlan, a teacher at Weston School, Oamaru such as "How can you warn a child of the possibility of unhealthy attentions from Uncle Joe or Dad (or Mum

for that matter) without poisoning family relationships”. He believed that the unit could cause more harm than good by making men reluctant to express their affection physically, “...every time a parent touched a child, the child will wonder, ‘now is this normal and healthy or is it the start of sexually deviant behaviour’?” As well as contacting the ODT, Mr Scanlan also wrote directly to Mr Sanders expressing his concerns on a number of points. In reply, Mr Sanders clarified various inaccuracies (Sanders/Scanlan 27/8/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.8).

The Otago Daily Times article also interviewed the principals of two other designated schools in the Otago region for their comments on ‘Keeping Ourselves Safe’, Mr Knudson, George Street Normal Primary School, Dunedin and Mr Gibb, Halfway Bush School, Dunedin. Mr Knudson stressed his school would firstly concentrate on such areas of safety as fire, water, road, electricity and first aid. Then, “...[i]f we did go into the area of sexual abuse we would keep it low key and find a balance between not wanting to frighten the children and leaving them vulnerable”. Mr Gibb said the programme “...aims to give them [children] confidence to say no to people” (12/3/8/3.Vol.7).

An interview with Freda Briggs, Lecturer Magill Campus, South Australian College of Advanced Education, Russell Marshall, Minister of Education and Helen Shaw, Department of Education was broadcast on 3 July 1987 on Radio NZ’s Checkpoint programme discussing the content, aims and development process of KOS (12/3/11 Vol.1).

In 1987 there were two instances of children being abducted and murdered in New Zealand and these highlighted the vulnerability of children to sexual abuse and also emphasised the need for child safety programmes. In June, six year old Teresa Cormack was abducted, sexually molested and murdered in Napier. In

October 1987, Louisa Damadran of Christchurch was abducted after leaving school and her body was later found about 400m south of the Waimakariri River Mouth.

The abduction and murder of Karla Cardno in May 1989 in Wellington once again reinforced the need for child protection programmes to be implemented in all schools.

An article about KOS written by Freda Briggs and published in the English paper, the Times Educational Supplement on 17 July 1987 led to Mr Sanders receiving a deluge of requests for copies or information about the programme from throughout England.

### **5.3 Trial schools' experiences of 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'**

On completion of the trials, Police staff visited each of the schools involved and received written evaluations from all teachers as well as several parents and students in forms 1 and 2. In a report to the Commissioner of Police on 21 July 1986, Mr Sanders wrote:

Overall the reaction from these groups can only be described as very positive. Although initially apprehensive, teachers soon found they could teach the programme with confidence. Only very few parents would not like to see it taught again. Most indicated that they appreciated their children doing it and many were adamant that it is suitable for all children... Form 1 and 2 children also commented on the need for and relevance of the programme. Some thought the material we are teaching at Form 1 and 2 should be taken lower down in the school and that their units should deal with situations that are more relevant to them (12/3/8/3 Vol.8).

He continued to say that only a small number of teachers involved had difficulty accepting that a programme, which included abuse, should be taught to young children though none actually refused to teach it. Some teachers were apprehensive about how the programmes would work in their classrooms but on completion of the trials that apprehension was replaced by enthusiasm, for example, “Well, what was difficult about that”. One unexpected result was the number of teachers who disclosed their own experiences of sexual abuse in their childhood but who had not yet addressed it. It highlighted the need for the final copy of the teachers’ guide to contain advice and information for teachers in these situations. Mr Sanders stated that the trials proved the vital importance of teacher inservice training to the success of ‘Keeping Ourselves Safe’ with each of the trial schools spending considerable time in preparation. Parental support and enthusiasm for the programme was very high with what children had learnt at school being discussed and reinforced at home. Comments from parents included “Thank you teachers for your time and help with this problem”, “Appears to be a gentle programme without emphasis on fear” (Sanders summary of trials, 15/12/1986. 12/3/8/3, Vol.8).

The teachers and parents involved in the trials found the video “A Time for Caring” unsatisfactory and inadequate and consequently the Police decided not to continue using it.

#### **5.4 Cases of sexual abuse exposed**

There were definite indications that individual cases of child sexual abuse were exposed as a direct result of the programme being taught in the trial schools. Such a case was at one of the trial schools in Whangarei. The teacher of the child involved wrote to Mr Sanders with the following information:

...another case of sexual abuse has been discovered in my classroom and the parents and I are of the definite opinion that it is as a result from your unit 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' that she [pupil] told me about it" (teacher/Sanders 30/6/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.7).

The Child Protection Team was called in to assist the girl and her family and the man's name given to the Police. In this instance, it seemed that the perpetrator was responsible for many indecent acts on girls. Although the girl involved was a member of the school's Special Class and the teacher believed it unlikely that her evidence would be taken seriously in court, her testimony would be kept and added to information that the Police hoped to gather about the suspect. "It now would appear that this man is responsible for many indecent acts on young girls, and now that they have been given his name and know all about him, they have to monitor his movements and catch him" (teacher/Sanders 30/6/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.8). In one school, the notification that 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' was to be taught was enough to encourage one child to ask for help (12/3/8/3. Vol.8).

The cases of child abuse that did come to the attention of the trial schools emphasised the necessity for schools to ensure effective procedures were in place to help those children when they disclosed abuse.

### **5.5 Submissions on 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'**

Submissions were welcomed from any individual or community groups that wished to comment on any aspect of the programme and were to be sent to the Curriculum Development Office at National Police Headquarters. This was specified on the draft copies of the programme that were available for inspection. These were sent to interested parties who requested them and also at

Public Libraries around the country (Hercus/McEwen 11/4/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.7).

A very comprehensive submission on 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' was prepared by Dr Karen Zelas on behalf of and endorsed by the National Advisory Committee on the Prevention of Child Abuse (NACPCA). Although the submission contained 14 points of concern the programme was considered "In general terms, EXCELLENT – comprehensive, well thought out, balance of information and experiential units" (Comment for NACPCA by Dr Karen Zelas, 26/3/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.8).

The first submission received from a school came from Ballance School, Pahiatua. This was/is a small country school with composite classes. Their main concern was the difficulty of teaching a specific section of the programme in a classroom containing several different age groups. This would require sending the younger children out of the classroom while the older group was being instructed and this could lead to supervision problems. Another of Ballance School's concerns was if there was only one child at a particular level, a situation that is not impossible in country schools, "...he/she may feel the material is directed at him personally" (Ballance School, Pahiatua, 25/3/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.8).

Mr Ready, Principal of Ponsonby Primary School, Auckland was generally supportive of the programme though included the following reservations in his submission of 29 April 1986, "...teachers would find it easier to handle if the language was less explicit... the units dealing with parental abuse are important, but we would not like to see an element of fear introduced into warm, normal father-daughter relationships" (12/3/8/3.Vol.8). The concern regarding the



possible damage done to family relationships, especially father/daughter relationships was common to several of the submissions received.

A report was submitted on behalf of the Hamilton branch of Women for Life (no date included) which described KOS as being "...based on the premise that parents are defaulting on the upbringing of their children, so the Police must make good these deficiencies, real or imagined, by giving the prescribed training to all children, irrespective of parental competence or wishes". The group she represented believed that as a result of KOS, "...children who knew nothing about sex or sexual molestation will now have plenty for their imaginations to work on" (12/3/8/3. Vol.8).

The submission received from the Department of Social Welfare on 8 July 1986 suggested rewriting the parents' pamphlet using less formal language to encourage participation from parents from different cultural backgrounds and from those less confident parents. Suggestions for teachers in relation to Polynesian children who are culturally unable to say 'no' to elders were also recommended. This submission concluded with the following comment, "In summary, the programme is comprehensive, the scripts are real life and all absolutely possible and reality based. The real success of it will be largely in the hands of skills of the teachers" (12/3/8/3. Vol.8).

The Auckland Regional Child Health Committee submission dated 9 July 1986, contained suggestions for minor alterations to seven of the video vignettes such as utilising a 'headmasterly figure' in the introductory vignette for presenting the new Health syllabus and putting the KOS material within that context. This submission contained no comments on any other aspects of the programme (12/3/8/3. Vol.8).

A submission dated 7 August 1986 was received from the secretary of Ministry of Women's Affairs. It appeared that this particular submission had been examined on the misapprehension that the videos formed the basis of KOS and the written materials accompanied it. This led to a distorted reading of the programme and consequently, a number of comments were based on incorrect information (12/3/8/3. Vol.8).

Those working on the final edition of KOS had already identified several concerns outlined in a number of submissions, such as the lack of resources in the community and questioning the role of Police Education Officers in the support network. These were mentioned in the submission presented by Jane Bell on behalf of the Waikato Women in Education on 9 August 1986. An additional suggestion recommended in this submission was that the sections "...dealing specifically with sexual abuse be co-taught or presented by a teacher with a support person present to assist in observing the children's responses. This measure would be helpful in identifying an abused child" (12/3/8/3 Vol.8). Rather than risk the student/teacher relationship and trust being compromised by having an 'observer' in the classroom, Mr Sanders considered it better to train teachers to recognise abuse in their classes as part of their in-service training (Sanders/Bell 18/8/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.8).

The issue of the role of the Police Education Officers was being addressed by training them to work as facilitators to support teachers, assist with inservice training and assist schools develop effective strategies for dealing with abused children who come to notice.

The New Zealand Board of Health approved the programme's content and aim

in general in its submission on 11 August 1986, though made several observations for example, the settings seemed "...predominantly middle-class. Unless adults are educated in ... avoid[ing] ... child abuse ... the problem is not tackled at source and we risk burdening children with an excessive responsibility for resolving their own predicaments". This submission included other points which were addressed in the final draft of the programme, such as, ensuring classes were given the opportunities to discuss and recognise other equally valid alternatives to the outcomes of stories included in the programme (12/3/8/3. Vol.8).

By December 1986, a large number of submissions had been received from a variety of community groups and individuals that Mr Sanders categorised into three groups. The first group contained criticisms of KOS that were based on misleading or incorrect information, such as suggesting schools which had trialled the programme had experienced negative effects when these schools had not used KOS but had actually used some other programme instead. The second group of submissions contained suggested outcomes which were based on anxiety or fear, such as the programme will make all children suspicious of their fathers when the expected outcome was that participating children would be able to distinguish between abusive and non abusive behaviour. The section of the programme that dealt specifically with sexual abuse portrayed males as abusers but also showed males helping and protecting children. This group of submissions tended to come from moral right organisations such as Coalition of Concerned Citizens. The final group of submissions contained comments that were utilised to strengthen the effectiveness of the programme. The teaching activities for the J1 – J3 age group, for example, needed to be rewritten as teachers found them too difficult for J1 children.

In March 1987 a recommendation was received from the Southern Division of Auckland's LREP team that the 'Guide to Parents' component of KOS should be made available in various ethnic languages. As South Auckland's population comprised many different groups of Polynesian parents for whom English was a second language, it was important to communicate with the various groups effectively to ensure the successful implementation of the programme (Wilson/Regional Co-ordinator 16/3/1987. 12/3/11 Vol.1).

Late submissions received included The National Collective of Rape Crisis and Related Groups of Aotearoa on 26 June 1987 and the Family Violence Prevention Co-ordinating Committee 30 June 1987. Both these organisations made several recommendations for changes to the parents pamphlets, for example changing the term "sexual intercourse" to "sexual violation" (Good/Sanders 26/6/1987. 12/3/11 Vol.1).

### **5.6 Ongoing funding difficulties**

By the end of July 1986, there were still insufficient funds to complete the programme. A decision had still not been received from the Child and Youth Development Trust regarding the application submitted in August 1985. In a report to the Child and Youth Development Trust on 18 July 1986 Mr Sanders outlined the progress to date and included a timeline of proposed developments. These were listed as:

- redrafting as a result of the trial evaluation,
- by October have the print materials to School Publications Branch, Department of Education, for final editing,
- print kits early in the new year for release to schools.

This timeline was dependent on funds becoming available, as was the production of the Pete and Penny video (12/3/8/3. Vol.7). Consequently, the Child and Youth Development Trust made \$87,000.00 available to provide the printed units and other materials for distribution to schools (Turnovsky/NZPolice 28/8/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.7). A further request for \$25,000.00 was made to the Child and Youth Development Trust for funds to produce a video as a key resource for staff in-service training (Shaw & Sanders/Turnovsky 8/9/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.8). This request was approved in June 1987 (Turnovsky/Sanders 30/6/1987. 12/3/11/1 Vol.1).

By June 1987 funding for the Pete and Penny video had still not been secured and the estimated costs had risen to \$120,000.00. An approach was made to the New Zealander Bankers Association for sponsorship of the video (Churches/Belgrave 22/6/1987. 12/3/11 Vol.1). Approaches were made to other major corporations such as McDonalds, Oasis Industries, Robert Jones Investment Group, PDL Holdings, Cadbury Schweppes Hudson Ltd, Independent Newspapers Limited all of which were unable or not prepared to provide any financial support for the programme (12/3/11 Vol.1). Eventually the video was completed by film maker, David Waters, Paint Pot Films in September 1989, at his own expense, although it was not completed in time for the official launch of the programme .

In March 1989 the sum of \$6,000.00 was received from the Teresa Cormack Trust Fund to enable copies of the child safety video "Keeping Safe" to be duplicated from the master tape (Watkins/Churches 28/3/1989. 12/3/11/1 Vol.1). In August 1989, the same Trust fund offered an extra \$10,000.00 for LREP to develop a secondary school programme. As the Karla Cardno Trust had agreed to undertake to raise \$100,000.00 by way of a radio appeal for the development

of the KOS programme aimed at secondary school pupils, it was suggested that the \$10,000.00 offered by the Teresa Cormack Trust be diverted to assist with further duplicating of the Pete and Penny video and the reprinting of the parents pamphlets on the KOS programme and on "Sexual abuse of children" (Griffiths/Olphert 24/8/1989. 12/3/11/1 Vol.1). In response, the Teresa Cormack Trust approved an additional donation of \$24,000.00 to use to duplicate the Pete and Penny video and reprint the pamphlets. This enabled the Police to immediately distribute copies to schools who had already undertaken the programme as well as those who were presently working on it (Griffiths/Manning 22/9/1989. 12/3/11/1 Vol.1).

### **5.7 Final Developments of 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'**

As the trial schools had found the video "A Time for Caring" unsatisfactory the developers of KOS decided not to use it but instead contribute to and use a video being jointly made by the DSW, Police, Health and Education Departments. This video was targeted at adult audiences, such as parents and teachers, rather than at children (Todd/Commissioner 17/7/1987. 12/3/8/3 Vol.7). Several alterations were suggested for one of the other video vignettes, "Uncle Joe" which was adjusted accordingly.

The Department of Education considered it important to involve a teacher experienced in the introduction of the revised Health Syllabus and the 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' trials for the final developments of the programme. Mrs Dianne Davies was seconded from Discovery School, Whitby for terms 2 and 3 1986 for this purpose .

One area of serious concern for Mr Sanders was the Department of Education's

ongoing prohibition and inflexibility on KOS containing any material about incest, rape or intercourse, that is, any form of sexual abuse other than touching. This situation was unacceptable to the Police, as they believed it restricted their ability to meet the needs of some children, especially Form 1-2 girls, a group of children considered to be particularly vulnerable to sexual abuse. The position of the Police was that KOS was intended to meet the needs of all New Zealand children and by omitting a critical aspect to a very at risk group, the programme was being compromised (Sanders/Geddis 28/7/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.8).

On completion, the teaching units contained the same basic content and material though there were some changes made to the text. This was partly the result of teachers' comments after the trials and partly because of the final editing process. The New Entrant – J3 units were the most extensively rewritten as the trial teachers found the original material not really suitable for very young children. All the stories were rigorously edited and most were shorter as a result. Story alternatives to the video vignettes were offered for use in case a teacher decided a specific video vignette was unsuitable for a particular class (Sanders/Davies memo June 1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.7).

Further trials of the final text were held at Plimmerton Primary School in the third term 1986, as a final check that the classroom activities were suitable (12/3/8/3. Vol.7).

In June 1986 Mrs Diane Davies, who had been seconded from a primary school to assist with the rewriting of the junior school units, met with Joy Hay of the Child Development Centre, Waikato Hospital to discuss Joy Hay's research into child abuse, the role and responsibility of the teacher in the context of child abuse and the KOS teacher in-service module. Their discussions identified

several areas that would assist teachers deliver KOS with confidence. These were outlined in a report from Mrs Davies to Mr Sanders on 3 July 1986 and suggested the need for schools to include as part of their inservice training, full staff discussions which would cover the following points:

- a. School policy and procedure,
- b. Information on sexual abuse, its incidence, nature and indicators,
- c. Anticipating student reaction,
- d. Answering student questions,
- e. Teaching KOS,
- f. Answering teacher's questions (agency personnel will be needed),
- g. The abused child, teaching and giving support (Sanders/Davies, 3/7/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.8).

Full discussions covering these points would ensure schools had clear policies and procedures in place should any pupils disclose sexual abuse after taking part in the programme. It would also ensure that teachers were familiar with what constitutes sexual abuse and its indicators, that they were thoroughly familiar with the content of the programme and were confident to answer pupil's questions that might arise.

### **5.8 Implementation procedure**

Mr Sanders submitted to Mrs Shaw, Senior Education Officer, Department of Education a copy of the suggested model of implementation in July 1986 for consideration. This involved the following 8 steps:

1. Designated school contacts a Police Education Officer indicating an interest in KOS.
2. Police Education Officer introduces KOS to school Principal and staff.
3. School staff agrees to teach the programme and seeks further information from Police Education Officer.
4. School staff consults and informs school community to determine



support for the programme.

5. School Council and Principal accept that there is support for the programme.

6. A facilitator conducts staff in-service training and school organisation of the programme is agreed. School policy in dealing with cases of abuse is determined.

7. Ongoing evaluation and monitoring by the facilitator to ensure the programme follows set guidelines.

8. School staff, council and community evaluate programme effectiveness, determine the place of 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' in the individual school health scheme and syllabus (Sanders/Shaw 18/7/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.8).

Initially, there was misunderstanding between the Police and the Department of Education about the method of implementing KOS. The Department of Education was happy for Police Education Officers to provide schools with a brief introduction to resource materials though they preferred that the programme itself be introduced to the teachers by teachers themselves rather than PEOs (Sanders/Shaw 18/7/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.8). The Department of Education's position was explained to Mr Sanders in a letter dated 18 November 1986 from Mr Werry, Director, Curriculum Development as follows, "Provided your officers work closely with principals and co-ordinators in introducing the programme into schools, I expect teachers to be accountable to the principal of a school from that point" (12/3/11 Vol.1). This position allowed for variations in the interpretation of 'working closely', which could result in the programme sometimes being introduced without adequate teacher in-service training. The Police preferred to train Police Education Officers to fulfil a more supportive, helpful role to ensure that schools understood and were committed to the prerequisites of consultation, in-service training and establishing a procedure to assist children who came to notice. After negotiation both parties agreed this position would offer schools the best opportunity to introduce the programme successfully (12/3/11.Vol.1).

In order to effectively assist schools implement the programme all Police Education Officers were required to complete a relevant training programme. This involved an intensive five-day familiarisation course at the Royal New Zealand Police College, Porirua. The course covered thorough examination of the KOS materials, the place of KOS within the LREP strategy, introducing KOS to schools effectively, bi-cultural perspectives relating to child sexual abuse and examining the Police Education Officers own feelings about abuse.

The minimum requirement of a Police Education Officer asked to visit a school in preparation for teaching KOS was that they introduce KOS to the school on request and supply the necessary materials when the school decided to teach it. Optional roles were to be available to assist with in-service training and also be a resource for those class lessons which suggest appropriate input from a Police Education Officer. It was also important that Police Education Officers assist schools develop relevant procedures for helping abused children that may come to notice. It was suggested that Police Education Officers contact the school during and after completion of the programme to discuss how the programme was going and record final comments. An evaluation form was prepared for this purpose. These comments would then be included in end of term reports to regional co-ordinators. It was important, however, that before schools embarked on teaching KOS they had a health programme in place and had taught some basic health units, such as Self Esteem, Caring for the Body and Relating to Others. Although Police Education Officers were not in a position to tell schools what they may and may not do, they did have a role in checking that adequate preparation had taken place before a school taught KOS (Sanders/LREPstaff no date. 12/3/11. Vol.3).

In 1988, the Department of Education distributed a circular to all schools which contained information to help formulate policies for dealing with sexual abuse of students (12/3/11. Vol.1).

*“Keeping Ourselves Safe” was finally launched by the Prime Minister, The Right Honourable David Lange on 8 March 1988.*

### **5.9 School evaluations**

As schools throughout New Zealand became eligible to use KOS, reports and evaluations on its success and effectiveness were regularly sent to National Police Headquarters. In August 1988 Wakari School, Dunedin wrote that due to the success of KOS it intended to include it as part of the Health programme every two years.

After a meeting for the parent community outlining the content and aims of the programme, Orewa Primary School sent a questionnaire to all the parent community asking the following questions, “I agree/disagree with teaching this unit in Orewa Primary School. I did/did not attend the “Keeping Ourselves Safe” meeting on Thursday 29 September [1988]”. Of those who attended the introduction, a total of 75 parents, all agreed that KOS should be taught. Of the 150 parents who did not attend, 4 disagreed with the programme being taught. After the introduction parents were asked to write comments on the following questions. “What concerns do you have, as a parent, about your child taking part in the KOS programme? How could you assist your child to take part in the programme, should it be introduced?” The following reply is an example of the answers received for the first question:

No concerns at all. It is a very necessary part of living, and I'm sure the teachers concerned will handle it with sensitivity. I think this is a very, good informative programme and have no concerns about my child taking part.

Only three comments expressed concern. The first was that young children could become frightened and the remaining two were concerned that men were being portrayed as 'ogres', and that the programme was 'male orientated'. The second question, that is, "How could you assist your child to take part in the programme should it be introduced?" was answered with suggestions such as "Talk! Talk! And more Talk! Reinforce. By discussing things at home and reinforcing what has been done". Orewa Primary School staff were also very positive about the programme with the following being examples of their comments, "Helped us come to terms with our past experiences. Developed a trust factor with the children- many of us feel the children's confidence has increased and they would be more inclined to talk to us if they were being abused". The final comments from the school principal Mr Morris were "The support from the Takapuna Police was excellent, the availability of resources fabulous and I'm sure it wouldn't have even been implemented if it wasn't for all the help and support. Thanks!!" (No date. 12/3/11 Vol.3).

In December 1989, the Police Education Officer, Tauranga, Constable Craig Shipton received the following report from Greerton School, Tauranga evaluating its introduction of KOS (Cleaver/Shipton 14/12/1989. 12/3/11 Vol.4).

Two cases of child abuse disclosed as a direct result of the programme were actioned by Social Welfare. One other suspected case is under constant review, and in another case staff and parents have been able to communicate clearly and co-operate fully in the rehabilitation of a young victim of sexual abuse.

Improvements in self-esteem, respect for others, frankness and openness in respect to abuse and harassment are apparent among pupils as a result of the implementation of the KOS programme.

Greerton School was also complimentary about the staff training programme provided by the Police, the principal Patricia Cleaver writing:

The staff training material provided by the Police Department was excellent and greatly facilitated our work as we relied on it completely and fully utilised the resources including the material on child sexual abuse. The procedures developed for consulting with parents were very effective in opening channels of communication and increasing understanding between groups with different views. The guidelines for formulating policies and procedures for reporting child abuse also provided us with guidelines to establish a resource and support group". (Cleaver/Shipton 14/12/1989. 12/3/11 Vol.4).

Miss Chambers, principal, Windsor Primary School, Oamaru was also very supportive of KOS writing:

We continually remark about the high quality of presentation and information given in the booklets at each of the three levels. Each lesson is interesting, well prepared and presented. We particularly like the very fair and balanced approach used in the sections re Sexual Abuse and the use of 'cartoons' on the video to portray difficult situations (Chambers/Webber, 30/3/1990. 12/3/11 Vol.4).

One problem with the implementation process was the shortfall of materials available, for example, high demands for the limited quantity of teaching videos meant some schools had to wait until they were available before they could proceed with the programme. This was due to ongoing funding shortages.

Although there were a number of cases of child sexual abuse exposed in schools as a consequence of pupils taking part in KOS, by 1990, the only two statutory

authorities able to investigate suspected cases of abuse were the Sexual Abuse Teams connected with the Police and the Department of Social Welfare (12/3/11. Vol.4). There were, however, other agencies that were able to offer support to abused children and their parents, for example, HELP, Rape Crisis and various cultural groups.

### **5.10 Programme for secondary school pupils underway**

In 1989, LREP staff decided to act towards extending the programme to include secondary school children. The programme was to cover such contexts as relationships between girls and boys, self-defence techniques, forms of abuse experienced by this age group, and keeping safe in situations such as going out alone. The programme was to follow the same format as the existing KOS programme, with two teaching units, a supporting introductory video and a video suitable as a teaching resource (Sanders, no date. 12/3/11 Vol.4).

Mr Sanders made an approach to the Department of Social Welfare on 15 August 1989 for assistance to fund the development and production of the programme for secondary school children. This was turned down (Renouf/Sanders 18/9/1989. 12/3/11 Vol.4). On 21 August 1989 an approach was made to the Karla Cardno Trust seeking sponsorship for funding the programme (Sanders/Olphert 21/8/1989. 12/3/11/1 Vol.1). The Karla Cardno Trust was established after the abduction and murder of 13 year old Karla Cardno on 26 May 1989 and was established "...to take whatever action it can in order to prevent harm coming to our nation's children" (Olphert, 1989. 12/3/11 Vol.4). The Karla Cardno Trust agreed to undertake to raise \$100,000.00 by way of a radio appeal for the development of the senior programme. The appeal was held on national radio on 6 October 1989 though

there is no record in the files of the amount raised.

By the end of 1992, around twenty secondary schools had trialled the draft KOS programme and the response was overwhelmingly positive. Evaluation meetings were held with teachers and Police Education Officers involved with the trials and these highlighted areas within the programme that required some adaptation or moderation. Evaluations of the material were also received from a number of community groups and individuals (12/3/11 Vol.4). A second draft was prepared in early 1993 which included components specifically for Polynesian and Maori students.

The final version of KOS for secondary school pupils was completed and published in 1994. It was arranged into a junior secondary (Forms 3 and 4) unit entitled 'Dealing With Risk' and a senior secondary unit (Forms 5, 6 and 7) entitled 'Building Safe Relationships'. The aims of the final version were to:

- encourage and empower young people to take responsibility for their own safety and well-being and that of others;
- encourage young people who are being abused, or who have been abused, to seek help;
- encourage young people to manage feelings in ways which don't harm others;
- contribute to an overall community prevention programme by making parents and teachers more aware of their responsibilities to help young people avoid abuse (KOS. Dealing with Risk, 1994).

The implementation of KOS in secondary schools process is much the same as for primary schools. Section 105C of the Education Amendment Act (1985) requires schools to consult with parents about how they will teach the health syllabus. The secondary school units of KOS, "Dealing with Risk" and "Building Safe Relationships" are designed to contribute to the Keeping

Safe theme of the Health Education Syllabus for Primary and Secondary Schools. Although there is scope for appropriate people from the community to take part in the programme, there is not the same expected parental involvement as there is in the programme for primary schools.

### **5.11 Summary**

From the onset, the long 10-year development and implementation process of KOS for primary and secondary schools was fraught with various hiccups and time consuming difficulties. These ranged from such legal dilemmas as the need to define the content of the programme as being ‘safety’ rather than ‘sexual’ education to an ongoing funding shortfall.

This chapter has described these difficulties in relation to events that occurred after the trials took place. The trials, the placing of trial materials in public libraries and supplying individuals and groups with copies of the trial materials led to a large number of submissions being sent to the Police Curriculum Officers and these have been described at length. The final developments of the material and videos used in the programme, the results of submissions and comments made by schools that had taken place in the trials, are covered including cases where sexual abuse was exposed as a result of the programme taking place.

It is apparent that there were various disagreements between the Department of Education and the Police throughout the development process, though the major area of conflict that occurred after the trials took place centered on the implementation procedure. This situation and its resolution is addressed.



The ongoing publicity about the content and intentions of the programme stirred up considerable controversy and condemnation among certain sections of New Zealand society, particularly the groups and individuals associated with the 'moral right' and their opinions are discussed in this chapter. There was however also much encouragement and enthusiasm because of the fact that a serious social problem was at last being taken seriously and being addressed and this is also covered. The reasons behind the controversy will be explored in the following chapter.

The chapter finishes with a very brief description of the main features of the development of the "Keeping Ourselves Safe" programme for secondary schools. A brief chronology of the main features of the development of KOS can be found at Appendix A

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### 6.1 Introduction

Although from the outset there was enormous community and professional support for the development of “Keeping Ourselves Safe” there were also considerable difficulties and fierce opposition. This will be summarised under the following subheadings:

- Negotiations between the New Zealand Police and the Department of Education;
- Differences regarding the content of the programme;
- Differences regarding the implementation of the programme;
- Difficulties obtaining funding for the programme;
- Submissions resulting from community concerns.

### 6.2 Negotiations between the New Zealand Police and the Department of Education

Initial difficulties with the development and implementation of the programme were the consequence of disagreements between the curriculum development unit of the New Zealand Police and the Department of Education because of rules and regulations that stipulated Department of Education curriculum development.

### **6.2.1 Differences regarding the content of 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'**

The first major question was whether the content of the programme would constitute sex education or not. The Police Curriculum Development Officers wanted to use precise terminology to describe genitals because they were convinced euphemistic language or the use of metaphors such as 'the plumbing system' could lead to children misinterpreting the intentions. The Department of Education however, preferred to use indirect language as they were concerned that specific sexual references would contravene the Health Syllabus regulations (DirectorGeneral:Educ/Thompson 30/8/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1). The then current Health Syllabus (1954:2) stated "There is no place in the primary school for group or class instruction in sex education." This meant the Police had to prove the programme could not be considered sex education. This was achieved by classifying the content covered in the programme as "...crime detection and prevention material" (Bates/DPA 24/6/1983. 12/3/8/3 Vol.1).

Even after receiving a legal statement clearing the material from any suggestion of it being sex education, two members of the Wellington Education Board continued to block the programme's development. This situation continued until a presentation of the complete programme by Mr Sanders and Senior Sergeant O'Brien convinced the whole Board of its merits ((Lelliott/O'Brien 27/2/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4).

This issue continued to provide difficulties for the Police Curriculum Officers, however, as the NZEI and Wellington Education Board were still anxious about possible complaints against teachers regarding the use of 'specific sex terms' (Co-ordinator:Youth Aid/ O'Brien 9/8/1984. 12/3/8/3 Vol.3). This difficulty continued for six months when Mr Sanders and Senior Sergeant O'Brien made a

full presentation of the programme to the Wellington Education Board and answered all questions and concerns (O'Brien/Lelliott 27/2/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4).

The fact that KOS was to be considered a safety programme and would therefore be considered a component of the revised Health Education Syllabus produced another difficulty. The Education Amendment Act 1985 set out the conditions under which health programmes could be taught. It also set out ways in which parents could be consulted on programmes related to the Health Education Syllabus that contained sex education components for classes Form 1 and above. It made provision by way of clause 105D for parents to have the right to withdraw their children from sex education classes (Thompson/Director of Education 28/3/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4). This problem was resolved when the Department of Education stated KOS would be considered a safety programme and therefore the clause in question could not be invoked.

The other difficulty that resulted from the Education Amendment Act was that schools had to be 'designated' before they were able to teach the new Health Education Syllabus which meant there would be substantial delays before KOS could be taught in all schools. This was because the Health Education Syllabus was to be introduced on a 'drip feed' basis, that is, only a certain number of schools were able to introduce it at a time (Hercus/Marshall 22/5/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.4). In order to overcome that delay and to give assistance and support when asked by schools, Police Education Officers were able to show the videos "No More Secrets" and "Some Secrets Should be Told".

### **6.2.2 Differences regarding the implementation of 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'**

The other significant area of disagreement between the Department of Education and the Police concerned the implementation procedure of KOS. The Police contended that their PEOs were trained specifically to introduce the programme to teachers and were able to support teachers introduce KOS and also assist schools develop policies and procedures that would effectively assist any children who had been abused. The Department of Education regulations suggested that schools should be able to do this without outside assistance and saw the Police's only role as providing the schools with the material. After negotiation and recognition of the thoroughness of the PEO's training, the method of implementation suggested by the Police was the one that was finally agreed upon.

### **6.3 Difficulties obtaining funding for 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'**

Obtaining sufficient funding to complete the programme was a major ongoing problem before and after the trials took place. A number of approaches were made to various organisations such as Johnson and Johnson and Trustee Bank Southland for funding which were invariably turned down (Shaw/Sanders 30/8/1985. 12/3/8/3/ Vol.5). Although Commercial Union sponsored several Police Educational Programmes, requests by Mr Sanders and Senior Sergeant O'Brien to assist with KOS were turned down. Funding from the Police Department, Department of Social Welfare and Department of Education's votes along with a donation of \$87,000.00 from the Child and Youth Development Trust three and a half years after the commencement of the programme's development enabled its continued development (Turnovsky/NZPolice 28/8/1986. 12/3/8/3/ Vol.7). The Teresa Cormack Trust also donated funds

towards the completion of the programme.

## **6.4 Submissions resulting from community concerns**

### **6.4.1 General concerns**

In order to allow any interested member of the public access to inspect the draft trial materials, copies of the draft materials were placed in libraries throughout New Zealand. This would enable the public to make submissions to the Police curriculum development office if they wished. This led to numerous submissions from organisations and individuals in the community who communicated their concerns about aspects of the programme to Mr Sanders and his team. Although the fiercest opposition from the community originated from organisations associated with the ‘moral right’, there were other objections from people not obviously affiliated with any particular organisation such as objections received from individual parents. One parent from Oamaru wrote:

I wish to express my disapproval of the KOS units. Of special concern is the unit attempting to cover the topic of incest or sexual abuse of children in their own homes...It is the adults who need educating NOT the children (parent/Sanders 28/6/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.8).

The concern that children were possibly being put in the position of taking on adult responsibilities was also mentioned in other submissions including those from the moral right for example, that of The New Zealand Board of Health which suggested that “Unless adults are educated in...avoid[ing]...child abuse...the problem is not tackled at source and we risk burdening children with an excessive responsibility for resolving their own predicaments” (NZBoard of Health/Sanders 11/8/1986. 12/3/8/3 Vol.8).

This highlighted the problem that too much responsibility can be placed on children for their own protection from sexual abuse in situations where they have the least power. Trudell and Whatley (1988:109) suggest this can lead to placing blame on the victim and can be seen as revictimisation:

...school sexual abuse prevention programs can have the unanticipated negative consequence of contributing to blame the victim. This is a dynamic that has long operated in our society whereby certain individuals (those with least power) are blamed for their own victimization.

#### **6.4.2 Moral right concerns**

Organisations recognised as being affiliated with the moral right were identified by Allannah Ryan (1986a). They have been easily identifiable in this research project because most of their correspondence was on the appropriate letterhead.

Their objections were based on the following concerns.

1. That the Police's role in educational programmes indicated the intent of the state to exercise authority over and intrusion into parental rights.
2. That the content of KOS would introduce children to 'sexuality education' thereby encouraging sexual permissiveness and perverted values which would in turn undermine family values.
3. That the programme could make children, especially girls, suspicious of all males even their fathers.
4. That there was reduced emphasis on 'Stranger Danger' concept.
5. That parents would not have the option of removing their children from classes that dealt with the sexual abuse situation.

As many of the concerns and the objections to KOS were voiced by those

affiliated with the 'moral right' it is necessary to provide a brief history of the development and ideology of the moral right in New Zealand in order to understand their perspectives on KOS.

## **6.5 The moral right movement in New Zealand**

### **6.5.1 History of the moral right in New Zealand**

The moral right is considered to be a faction of a movement that has been called the 'new right', the 'radical right' or the 'extreme right'. Although these terms are often used interchangeably, the 'new right' is generally used to describe the various right-wing conservative moral, religious, and racist groups that have sprung up since the 1960s. Ryan (1988a:56) suggests that "...morally conservative groups have not simply appeared out of thin air but represent a political response to specific social and historical changes to New Zealand society". She describes the moral right as "... a neo-conservative movement that is concerned with maintaining the authority of the family and traditional ideas about gender and sexual relations". Power (1984: 37) describes the new right in America, a description that is also applicable to the New Zealand situation, especially as it was in the early-mid 1980s:

The new right is not a monolithic organisation, but a loose grouping of political single issue, and religious organisations with somewhat divergent interests. In recent years...these groups were able to forge a fairly high level of unity, which focussed in part on reproductive, sexual and 'family' issues. This unity is anti-feminist at heart.

In New Zealand the moral right consists of various religious groups and groups concerned with single issues such as abortion and homosexuality. Although these groups are varied in their membership, management structure, tactics and



goals they share a common ideology, that is the preservation of the 'family'. The moral right considers the family to be in a perilous condition and "...in desperate need of preservation and protection from the destabilising influences of 'permissive' society" (Ryan 1986b:105).

In 1986 there were approximately 40 organisations and churches that would be considered 'moral right', actively dealing with such moral issues as sex education, contraception, sterilisation, abortion, sexual permissiveness and pornography (Ryan 1986a). Some of these included the Concerned Parents Association (CPA), Christians for Life, Christian Alternative Movement, Society for the Promotion of Community Standards (SPCS), Community Organisation on Moral Education (COME) and Women's Christian Temperance Movement. Vodanovich (1985) notes that there was an increase in membership of fundamentalist churches from the late 1970s and that between 1976 and 1981, while membership of traditional churches rose by 7.27%, the membership of Pentecostal churches rose by an astronomical 127.3%.

Ryan (1986b) suggests the development of the moral right in New Zealand can be traced back to 1970 with the formation of the Society for the Promotion of Community Standards (SPCS) by Patricia Bartlett and the Society for the Protection of the Unborn Child (SPUC). The SPCS was concerned with liberal attitudes that were pervading television, book and film censorship and advertising and was formed after a petition to Parliament calling for amendments to the Film and Crimes Acts, which would make nudity and homosexuality illegal in films and on the stage, failed. SPUC was established to prevent a similar liberalisation of New Zealand abortion laws as had occurred in Britain in 1967. The Family Rights Association (FRA) was established in 1973 to protect the institution of the family. FRA members believed the family was

under threat from permissive elements, such as homosexuality and women's liberation, that were infiltrating society. The Concerned Parents Association (CPA) was set up in 1974 after the Ross Report entitled "Human Development and Relationships in the School Curriculum" suggested "Age-relevant courses for pupils to cover the topics of human physiology, reproduction, family relationships and the moral and social implications of sexual behaviour" (Coggan 1992:42). The findings of this report were one of the first targets of a deliberate campaign against sex education by the moral right. "Too Great a Risk", a comic on contraception circulated to schools in 1974 was another reason for the formation of the CPA. The 1975 Royal Commission on Contraception, Sterilisation and Abortion initiated by the Labour Government was the catalyst for considerable activity by various moral right groups, such as Women for Life, The Save Our Homes campaign and the Integrity Centre in Christchurch.

The Johnson Report, 1977, which was established to investigate New Zealand education with a focus on social education supported the findings of the Ross Report. In reaction to the Johnson Report's recommendations for more comprehensive educational programmes and shared responsibilities in social education, the Community Organisation on Moral Education (COME) was formed by members of the FRA and SPCS, with SPUC joining in 1978. The Working Women's Council was established in opposition to the acceptance of the Working Women's Charter by the Federation of Labour in 1980.

Although the moral right organisations were active in the early 1980s, the election of the Labour Government in 1984 led to the profile of these organisations becoming more pronounced. This is because many of the Labour Party's left wing platforms were seen to be in direct opposition to the ideals of

the moral right.

The development of KOS beginning in 1983, the Homosexual Law Reform 1985, the establishment of the Ministry of Women's Affairs and the Education Amendment Act 1985 were all reasons for concerted efforts by the various groups to work together to prevent the perceived contamination of the family by the permissive elements that were pervading society. The introduction of the Homosexual Law Reform Bill in March 1985 led to the formation of the Coalition of Concerned Citizens (CCC), an organisation which described itself

... as a gathering point for people troubled by a changing social and economic landscape, a platform for conservatives to hurl rocks at the agents of change: the Vietnam war protestors, feminists, greenies, the entire candelabra of the 'permissive society'" (Ansley 1985:17 as cited in Ryan 1986b).

Ryan (1986b:106) suggests that the aim of the CCC was to "... form a united front to fight the permissive enemy through disseminating information and acting as a catalyst to motivate and spearhead action on moral issues".

### **6.5.2 Conditions which generated the rise of the moral right**

Prior to the 1960s and 1970s, there existed a specific ideology about family life, sexuality, gender and sexual relationships which was challenged by the liberal, feminist and gay movements of the 1960s and 1970s. These movements were calling for an end to apparent gender and sexual oppression. In addition, traditional and established religions were losing their grip as the protectors of morality as the idea of morality based on individual choice and freedom became more widely accepted. Pressure from the feminist movement meant the government also became more involved in areas that had previously been

considered private for example, introducing laws promoting equal pay for women, liberal divorce proceedings, the right to have an abortion and a greater emphasis on child welfare. These conditions combined to represent a liberal or progressive movement and the development of a morally conservative movement, that is the moral right, was a response to what was perceived to be a troubling growth in permissiveness which would lead to a moral and sexual crisis in society. Ryan (1986b:109) writes that it "...identified both state intervention in 'private' areas of 'morality' and family-life, and the new progressive movements, as 'the enemy' that had to be defeated if morality and authority were to reign once again".

The proposed new safety programme "Keeping Ourselves Safe" was perceived by the moral right as principally sex education, yet another interference by the state into matters that were sacrosanct to the family and an example of the 'permissive' elements that were infiltrating society. Weeks (1981) suggests that the moral right uses the concept of permissiveness as a metaphor to illustrate sexual and moral liberalisation and disrespect for what is traditional and good. He also suggests that British society's permissiveness made it "...easier in the 1970s to recreate a sense of crisis around social changes and the beginnings of a mass support for authoritarian moral solutions" (Weeks 1981:249).

### **6.5.3 Discussion on the ideology of the moral right**

According to Ryan (1986a) the ideology of the moral right is a form of 'populist moralism,' that is, it creates a political space between two opposing positions. Ryan (1988b:116) describes this situation in the following way "...the world is divided into two poles that meet in a point of confrontation where an 'enemy' must be overcome so that the forces of 'good' may triumph". The Integrity

Centre, Christchurch as cited in Snook (1988:250) illustrates the polarities well in their description of the 'enemy' which is seen in political terms, that is "...radical folk with socialist intent..." and the 'goodies' who are seen in religious terms, that is "...dedicated Christians...".

Hall (1983:3) contends that populist moralism is seen "... where the great syntax of 'good' versus 'evil', of civilised and uncivilised standards, of the choice between anarchy and order, constantly divides the world up and classifies it into its appointed stations." Populist moralism is also very concerned with ideas about 'correct' gender roles and sexuality, including sex education.

The moral right believes sex education in schools is an intrusion and violation of parental rights by the government. In addition, sex education in schools is seen as a potential vehicle for feminists and other sexually permissive groups to contaminate young minds. The moral right are staunch defenders of parental rights for sex education. As sex belongs within the family, the correct place for sex education is within the family home, with the parents being the appropriate educators (Openshaw 1986; Ryan 1986b, 1988a; Snook 1988). The moral right discourse on sex education is thus very sexually conservative and anti-feminist.

The polarities discussed previously can be illustrated as having, on one hand, the 'good, moral parents' defending the family and on the other, the permissive, radical groups such as feminists and homosexuals and the liberal state, all anxious to destroy the 'good moral values' of the family. Feminists and other radical groups are seen as 'evil' because they threaten family values that have been decreed by God. The moral right perceives this as challenging traditional stereotypical gender roles and encouraging women to step outside their maternal role, a role that is natural because of their biological make-up.

The October/November (1983:8) Newsletter published by the CPA contains the following description of the family:

God's order is that, within marriage, a man has the responsibility for the care and protection of his wife: together they have the responsibility for the care, protection, upbringing and education of their children. The system breaks down when the State intervenes in family responsibilities and when men do not give women in general and their wives in particular, the respect and protection they need and deserve: this results in the exploitation of women by men and abuse of children by adults.

As men respect women and value them in their roles of wives, mothers and homemakers (one of the most important functions in society), and as women respect and value men in their role as leaders and protectors, and as they both respect and value their children as mankind's future, so the problems of child abuse, rape and sexual violence will diminish.

In this kind of patriarchal familial construction all the power is in the hands of men, and women have no place in any political activity. Women are considered the weaker sex, in need of protection by men, and their place is in the home where they are the moral guardians of the family and expected to nurture their family and make the home a happy place (Ryan 1988b). Of the CPA and the SPCS, Snook (1988:259) writes "There is, first of all, opposition to equality of the sexes and a commitment to traditional sex roles."

Ryan (1988b:122) suggests that the moral right perceives sex education in schools to equate to the following:

#### SEX EDUCATION

- = sexual permissiveness
- = distortion of gender roles and identity
- = breakdown in family life
- = breakdown in authority
- = breakdown in society.

In short, the moral right believes sex education in schools could result in children questioning traditional sexual relationships and gender roles which in turn could weaken the stability of the family thereby weakening the structures of society.

After this brief explanation of the history and beliefs of the moral right in New Zealand, it is time to look at the specific concerns and objections they held about 'Keeping Ourselves Safe'.

## **6.6 Addressing the concerns**

### **6.6.1 The role of the Police in educational programmes**

The moral right was concerned that the Police's role in educational programmes indicated the state's intention to exercise authority over and intrusion into parental rights. This concern questioned the role and rights of the Police to educate children, especially including such a highly sensitive topic.

By the time the development of "Keeping Ourselves Safe" was initiated in 1983 by the Curriculum Development Office of the New Zealand Police, PEOs had had an association with school children and their teachers for 27 years.

The New Zealand Police's associations with schools goes back to 1956 when it was believed that Police Officers having contact with school children would provide them with a healthy and positive influence. In 1957, a series of talks by Police Officers was initiated in Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin schools. These talks, illustrated by slides, discussed the role and duties

of Police Officers. The 'Juvenile Crime Prevention' section of the Police Department was established in 1958. The name was changed to 'Youth Aid' section in 1968 and permanent 'school talks' were established with a set syllabus, including teaching aids and project materials, being followed. These were tested in Wellington schools in 1969.

In 1970, special attention was given to the preparation of including the programmes in secondary schools, although this work was restricted to secondary schools in the Wellington area only. From 1969 - 1971, the number of schools benefiting from talks by Police Officers had doubled. The first Curriculum Development Officer, Mr Nash was appointed at Police National Headquarters in 1975. The programmes were to be developed in close collaboration with the Department of Education. In 1976, Sergeant Hodge was appointed as Deputy Co-ordinator: Youth Aid. The result of these two new positions was improved training for Police Education Officers (PEOs) with the first training course being developed in partnership with Hamilton Teachers College. A closer partnership between teachers and LREOs was also recommended.

A review of 'school talks' in 1977 found several areas in need of attention, such as, inadequate curriculum statements, programmes were under resourced, and visits were frequently being cancelled because of other duties taking precedence. In order to address these shortcomings, a second Education Officer was appointed to Police National Headquarters and negotiations commenced with the Department of Education to provide a qualified teacher to work as a Curriculum Officer. Consequently Mr C Ryan was seconded from the Department of Education for two years to work with the Curriculum Officer. The role of the Curriculum Officer was to ensure that Police and Department of



Education educational objectives were integrated. 1978 saw the positions of 'Regional Co-ordinators' being established in Auckland and Wellington to oversee Law Related Educational Programmes (LREP) in the districts in each region.

The new curriculum for LREPs was published and introduced into schools throughout New Zealand in 1980. It was closely related to the Department of Education's Social Studies syllabus and spanned from Infant classes to Form 4. Co-operation between teachers and PEOs was one of the main objectives. In 1981 Mr Sanders was appointed to a position as a nonsworn Curriculum Officer and commenced work on a new curriculum for use in schools. In 1982 "Play a Part in Crime Prevention", a comprehensive teaching kit sponsored by Commercial Union was published and 5000 kits were distributed to intermediate schools throughout New Zealand. Commercial Union also sponsored the 1983 development and production of "A Pictorial History of the New Zealand Police" for use by PEOs. A copy of this book was donated to every school in New Zealand.

By the time 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' was initiated in 1983, the New Zealand Police had a well established role in the education of New Zealand children. Although the 'Keeping Ourselves Safe' incorporated a 'sensitive issue' that is child sexual abuse, that 'sensitive issue' is considered a crime by the Police. As it is their duty to prevent crime, it was the legal obligation of the Police to develop a child abuse prevention programme in order to protect young people from abuse. Moral right organisations such as the CCC and the CPA believed the teaching of KOS and its utilisation of PEOs to be a gross infringement of parental rights that would ultimately diminish parental authority. In its October/November Newsletter (1983:7) the CPA suggested the proposed Police

safety education programme would result in

...virtually the complete take-over by the state of the up-bringing of children in New Zealand. Under the guise of promoting a healthy lifestyle, it is proposed to mould children's attitudes, morals and values concerning just about every facet of life – how they view themselves, relate to other people, develop sexual morality, set goals for the future. And it would all be done in a manner which undermines traditional morality and opposes Christianity.

In response moral right organisations such as the CPA, SPCS, Integrity Centre and COME all promoted activities to oppose the programme by encouraging member parents to join various school committees and other controlling bodies and making their views known. Members were also encouraged to instigate and circulate petitions with the aim of undermining and thwarting the development of KOS (CPANewsletter Oct/Nov 1983:7).

### **6.6.2 Introducing children to sexuality education**

This concern focussed on the idea that the content of KOS would introduce children to 'sexuality' education thereby encouraging sexually permissive and perverted values that would in turn undermine family values.

The preservation of the family is at the heart of moral right beliefs and any influence that could possibly cause the foundational structure of the family to falter is to be avoided. Within a moral right family, "... the women are primarily childbearers and rearers and the men are the breadwinners" (Ryan 1988a:69).

Heterosexuality, monogamy and sex for reproduction within the marriage are the only correct expression of sexual activity and any variances from this standard such as homosexuality, are abhorrent as they encourage sexual

promiscuity outside the marriage. Providing a programme that would introduce children to 'sexuality' education in an environment outside the safety of the home, would negatively influence children's attitudes, morals and values as well as encourage children to engage in sexual activity (Openshaw 1986; Ryan 1986a; 1988a). Mr Elliot-Hogg (1985:22) as cited in Ryan (1988a:71) suggested that

the introduction of 'permissive' sex education is seen as an intrusion into education, an encroachment authorised and promoted by a small group of people who are at this moment authorising and leading a historic shift to break down children's natural modesty, distort their perspective, undermine their home taught values and habituate them from their first year in schooling in genital thinking.

According to Ryan (1988a:72), the moral right are "...opposed to any sexual activity on the part of children. It is believed there is a latency period when children are not interested in sex and to willingly introduce sex education during this period is dangerous." This latency period, which ensures children's innocence, is thought to be natural and biologically determined and will be destroyed by the introduction to sexuality education by the psychological disturbances that will inevitably follow. The April 1980 CPA Newsletter (as cited in Ryan 1986a:134) contains a paragraph discussing these biological differences:

Girls begin to talk earlier, read sooner, learn foreign languages more easily, and because of greater skin sensitivity in the fingertips are more proficient in fine work (motor performance). Boys show earlier visual superiority, are clumsier regarding fine manipulations but are better at activities calling for total body co-ordination.

Sex education was also considered to thwart natural development of sexual

identity (Ryan 1986b:110). Ultimately, the moral right believes that sexuality education would also lead to the breaking down of 'ideal' family structures by interfering with the 'normal' development of sex roles and sexual identity (CPA Newsletter Oct/Nov 1983:6).

In contrast to the moral right's belief in a 'latency period' in young children, Skolnick (1986:339) writes "Children at this age often do display a noticeable interest in sexual matters – it is the age of 'playing doctors,' of 'show me,' the discovery of sexual arousal and masturbation." Briggs and Hawkins (1997:115) also suggest "Young children are known to be especially curious about their bodies". In fact, Wilson (1989:225) contends that "Feminists...take issue with the KOS programme because it is presented in isolation from information about sexuality and education about sex generally." She also suggests that "Feminists insist that the connection between sexual assault and sexuality cannot be ignored and they stress the need for adequate sex education to enable children to learn how to respect and protect themselves" (Wilson 1989:225).

Other feminists (Butler 1986; Driver & Droisen 1989; Herman 1984) accentuate the role that power plays in the act of sexual abuse. This resonates with Foucault's power/knowledge relation as stated by Ransome (1997:23), thus "...some kinds of knowledge act as forms of power and that knowledge and power work together to produce certain kinds of environments."

The lack of relevant knowledge may result in a disempowerment of the child. By providing the child with self-protection strategies and information a child gains power over his body and, potentially, over the actions of adults. Correct information gives children the potential to challenge the hierarchical power

between adult and child if the adult is abusive.

Krivacska (1990) was especially critical of child protection programmes that view children as asexual, that is, use evasive language rather than correct terminology, by claiming such programmes were inevitably ineffective. Adult survivors of child sexual abuse have spoken of how their ignorance of sexuality as children made their exploitation by abusers easier (Saphira 1986; Butler 1986). This point is substantiated by a letter sent to the editor of the New Zealand Woman's Weekly, after an article on KOS was published in 4 November 1985 issue. The writer states that she was raped by a family friend when she was 10 years old and that

...for years I thought it was my fault. But now I realise there was no way it could have been – I didn't even know what was happening until it was too late – I was that naïve and innocent.

If I had not been so innocent and had perhaps been taught at least a few facts at school I might have known how to avoid the situation. Because, looking back it could have been avoided if only someone had told me what to do (17/12/1985. 12/3/8/3 Vol.6).

Finkelhor (1986:225) also suggests that many

...children could have been spared substantial vulnerability and suffering if they had had simple pieces of information, for example, about their right to refuse sexual advances or about the inappropriateness of the behaviour that an adult was engaged in.

“Keeping Ourselves Safe” is not and has never intended to be ‘sex education.’

Its specific aims are to

- teach children a range of safe practices that they can use when interacting with other people;
- encourage children who have been, or are being, abused, to seek

help;

- contribute to an overall community prevention programme by making parents and teachers more aware of their responsibilities to help children avoid abuse (KOS Standing Up For Myself 1997:7).

Rather than seeking to undermine family values by encouraging sexually permissive and perverted values, the KOS programme places considerable emphasis on parental involvement to support and reinforce skills and concepts learned at school. The homework tasks assigned to each of the units are designed to encourage and develop links between home and school. In addition to contributing to community prevention by increasing teachers' and parents' awareness of the necessity to help children avoid sexual abuse, research has shown that parental assistance, by reviewing the information taught at school, increases retention of knowledge (Haugaard & Reppucci 1988; Miller-Perrin & Wurtele 1988; Wurtele & Miller-Perrin 1987).

The programme also focuses on teaching safety strategies in a variety of settings thereby empowering children in ways that will help them avoid being hurt. Rather than attempt to destroy family bonds, it helps children recognise adults who are trustworthy because of their actions and not necessarily because of their positions (Briggs & Hawkins 1992; 1997).

### **6.6.3 Children could become suspicious of men**

This concern focussed on the idea that the programme could make children, especially girls, suspicious of all males, including their fathers.

Children being suspicious of males, especially their fathers, is unacceptable within a moral right family where the father is the head of the household. Power is seen to be situated in the patriarchal position and therefore his

authority is not to be questioned. The moral right believes that a repercussion of sexuality education being given to children is that the father's authority could possibly be questioned.

However, this situation is very unlikely to occur as a result of a child participating in the KOS programme. The programme does not cast fathers in abusive roles only. Fathers are portrayed as supportive and caring though some are portrayed as abusive, as are all other adults, including women.

In addition, KOS does not include instances of the more frightening forms of sexual abuse such as those that continue over a long period of time or involve force. The situations that do deal with sexual abuse emphasise positive actions children can take and encourage brainstorming to decide on strategies for getting away from or out of dangerous situations. An example of this can be seen in activity 5 of the "Getting Help" unit for standards 2 – 4. Entitled "Confusing Touch" it utilises a story "Jane and Uncle Steve" as a base for helping children discriminate between ways adults touch them. In addition children practice saying no and learn that they are not responsible if an adult touches them inappropriately. The unit builds on skills learned in "Different Kinds of Touching" of the New Entrant – J 3 "Knowing What To Do" unit. The unit finishes with an activity designed to help children develop assertive responses they could make if an older person made sexual approaches to them. This concept is developed further in module 5 "Reporting Abuse" of the unit for Forms 1 – 2, "Standing Up For Myself" when children learn why it is important to report abuse and know who to inform and what to tell.

The fact that each successive stage of the programme builds on children's existing knowledge and uses positive rather than negative language ensures that

participants feel empowered after completing the KOS programme rather than frightened or suspicious. Having parents involved with the follow up work at home would give them the opportunity to allay any fears children may have. Briggs and Hawkins (1996) surveyed 252 10–12 year old children and 142 parents from 10 New Zealand intermediate schools that had used the relevant KOS unit. They asked questions about negative effects as they had heard parents express the following fears:

- That child protection programmes could cause undue anxiety in children;
- Diminish their trust in adults and
- Result in children disobeying their parents.

Of the 142 parents Briggs and Hawkins (1996) interviewed, only 8 thought

...that their child had become more fearful as a result of the programme. Seven thought that the children had become more anxious and cautious in general. One child was said to 'have become overly protective of younger siblings'. A father blamed KOS for filling her with fears about rape. She thinks there's someone hiding behind every corner waiting for her.' He had not discussed this with his daughter however and she revealed to interviewers that her fear of rape related to sexual violence in films and videos reinforced by peer group horror stories (Briggs & Hawkins 1996:26).

In spite of the 8 parents who believed their child had become more fearful, in their findings Briggs and Hawkins (1996) found that all of the other parents and students surveyed supported the teaching of KOS in schools.

#### **6.6.4 Reduced emphasis on 'Stranger Danger'**

This concern focussed on the fact that the new programme would lead to a reduced emphasis on the "Stranger Danger" concept.



This concern was voiced in several newspapers around New Zealand after the murdered body of 6-year-old Teresa Cormack was found. The concern in question was “What the Police programme ‘Keeping Ourselves Safe’ could have done toward keeping her safe which the other Police programme ‘Stranger Danger’ could not” (parent/Taranaki Times 30/6/1987. 12/3/11 Vol.1). The reality is that no child safety programme at all could have prevented Teresa Cormack’s death.

The ‘Stranger Danger’ myth was one of the first to be exposed by feminist researchers (refer to chapter 3). Their findings pointed out that the majority of child sexual abusers are not strangers. In fact, Jackson’s (1980) New Zealand research found that 89% of abusers are known to the child, either a relative or a friend and not surprisingly, most sexual abuse occurs in the child’s own home, or in the home of a relative or friend. Most young children, although not knowing what strangers are, are already terrified of strangers because of conditioning by parents, peers and the media (Briggs 1991). Briggs and Hawkins (1997:193) state that when they asked hundreds of New Zealand and Australian children aged under 8 years if they had ever seen a stranger they were told that although they had not they would recognise one immediately. This is because “...strangers are part monster, part human, always male and are readily identified because they wear black masks, balaclavas, black clothing and they drive old black cars.”

Rather than teach children to identify dangerous people it is surely more important to teach them to avoid potentially dangerous situations and equip them with skills that will enable them to act assertively when they feel unsafe.

### **6.6.5 No option of withdrawing children from class**

This concern focussed on parents not having the option of withdrawing their children from classes that dealt with the sexual abuse situations.

As the attitudes of the moral right to sexuality education have been discussed earlier it is not necessary to make mention of them again here. Although the programme is an optional one, once it is accepted for use in a school, the programme becomes compulsory for all children and individual children can not be withdrawn. This is an important aspect of the programme and one that surely adds to its strengths. Although it was a realistic fear and parents were not able to withdraw their children from class, allowing individual children to be withdrawn would sabotage prevention strategies being taught.

Finkelhor (1986:229) conducted research with 521 parents of children ages 6 – 14 in the Boston metropolitan area. He found that although the parents believed they covered the subject adequately themselves, the reality was quite different:

Only 29% of the parents said that they had had discussions with their children specifically related to the topic of sexual abuse. Even when such discussions had occurred, in many cases they failed to mention important aspects of the problem. Only 53% of discussions, for example, mentioned the possibility of abuse by an adult acquaintance, only 22% by a family member. Only 65% mentioned the possibility of someone trying to take off the child's clothes.

The discussions that did occur often took place too late. Most parents believed the optimal age for discussing sexual abuse with a child was around age 9. Evidence from victim's childhood experiences revealed, however, that more than a third of them were victimised before age 9.

The only avenue for parents in New Zealand who wanted to withdraw their children from these classes was to object during the community consultation stage or remove their children from the school.

## **6.7 Reflections on the study**

In this study the researcher set out to do the following:

- Study and document the development process of KOS;
- Describe the implementation process of KOS as documented in the Police files;
- Study and document the reactions, comments, recommendations and submissions of organisations and members of the public;
- Gain some understanding of the controversy KOS provoked from the outset of its development;
- Discuss the outcomes of the development and implementation of KOS and provide recommendations.

To achieve this, it was necessary to:

- Define key terms and concepts relevant to child sexual abuse;
- Discuss child sexual abuse from a feminist theoretical perspective;
- Interview Mr Sanders and Senior Sergeant O'Brien, who were involved in the initiation of the programme;
- Become familiar with the content of "Keeping Ourselves Safe" in order to comment where relevant:

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of the reaction the programme provoked from its instigation to its final implementation. The researcher has achieved these aims. The process of the development and

implementation of the programme has been written as a narrative description. This was done after a thorough examination of the Police files which contains documentation of reactions from community organisations as well as individual members of the public.

This process assisted in the understanding of these reaction, comments, suggestions and concerns. Concerns of the moral right movement regarding KOS were described and contextualised. Questions, concerns and suggestions from parents that emphasised parents' rights were also discussed.

It is important to note the limitations of this project. To get a more accurate picture of the process of development and implementation of KOS and the resulting controversy, it would be preferable to have had available all correspondence and documentation relating to it. It was obvious on several occasions while writing the narrative description that there were gaps in the documentation, for example, there were copies of letters sent by Senior Sergeant O'Brien to Johnson and Johnson requesting financial support for KOS. Although other documentation refers to the fact that Johnson and Johnson had refused the request for funding, there is no actual reply from that company in the files.

The files do not reflect the frustration and despair experienced at times by individuals and the team at Police Headquarters. Possible tension between the Department of Education and the Police because of delays due to 'red tape' and Department of Education regulations is not clearly stated.

It appeared to the researcher after looking through the files that the major difficulty the Police team had to contend with were the objections from the

'moral right'. However, the interviews with Senior Sergeant O'Brien and Mr Sanders who was accompanied by Sergeant Graeme Gibbs, contradicted this impression. It became clear that legislation and regulations which governed the Department of Education and led to the interminable delays before the trials could take place, had left a stronger lasting impression than the objections of the moral right. Of the moral right and their objections Mr Sanders said:

I think parents have a right to be cautious about what is put in front of their children and they have a right to have it explained to them. My objective was always to work on a rational level and try to show them that we weren't doing anything that was about sexuality in terms of contraception, abortion and procreation, but we were concerned about the safety of children and because they had to be protected from sexual abuse they had to understand a little bit about sexuality (personal communication January 1998).

A further limitation of this research study is that the researcher did not examine Department of Education records nor seek the view of relevant Department of Education staff. This could have provided another perspective and a more comprehensive account of events but was beyond the limits set for this master's thesis. Confining the study to the resources provided by the Police set limits for this research but additional areas of inquiry could be addressed in a further study.

## **6.8 Recommendations**

The following suggestions may be relevant for the development and implementation of any future programmes.

Early negotiations between any associated parties involved in developing new programmes would minimise potential time delays. Negotiations should take

place prior to any planning so that different parties can co-operate from the outset. These negotiations would clarify each party's role, position and boundary. Language used in these negotiations and mediation needs to validate and promote collaboration between all parties. This language needs to use a 'both/and' rather than an 'either/or' stance.

It is important to take precautions that will help avoid parents feeling marginalised, disempowered and without choices. Getting their input and ideas at the earliest stage of development of the programme will validate the rights, roles and responsibilities of parents. It could be expected that using, for example, a social constructionist approach where multiple realities are validated and parents form part of the initiation and development, would strengthen the impact of the programme. In the case of KOS empowering children should not mean disempowering parents. The feelings of disempowerment that appeared to be experienced by some parents challenging KOS need to be reduced to the minimum.

To enhance co-operation with all recipients of a programme, for example, parents and children, consultations regarding content could be included at the start of the development process and not only, as was done in KOS's case, as a final evaluation after having completed the programme.

Developing a system whereby parents are given choices as to whether their children participate in a particular programme should be investigated.

From a feminist perspective it would seem appropriate to place a woman in a leadership or at least co-leadership role when developing programmes that are principally women's issues.

## **6.9 Further research**

As the majority of objections to KOS came from individuals associated with the moral right, research needs to investigate how the beliefs and ideology of this group can be accommodated within mainstream educational programmes they might consider contentious.

Further research to determine whether knowledge about the incidence and consequences of child sexual abuse is widespread or not is also indicated. From this could follow research to determine whether parents in New Zealand nowadays are more confident and capable of providing their children with adequate safety skills and how this can be accommodated within a school programme.

One letter received by the Police Curriculum Development Officers was concerned that the programme was inappropriately placing adult responsibility on children. This is a very realistic concern and ideally, children should not find themselves in situations where they need to protect themselves. Unfortunately child sexual abuse is very widespread and it is, mostly, perpetrated by adults. Research into the question of abused children shouldering misplaced adult responsibility, will assist in addressing this problem and could contribute to developing a programme for parents and other adults regarding sexual abuse of children.

Finally, further research could investigate what it means when parents and children report heightened fear and anxiety as a consequence of participating in child protection programmes. Findings of Finkelhor and Dziuba-Leatherman

(1995) suggest that even if fear and anxiety is increased as a result of participation in these programmes, this is not necessarily an indication that the programme is having negative effects. These findings suggest further exploration.



## REFERENCES

- Abrahams, N., Casey, K., & Daro, D. (1992). Teachers' knowledge, attitudes and beliefs about child abuse and its prevention. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 16, 229-238.
- Adler, N., & Schutz, J. (1995). Sibling incest offenders. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 19 (7), 811-819.
- Ansley, B. (1985). The growing might of the moral right. Listener 26/10/1985, 16-18. In A. Ryan (1986). 'For God, country and family': Populist moralism and the New Zealand moral right. *New Zealand Sociology*, 1 (2), 104-112.
- Araji, S., & Finkelhor, D. (1986). Abusers: A review of the literature. In D. Finkelhor. *A sourcebook on child sexual abuse*. California: Sage Publications.
- Bagley, C., & King, K. (1990). *Child sexual abuse. The search for healing*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, A., & Duncan, S. (1985). Child sexual abuse: A study of prevalence in Great Britain. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 9(4), 457-467.
- Bass, E. (1983). Child sexual abuse. In P. Searles & R.J. Berger. (eds) *Rape and Society*. San Francisco: Westview Press.
- Bass, E., & Davis, L. (1988). *The courage to heal: A guide for women survivors of child sexual abuse*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Beilharz, P.(ed) (1992). *Social theory: a guide to central thinkers*. NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Bell, V. (1993). *Interrogating incest. Feminism, Foucault and the law*. London: Routledge.
- Berrick, J.D., & Barth, R. (1992). Child sexual abuse prevention: Research, review and recommendations. *Social Work Research & Abstracts*, 28 (4), 6-15.
- Berrick, J.D., & Gilbert, N. (1991). *With the best of intentions. The child sexual abuse prevention movement*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Binder, R., & McNeil, D. (1987). Evaluation of a school-based sexual abuse prevention program: Cognitive and emotional effects. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 11, 497-506.
- Bolton, F.G., Morris, L.A., & MacEachron, A.E. (1989). *Males at risk. The other side of child sexual abuse*. California: Sage Publications.
- Boney-McCoy, S., & Finkelhor, D. (1995). Prior victimization: A risk factor for child sexual abuse and PTSD-related symptomatology among sexually abused youth. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 19 (12), 1401-1421.
- Bouma, G. (1993). *The research process*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Briggs, F. (1988). *Keep children safe*. Auckland: Longman Paul Ltd.
- Briggs, F. (1991). Child protection programmes: Can they protect young children? *Early Child Development and Care*, 67, 61-72.
- Briggs, F. (1991). *Keeping Ourselves Safe: a personal safety curriculum examined*. Set Number 2, Item 7.
- Briggs, F. (1993). *Why my child?* Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Ltd.
- Briggs, F. (1994). *Children and families: Australian perspectives*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Briggs, F. (1995). *From victim to offender*. NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Briggs, F., & Hawkins, R. (1993). *Follow up data on the effectiveness of "Keeping Ourselves Safe" when used with children of 5-8 years*. Report to the New Zealand Law Related Education. Wellington.
- Briggs, F., & Hawkins, R. (1994). Choosing between child protection programmes. *Child Abuse Review*, 3, 272-284.
- Briggs, F., & Hawkins, R. (1994). Follow-up data on the effectiveness of New Zealand's national school based child protection program. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 18 (8), 635-643.
- Briggs, F., & Hawkins, R. (1997). *Child protection*. NSW: Allen & Unwin Pty Ltd.
- Browne, A., & Finkelhor, D. (1986). Impact of child sexual abuse: A review

of the research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99, 66-77.

Brownmiller, S. (1979). *Against our will*. London: Penguin.

Budin, L., & Johnson, C. (1989). Sex abuse prevention programs: Offenders' attitudes about their efficacy. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 13, 77-87.

Burns, R. (1994). *Introduction to research methods*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.

Butler, S. (1985). *Conspiracy of silence: The trauma of incest*. New York: Volcano Press.

Butler, S. (1986). Thinking about prevention: A critical look. In M. Nelson, & K. Clark, (eds) 1986. *The educator's guide to preventing child sexual abuse*. California: Network Publications.

Cashman, H. (1993). *Christianity and child sexual abuse*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Chodorow, N. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Cicchetti, D., & Toth, S. (eds) (1995). *Child abuse, child development and social policy*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Coggan, C. (1992). Sexuality education: theory and praxis. M.A. thesis. University of Auckland.

Cohn, A. H. (1986). Preventing adults from becoming sexual molesters. *Child abuse and neglect*. 10. 559-562.

Conte, J., Rosen, C., & Saperstein, L. (1986). An analysis of programmes to prevent the sexual victimization of children. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 6(3), 141-155.

Conte, J., Rosen, C., Saperstein, L., & Shermack, R. (1985). An evaluation of a program to prevent the sexual victimization of young children. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 9, 319-328.

Conte, J., & Schuerman, J. (1987). Factors associated with an increased impact of child sexual abuse. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 11, 201-211.

Cooper, D.M., & Ball, D. (1987). *Social work and child abuse*. London: MacMillan Education Ltd.

Craissati, J., & McClurg, G. (1996). The Challenge project: Perpetrators of child sexual abuse in South East London. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 20 (11), 1067-1077.

Daro, D. (1991). Child sexual abuse prevention: Separating fact from fiction. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 15, 1-4.

Daro, D., & McCurdy, K. (1994). Preventing child abuse and neglect: Programmatic interventions. *Child Welfare*, 5, Sept/Oct, 405-430.

Delmar, R. (1986). What is feminism? In A.C. Herrmann & A.J. Stewart. (1994). *Theorizing feminism. Parallel trends in the humanities and social sciences*. San Francisco: Westview Press.

Donovan, J. (1994). *Feminist theory. The intellectual traditions of American feminism*. New York: Continuum Publishing Company.

Driver, E., & Droisen, A. (eds). (1989). *Child sexual abuse. Feminist perspectives*. London: MacMillan Education Ltd.

Duran, J. (1991). *Toward a feminist epistemology*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Durrant, M., & Kowalski, C. (1992). Overcoming the effects of sexual abuse: Developing a self-perception of competence. In M. Durrant & C. White (eds) (1992) *Ideas for therapy with sexual abuse*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Durrant, M., & White, C. (eds) (1992). *Ideas for therapy with sexual abuse*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Dziuba-Leatherman, J., & Finkelhor, D. (1994). How does receiving information about sexual abuse influence boys' perceptions of their risk? *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 18 (7), 557-568.

Edwards, A. (1987). Male violence in Feminist Theory. In J. Hanmer, & M. Maynard. (1987). *Women, violence and society*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Edwards, A., & Talbot, R. (1994). *The hard-pressed researcher*. London: Longman.

Eisenstein, Z. (1981). *The radical future of liberal feminism*. New York: Longman.

Eisenstein, Z. (1994). *The color of gender*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Eisner, E. (1979). Recent developments in educational research affecting art education. *Art Education*, 32, 12-15.

Elliot-Hogg, D. (1985). The search for traditional values. Paper presented at a seminar on 'Teenagers and sex education'.

Elliott, M., Browne, K., & Kilcoyne, J. (1995). Child sexual abuse prevention: What offenders tell us. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 19 (5), 579-594.

Elrod, J., & Rubin, R. (1993). Parental involvement in sexual abuse prevention education. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 17, 527-538.

England, P. (ed) (1993). *Theory on gender/ feminism on theory*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Finkelhor, D. (1979). *Sexually victimized children*. New York: Free Press.

Finkelhor, D. (1984). *Child sexual abuse: Theory and research*. New York: Free Press.

Finkelhor, D. (1986). *A sourcebook on child sexual abuse*. California: Sage Publications.

Finkelhor, D. (1990). Risk factors in the sexual victimization of children. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 4, 265-273.

Finkelhor, D. (1994). The international epidemiology of child sexual abuse. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 18 (5), 409-417.

Finkelhor, D., Asdigian, N., & Dziuba-Leatherman, J. (1995). The effectiveness of victimization prevention instruction: An evaluation of children's responses to actual threats and assaults. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 19 (2), 141-153.

- Finkelhor, D., & Baron, D. (1986). High-risk children. In D. Finkelhor. (1986). *A sourcebook on child sexual abuse*. California: Sage Publications.
- Finkelhor, D., & Dziuba-Leatherman, J. (1995). Victimization prevention programs: A national survey of children's exposure and reactions. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 19* (2), 129-139.
- Finkelhor, D., Williams, L.M., & Burns, N. (1988). *Nursery crimes: Sexual abuse in day care*. California: Sage Publications.
- Fleming, J., Mullen, P., & Bammer, G. (1997). A study of potential risk factors for sexual abuse in childhood. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 21* (1), 49-58.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. USA: Peregrine Books.
- Fraser, N., & Nicholson, L. (1988). Social criticism without philosophy: an encounter between feminism and postmodernism. *Theory, Culture and Society, 5*. 373-394.
- Fryer, G., Kraizer, S., & Miyoshi, T. (1987). Measuring actual reduction of risk to child abuse: A new approach. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 11*, 181-185.
- Furniss, T. (1991). *The multiprofessional handbook of child sexual abuse*. London: Routledge.
- Garbarino, J. (1987). Children's response to a sexual abuse prevention programme: A study of the "Spiderman" comic. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 11*, 181-185.
- Gavey, N. (1990). Rape and sexual coercion within heterosexual relationships. PhD Thesis. University of Auckland.
- Giddens, A. (1993). *Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gilbert, J., Berrick, N., Le Prohn, N., & Nyman, N. (1989). *Protecting young children from sexual abuse*. California: Lexington Books.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Giovannoni, J.M. (1982). Prevention of child abuse and neglect: Research and policy issues. *Social Work Research and Abstracts, 18*, 23-31.

Glaser, D., & Frosh, S. (1988). *Child sexual abuse*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Goodyear-Smith, F. (1993). *First do no harm. The sexual abuse industry*. Auckland: Benton-Guy Publishing.

Goldner, V. (1985). Feminism and family therapy. *Family Process*, 24, 135-147.

Golombok, S., & Fivush, R. (1994). *Gender development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gomes-Schwartz, B., Horowitz, J., & Cardarelli, A. (1990). *Child sexual abuse. The initial effects*. California: Sage Publications.

Gordon, C. (ed) (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault*. New York: Pantheon.

Green, A.H. (1988). Overview of the literature on child sexual abuse. In D.H. Schetky, & A.H. Green. (eds) (1988). *Child sexual abuse: A handbook for health care and legal professionals*. New York: Brunner/Mazel Inc.

Griffin, G., Hester, M., Rai, S., & Roseneil, S. (eds) (1994). *Stirring it. Challenges for feminism*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Grosz, E. (1994). *Volatile bodies. Towards a corporeal feminism*. NSW: Allen & Unwin Pty Ltd.

Haines, H. (1987). *Mental health for women*. Auckland: Reed Methuen.

Hall, S. (1983). 'Thatcherism – rolling back the welfare state'. *Thesis Eleven*, 7, 6-19.

Hanmer, J., & Sanders, S (1984). *Well-founded fear: a community study of violence to women*. London: Hutchinson.

Hanmer, J., & Maynard, M. (1987). *Women, violence and social control*. London: Macmillan Press.

Hansen, T. (1991). *Seven for a secret*. London: Triangle.

Haugaard, J.J., & Reppucci, N.D. (1988). *The sexual abuse of children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hayward, J. (1993). *Perspectives in sexual abuse from home and abroad*. Wellington: Winston Churchill Report.

Hazzard, A., Webb, C., Kleemeier, C., Angert, L., & Pohl, J. (1991). Child sexual abuse prevention: Evaluation and one-year follow-up. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 15*, 123-138.

Herman, J. (1984). *Father-daughter incest*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Herrmann, A.C., & Stewart, A.J. (eds) (1994). *Theorising feminism. Parallel trends in the humanities and social sciences*. San Francisco: Westview Press.

Horowitz, L., Putnam, F., & Noll, J. (1997). Factors affecting utilization of treatment services by sexually abused girls. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 21 (1)*, 35-48.

Howes, P., & Cicchetti, D. (1995). A family/relational perspective on maltreating families: Parallel processes across systems and social policy implications. In D. Cicchetti, & S. Toth. (eds) (1995). *Child Abuse, Child Development and Social Policy*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Huchton, L.M. (1985). *Protect your child. A parent's safeguard against child abduction and sexual abuse*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Ltd.

Jackson (Saphira), M. (1980). The sexual abuse of children. Preliminary survey. Unpublished article.

Jackson, S. (ed) (1993). *Women's studies*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf

Jaggar, A.M., & Rothenberg, P.S. (1993). *Feminist frameworks (3rd Ed)* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Jenkins, P. (1992). *Intimate enemies: Moral panic in contemporary Great Britain*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Jesson, B., Ryan, A., & Spoonley, P. (eds) (1988). *Revival of the right - New Zealand politics in the 1980s*. Auckland: Heinemann.



- Johnson, T. (1993). Sexual behaviours: A continuum. In E. Gill. & T. Johnson (eds) (1993). *Sexualized children: Assessment and treatment of children who molest*. Rockville, MD: Launch Press.
- Jones, K.B., & Jonasdottir, A.G. (eds) (1988). *The political interests of gender*. London: Sage Publications.
- Kamsler, A. (1992). Her-Story in the making: Therapy with women who were sexually abused in childhood. In M. Durrant. & C. White. (1992). *Ideas for therapy with sexual abuse*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- Kaslow, F. (ed) (1996). *Handbook of relational diagnosis and dysfunctional family patterns*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Kelly, L. (1988). *Surviving sexual violence*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kelly, L., Regan, L., & Burton, S. (1991). *An exploratory study of the prevalence of sexual abuse in a sample of 16-21 year olds*. London: Polytechnic of North London.
- Kempe, R.S., & Kempe, H.C. (1984). *The common secret. Sexual abuse of children and adolescents*. New York: WH Freeman & Company.
- Kleemeier, C., Webb, C., Hazzard, A., & Pohl, J. (1988). Child sexual abuse prevention: Evaluation of a teacher training model. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 12, 555-561.
- Kolko, D., Moser, J., Litz, J., & Hughes, J. (1987). Promoting awareness and prevention of child sexual victimization using the Red/Green Flag Program: An evaluation with follow-up. *Journal of Family Violence*, 2, 11-35.
- Krivacska, J. (1990). *Designing child sexual abuse prevention programmes*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles Thomas.
- Lang, R.A., & Frenzel, R.R. (1988). How sex offenders lure children. *Annals of Sex Research*, 1, 303-317.
- Linnell, S., & Cora, D. (1993). *Discoveries. A group resource guide for women who have been sexually abused in childhood*. NSW; Dymyna House Inc.
- MacKinnon, C. (1989). *Toward a feminist theory of the state*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

MacLeod, M., & Saraga, E. (1988). Challenging the orthodoxy: Towards a feminist theory and practice. *Feminist Review*, 28, 16-55.

McGregor, K. (1994). *Warriors of truth*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Manning, P. K., & Cullum-Swan, B. (1994). Narrative, content and semiotic analysis. In N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln. (eds) (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. California: Sage Publications.

Martin, J., Anderson, J., Mullen, P., Romans, S., O'Shea, M., Walton, V., & Phillips, A. (1991). *Otago women's health survey, Preliminary Summary*. Dunedin: Department of Psychological Medicine, Dunedin Public Hospital.

Matsakis. A. (1991). *When the bough breaks*. California: New Harbinger Publications, Inc.

Maynard, M., & Purvis, J. (ed) (1994). *Researching women's lives from a feminist perspective*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Meiselman, K. (1981). *Incest - a psychological study of causes and effects with treatment recommendations*. London: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, D. (1991). *Handbook of research design and social measurement*. California: Sage Publications.

Miller-Perrin, C., & Wurtele, S. (1988). The child sexual abuse prevention movement: A critical analysis of primary and secondary approaches. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 8, 313-329.

Ministry of Education. (1993). *Prevent child abuse. Guidelines for early childhood education services*. Wellington: Learning Media, Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Health. (1996). *Child abuse prevention. The health sector's contribution to the "Strengthening Families" initiative*. Wellington: Public Health Group.

Mortensen, D. (1993). *Adolescent sexual offending*. Wellington: A report for the Winston Churchill Trust.

Mullen, P., Martin, J., Anderson, J., Romans, S., & Herbison, G. (1996). The long term effect of the physical, emotional and sexual abuse of children: A community study. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 20 (1), 7-21.

Mullen, P., Romans-Clarkson, S., Walton, V., & Herbison, G. (1988). Impact of sexual and physical abuse on women's mental health. *The Lancet*, April 16, 841-845.

Nelson, M., & Clark, K. (1986). *The educators guide to preventing child sexual abuse*. California: Network Publications.

New Zealand Police archives, files and loose documentation. 12/3/8/3 Vols 1-8; 12/3/11 Vols 1-3; 12/3/12 Vols 1-4.

New Zealand Police & Department of Education. "*Keeping Ourselves Safe*". "Knowing what to do" (1994), Junior Primary (J1-3/S1). "Getting help" (1987), Middle Primary (S2-4). "Standing up for myself" (1987), Senior Primary (F1-2). "Dealing with risk" (1994), Junior Secondary (F3-4). "Building safe relationships" (1994), Senior Secondary (F5-7). Wellington: Learning Media.

Oldfield, D., Hays, B., & Megel, M. 1996. Evaluation of the effectiveness of Project Trust: An elementary school-based victimization prevention strategy. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 20 (9), 821-832.

Openshaw, R. (1986). Upholding basic values: A case study of a conservative pressure group. In B. Jesson., A. Ryan., & P. Spoonley. (eds) (1988). *Revival of the right - New Zealand politics in the 1980s*. Auckland: Heineman.

Oskamp, S., & Costanzo, M. (1993). *Gender issues in contemporary society*. California: Sage Publications.

Pagliassotti, D. (1993). Construction of sex and gender. *Communication Research*, 20 (3), 472-493.

Patton, M.Q. (1991). *Family sexual abuse. Frontline research and evaluation*. California: Sage Publications.

Perniskie, L.M. (1995). Child protection programmes: What do children learn and remember? "Keeping Ourselves Safe" - An Evaluation with follow-up. M.A thesis, Victoria University, Wellington.

- Phelan, P. (1995). Incest and its meaning: The perspectives of fathers and daughters. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 19, 7-24.
- Plummer, C. (1984). *Preventing sexual abuse: What in-school programs teach children*. Paper presented at the Second National Conference for Family Violence Researchers, New Hampshire, August 7-10.
- Poling, J.N. (1991). *The abuse of power*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Porter, R. (ed) (1984). *Child sexual abuse within the family*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Power, M. (1984). Falling through the "Safety Net": Women, economic crisis and Reagonomics. *Feminist Studies*, 10 (1), 31-58.
- Ransome, J. (1997). *Foucault's discipline*. London: Duke University Press.
- Rush, F. (1980). *The best kept secret - sexual abuse of children*. USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Russell, D.E. (1983). The incidence and prevalence of intrafamilial and extrafamilial sexual abuse of female children. *Child Abuse and Neglect*. 7(2), 133-146.
- Ryan, A. (1986a). 'For God, country and family'. Populist moralism and the New Zealand moral right. M.A thesis. Massey University.
- Ryan, A. (1986b). 'For God, country and family': Populist moralism and the New Zealand moral right. *New Zealand Sociology*, 1(2), 104-112.
- Ryan, A. (1988a). Remoralising politics. In B. Jesson., A. Ryan., & P. Spoonley. (eds) (1988). *Revival of the right - New Zealand politics in the 1980s*. Auckland: Heinemann.
- Ryan, A. (1988b). The moral right, sex education and populist moralism. In S. Middleton. (ed) (1988). *Women and education in Aotearoa*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.
- Sanders, O. (1997). Keeping Ourselves Safe. Unpublished paper presented at a public meeting at the University of Illinois, August, 1997.
- Saphira, M. (1981). *The sexual abuse of children*. Auckland: Papers Inc.

Saphira, M. (1985). *The sexual abuse of children*. (2nd ed). Auckland: Papers Inc.

Saphira, M. (1987). *For your child's sake. Understanding sexual abuse*. Auckland: Reed Methuen.

Saphira, M. (1992). *Stopping child abuse: How do we bring up New Zealand children to be non-offenders?* Auckland: Penguin.

Saslowsky, D.A., & Wurtele, S.K. (1986). Education children about sexual abuse: Implications for pediatric intervention and possible prevention. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 11, 235-245.

Schwartz, M.F., & Cohn, L. (eds) (1996). *Sexual abuse and eating disorders*. New York: Brunner/Mazel Inc.

Searles, P., & Berger, R.J. (eds) (1995). *Rape and society*. San Francisco: Westview Press.

Seng, M. (1986). Sexual behaviour between adults and children: some issues of definition. *Journal of offender counselling services and rehabilitation*, 11, 47-61.

Sheldrick, C. (1991). Adult sequelae of child sexual abuse. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 158 (Supplement 10), 55-62.

Shrage, L. (1994). *Moral dilemmas of feminism*. New York: Routledge.

Sigurdson, E., Strang, M., & Doig, T. (1987). What do children know about preventing sexual assault? How can their awareness be increased? *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 32, 551-557.

Skevington, S., & Baker, D. (1989). *The social identity of women*. London: Sage Publications.

Skolnick, A. (1986). *The psychology of human development*. New York: HBJ Publishers.

Snashall, R. (1986). *National conference on child abuse*. Australia: Australian Institute of Criminology.

Snook, I. (1988). Contesting the curriculum: The politics of 'Basics and frills'. In

B. Jesson., A. Ryan., & P. Spoonley. (eds) (1988). *Revival of the right - New Zealand politics in the 1980s*. Auckland: Heineman.

Stanley, L., & Wise, S. (1993). *Breaking out again*. London: Routledge.

Steier, F. (ed) (1991). *Research and reflexivity*. London: Sage Publications.

Swan, H.L., Press, A.N., & Briggs, S.L. (1985). Child sexual abuse prevention: Does it work? *Child Welfare*, 64, 395-405.

Szirom, T. (1988). *Teaching gender?* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Taal, M., & Edelaar, M. (1997). Positive and negative effects of a child sexual abuse prevention program. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 21 (4), 399-410.

Tharinger, D.J., Krivacska, J.J., Laye-McDonough, M., Jamieson, L., Vincent, G.G. & Hedlund, A. (1988). Prevention of sexual abuse: An analysis of issues, educational programs and research findings. *School Psychology Review*, 17, 614-634.

Thompson, J. (1983). *Learning liberation - women's responses to men's education*. London: Croom Helm.

Townley, B. (1994). *Reframing human resource management*. London: Sage Publications.

Trudell, M.S. & Whatley, M.H. (1988). School sexual abuse prevention: unintended consequences and dilemmas. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 12, 103-113.

Tutty, L. (1990). Preventing child sexual abuse: A review of current research and theory. In M. Rothery., & G. Cameron. (eds) (1990) *Child maltreatment: Expanding our concept of helping*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tutty, L. (1992). The ability of elementary school children to learn sexual abuse prevention concepts. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 16, 369-384.

Tutty, L. (1995). The revised children's knowledge of abuse questionnaire: Development of a measure of children's understanding of sexual abuse prevention concepts. *Social Work Research*, 19 (2), 112-120.

Van Kessel, K. (1990). An evaluation of side effects of "Keeping Ourselves Safe". A child sexual abuse prevention programme. M.A thesis. University of Auckland.

Vodanovich, I. (1985). Women's place in God's world. *New Zealand Women's Studies Journal*, 2 (1), 68-79.

Walby, S. (1990). *Theorizing patriarchy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Walker, R. (ed) (1993). *Applied qualitative research*. Suffolk: Ipswich Book Co.Ltd.

Ward, E. (1984). *Father daughter rape*. London: Women's Press Ltd.

Warden, D. (1996). The prevention of child sexual abuse. In W. Gilham & J. Thompson (eds) (1996). *Child safety: Problem and prevention from preschool to adolescence*. London: Routledge.

Watkins, B. & Bentovin, A. (1992). The sexual abuse of male children and adolescents: A review of current literature. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 33, 197-248.

Wattenberg, E. (1985). In a different light: A feminist perspective on the role of mothers in father-daughter incest. *Child Welfare*, 64, 203-211.

Webster, R. (1991). Issues in school-based child sexual abuse prevention. *Children & Society*, 5:2, 146-164.

Weeks, J. (1981). *Sex, politics and society: The regulation of sexuality since 1800*. Longman: New York.

White, M. 1989. *Selected papers*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Wilson, S. (1989). The New Zealand primary education system's approach to child sexual abuse: A feminist critique. M.A. thesis. University of Auckland.

Wolfe, D.A., MacPherson, T., Blount, R., & Wolfe, V. (1986). Evaluation of a brief intervention for educating school children in awareness of physical and sexual abuse. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 10, 85-92.

Woodward, J. (1990). Evaluating the implementation of the "Keeping Ourselves Safe" child sexual abuse prevention education programme. M.Ed thesis. University of Otago.

Wurtele, S.K., Kast, L.C., & Melzer, A. (1992). Sexual abuse prevention education for young children: A comparison of teachers and parents as instructors. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 16, 865-876.

Wurtele, S.K., Kast, L.C., Miller-Perrin, C.L. & Kondrick, P.A. (1989). Comparison of programs for teaching personal safety skills to preschoolers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57, 505-511.

Wurtele, S.K., Marrs, S.R. & Miller-Perrin, C.L. (1987). Practice makes perfect? The role of participant modeling in sexual abuse prevention programs. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55, 599-602.

Wurtele, S.K. & Miller-Perrin, C.L. (1987). An evaluation of side effects associated with participation in child sexual abuse prevention programs. *Journal of School Health*, 57, 228-231.

Wurtele, S.K., & Miller-Perrin, C.L. (1992). *Preventing child sexual abuse - sharing the responsibility*. London: University of Nebraska Press.

Wyatt, G.E., & Peters, S. (1996). Issues in the definition of child sexual abuse in prevalence research. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 10, 231-240.

Wyatt, G.E., & Powell, G.J. (eds) (1988). *Lasting effects of child sexual abuse*. California: Sage Publications.

Yeatman, A. (1994). Feminism and power. *Women's Studies Journal*, 10 (1), 79-100.



## APPENDIX A

### BRIEF CHRONOLOGY OF MAIN EVENTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF KOS

8 February 1983. First reference of the need to replace the “Stranger Danger” concept. “Keeping Ourselves Safe” initiated by Mr Sanders.

16 May 1983. Child Sexual Abuse Coordinating Committee set up in Auckland to establish a regional approach for the management of incest and child sexual abuse.

24 June 1983. Legal position of the programme’s content clarified as being safety education rather than sex education.

15 July 1983. Meeting with Minister of Education Mr Wellington, Minister of Police Mr Couch, Senior Sergeant O’Brien, and Dr Abbott to settle disagreements between the two departments and at which the Minister of Education committed his department to continue working with Police on KOS

21 September 1983. First press release describing the intentions of KOS.

10 – 11 October 1983. First meeting of the KOS joint working party involving teachers and members of the Department of Education and Police Curriculum Department.

7 November 1983. Initial work on KOS units revised and reedited.

teaching video. This was refused.

12 – 14 June 1984. Working party met to write Forms 1 and 2 units.

September 1984. NZEI expressed concern about the possibility of parents taking disciplinary action against teachers because of the content of the programme. The Wellington Education Board suggested that trials take place by avoiding reference to contentious issues. This would jeopardise the effectiveness of the programme.

November 1984. \$48,000.00 was received from Social Welfare Department for the production of the Std 2 – Form 2 video.

13 February 1985. This situation was resolved after Mr Sanders and Sergeant O'Brien gave the Wellington Education Board a full presentation of the content and intentions of KOS.

21 March 1985. The Education Amendment Act was introduced in Parliament. There were serious concerns about how it would affect the implementation of KOS as it was linked with the new Health Syllabus and under the Education Amendment Act, schools would only be able to use the new Health Syllabus as they became 'designated'. This could result in a very long delay before some schools were legally able to use KOS.

12 June 1985. Support was received from the Waikato Child Abuse Project.

15 June 1985. An article written by Martin Viney of the Concerned Parents Association was published in the NZ Listener. This article declared KOS to be "... clearly sex education" (NZListener June 15 1985:27).

21 June 1985. Support received from The NZ Board of Health Committee on Child Health.

August 1985. An application for \$87,000.00 was submitted to and accepted by the Child and Youth Development Trust.

August 1985. An application was submitted to Trustee Bank, Southland for \$50,000.00 for production of the Pete and Penny video for J1 – J3 classes.

September 1985. The written materials and the teaching video were completed and ready to be trialled. This led to a deluge of requests from schools throughout New Zealand for copies of KOS.

October 1985. It was obvious by this date that additional LREP staff would be required to implement the programme effectively in schools. As a result 6 more staff were applied for.

November 1985. Support received from the Maori Women's Welfare League Executive.

21 November 1985. Guidelines for the reporting of child abuse were developed by a subcommittee of the NZEI.

November 1985. By this date there was still a shortfall of \$109,000.00.

February 1986. Congratulations on KOS were received from the Family Planning Association.

February 1986. Ten schools in Wellington, Christchurch and Whangarei were selected to participate in the trials of KOS.

26 March 1986. A submission was received from Dr Karen Zelas on behalf of the National Advisory Committee on Prevention of Child Abuse.

24 April 1986. TVNZ included an item on the KOS trials in their 6.30 News.

25 April 1986. Ballance School, Pahiatua was the first school to send in a submission on KOS.

30 April 1986. Video Dispatch, a television programme targeted at young teenagers included a 5 minute item on KOS.

April/May 1986. The KOS teaching video won the Public Service Sector at the Silver Screen Awards at the 19<sup>th</sup> Annual International Television Association Video Festival in Washington.

17 May 1986. The NZ Herald included a lead article about the experiences of two of the Whangarei schools involved in the trials.

June 1986. Mrs Dianne Davies was seconded from Whitby School for the terms

2 and 3 to work on the development of the final version of KOS.

18 June 1986. After being the guest speaker on a Radio 3ZB talkback show, Mr Sanders received many requests for copies of KOS.

3 July 1986. Freda Briggs, Russell Marshall, Minister of Education and Helen Shaw from the Department of Education appeared on Radio NZ's Checkpoint show discussing the aims, content and development process of KOS.

8 July 1986. Submission received from the Department of Social Welfare.

9 July 1986. Submission received from the Auckland Regional Child Health Committee.

July 1986. There were still insufficient funds to complete the programme.

7 August 1986. Submission received from the Ministry of Women's Affairs. This was based on the misapprehension that the videos, rather than the written materials, formed the basis of the programme.

9 August 1986. Submission received from Waikato Women in Education.

11 August 1986. Submission received from NZ Board of Health.

September/October 1986. The Concerned Parents Association sent all its members a copy of a special issue to inform them about KOS's aims and content. This contained many inaccuracies.

November 1986. The implementation process of KOS was finalised after considerable discussion between Mr Sanders and the Department of Education.

February 1987. "The War Cry", magazine of the Salvation Army published a major article very enthusiastically endorsing KOS.

March 1987. The Executive of the Christchurch Diocesan Diocesan of Federation of Catholic Parent – Teacher Organisation declared KOS to be 'excellent'.

June 1987. \$25,000.00 was received from the Child and Youth Development Trust for the production of the staff training video.

8 March 1988. "Keeping Ourselves Safe" launched by Prime Minister Mr David

Lange.

January 1989. LREP staff decide to extend KOS to include secondary school pupils.

March 1989. \$6,000.00 was received from the Teresa Cormack Trust to make copies of the KOS teaching video for wider distribution. The Trust also donated an extra \$24,000.00 to duplicate the Pete and Penny video and reprint the pamphlets.

15 August 1989. An approach to the Department of Social Welfare for funding for the Secondary School programme was turned down.

21 August 1989. After an approach to the Karla Cardno Trust for sponsorship, they agreed to raise \$100,000.00.

September 1989. David Waters completed the Pete and Penny video at his own expense.

November 1992. The drafts of the secondary KOS programme were trialled by 20 secondary schools.

February 1993. The second draft was completed. This also included a component for Maori and Polynesian students.

1994. The final version of the secondary school programme was completed and the units for primary and intermediate schools were revised.