



Pajala, Petra and Ripatti, Pia

A Compiled Analysis of Child Abuse Prevention Programs for Educators

Master's Thesis
KASVATUSTIETEIDEN TIEDEKUNTA
Intercultural Teacher Education
2018

Oulun yliopisto

Kasvatustieteiden tiedekunta

A compiled analysis of child abuse prevention programs for educators (Pajala, Petra; Ripatti, Pia)

Pro Gradu, 80 sivua

Kesäkuu 2018

Pro Gradu -tutkielma vertailee kolmea koulupohjaista lasten turvataitokasvatusohjelmaa: Stay Safe (Irlanti), Turvataitoja Lapsille (Turvataitokasvatus, Suomi) ja Cool and Safe (Saksa). Tutkimuksen tarve nousi esiin kun huomattiin, ettei opettajille ole yhtenäistä ja kattavaa opasta auttamaan oikeanlaisen turvataitokasvatusohjelman valitsemisessa. Turvataitokasvatuksen tärkeimpänä päämääränä on opettaa lapsia kieltäytymään ja suojautumaan hyväksikäyttötilanteissa, sekä ymmärtämään oikeutensa koskemattomuuteen. Näiden lisäksi tutkielmassa käsitellään muun muassa psykologisia hyötyjä, vanhempien roolia, rikosentekijän henkilöllisyyttä, sekä hyväksikäytön ja suostumuksen määritelmiä turvataitokasvatuksen näkökulmasta. Aineistona käytettyjä turvataitokasvatusohjelmia sekä teoriaa vertaillaan eri ohjelmien hyvien ja huonojen puolien, sekä menestyksen määrittelemiseksi.

Jotta tutkimustulokset olisivat merkityksellisiä ja selkeästi jäsenneiltyjä opettajille ja muille kasvatustieteen ammattilaisille, tutkimus on toteutettu kvalitatiivisesti kirjallisuuskatsauksen ja sisältöanalyysin keinoin. Aineiston pohjalta on luotu kriteerit, joiden pohjalta tutkielman löydökset sekä päätelmät on tehty. Nämä löydökset ja päätelmät korostavat suurta tarvetta kehittää koulupohjaisia turvataitokasvatusohjelmia entisestään: ohjelman joustavuutta eriyttämisen näkökulmasta, sekä vanhempien osallisuutta tulisi tulevaisuudessa korostaa ja lisätä. Lisäksi käytettyyn kieleen, sekä rikosentekijän kuvailuun tulisi kiinnittää huomiota stereotypisoinnin välttämiseksi. Myös lapsen hyvinvointiin ja ahdistuksen ehkäisyyn tulisi kiinnittää enemmän huomiota. Turvataitokasvatuksen positiivisiin tuloksiin lukeutuvat muun muassa lapsen tietoisuus oikeudestaan fyysiseen koskemattomuuteen, yleisten turvataitojen paraneminen sekä halukkuus keskustella hyväksikäytöstä aikuisen kanssa. Turvataitokasvatusohjelmien tutkimuksissa on edelleen paljon aukkoja, minkä vuoksi ohjelmista on mahdotonta tehdä ratkaisevia tai täysin varmoja johtopäätöksiä. Tutkielman päätelmät kuitenkin tukevat kenen tahansa kasvatustieteen ammattilaisen tarvetta tutustua turvataitokasvatukseen lasten hyväksikäytön ehkäisemiseksi, sekä ohjelmien toimeenpanemiseen luokkahuoneessa.

Avainsanat: Turvataitokasvatus, lapsen hyväksikäyttö, lapsen seksuaalinen hyväksikäyttö

University of Oulu

Faculty of Education

A compiled analysis of child abuse prevention programs for educators (Pajala Petra, Ripatti Pia)

Master's Thesis, 80 pages

June 2018

The creation of this thesis arose due to the need to create a compiled text that informs and supports educators in choosing an effective program in order to empower their students in speaking up and saying no, protecting younger generations from the risk of abuse or sexual abuse. As a result, the thesis delves into discovering and assessing three different school-based prevention programs against Child Sexual Abuse (CSA), which are: Stay Safe (Ireland), Turvataitokasvatus (Finland) and Cool and Safe (Germany). For a more informative and structured assessment the thesis investigates the effects the role of the parents have, the varying identities of a perpetrator, the definitions of CSA and consent for the target age group, and the psychological benefits of a successful prevention program. The theoretical knowledge collected is then used to contrast the thesis' chosen programs, defining their success based on the observed advantages and disadvantages.

To be able to collect structured and coherent data relevant to educators, the thesis relies on literary review and content analysis, both methods that support the qualitative nature of the research. The qualitative methods assisted in forming the criteria, which resulted in structuring the findings and conclusions. The findings and conclusions formed in the thesis clearly demonstrate the need for further development of school-led prevention programs, such as its flexibility for teachers to implement the program, further parent involvement, decreasing anxiety within the child, vocabulary use, and breaking perpetrator stereotypes, to name a few. Nonetheless certain advantages have been demonstrated as well, such as student awareness of their rights and body, safety skills, and the transparency to discuss about CSA with adults, to name a few examples. Further defining conclusions are difficult to form due to the lack of cohesive data on CSA, nevertheless the data compiled in the thesis will support any educators' need to learn the basics of preventative programs on CSA and how to implement them in class.

Keywords: Child Abuse, Child Sexual Abuse, Prevention Program

Contents

- 1 INTRODUCTION..... 7**
- 2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK..... 10**
 - 2.1 Definitions 10
 - 2.1.1 *Child Abuse (CA)*..... 10
 - 2.1.2 *Child Sexual Abuse (CSA)*..... 11
 - 2.1.3 *The Role Of Consent With Minors Involved*..... 13
 - 2.2 Perpetrator's identity..... 15
 - 2.3 Role Of The Parents In CSA Prevention..... 19
- 3 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE OF CSA PREVENTION PROGRAMS..... 22**
 - 3.1 Benefits Of Prevention Programs..... 22
 - 3.2 Aims And Guidelines Of CSA Prevention Programs 25
 - 3.2.1 *Child Characteristics In Planning The Programs* 26
 - 3.2.2 *Intervention Characteristics*..... 28
 - 3.2.3 *Design Characteristics*..... 29
 - 3.2.4 *Other types of preventative actions*..... 31
- 4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 34**
 - 4.1 Criteria for choosing the programs and data 36
 - 4.1.1 *Stay Safe*..... 40
 - 4.1.2 *Turvataitokasvatus*..... 41
 - 4.1.3 *Cool and Safe* 42
- 5 FINDINGS..... 44**
 - 5.1 Stay Safe..... 44
 - 5.2 Turvataitokasvatus..... 50
 - 5.3 Cool and Safe..... 55
- 6 DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS..... 61**
 - 6.1.1 *Theoretical background and evidence on success* 62
 - 6.1.2 *Cultural influences affecting the program*..... 63
 - 6.1.3 *Consent, empowerment and unguilting of the participants* 64
 - 6.1.4 *Terminology used in the program and manuals* 65
 - 6.1.5 *Training Staff*..... 66
 - 6.1.6 *Role of the Parents*..... 67
 - 6.1.7 *Perpetrator’s Identity*..... 68
 - 6.1.8 *Conclusion*..... 69
- 7 RELIABILITY AND ETHICAL DISCUSSION..... 71**

8 CONCLUSION..... 74
9 REFERENCES..... 77

INTRODUCTION

The topic of this thesis is Child Sexual Abuse prevention programs. More specifically, we will be looking into the pros and cons of school-based programs and how they compare to other prevention methods; such as programs directed at rehabilitating perpetrators. We will be comparing three programs from three different countries in order to connect the theory of how a Child Sexual Abuse program should be conducted, to what is being done in practice. While the programs we have chosen are from three different countries, most of the studies we reference are conducted in the USA. These studies were the most accessible for the general public; and they examine different focal points of CSA in various contexts (such as in the classroom, the role of the parents, the perpetrator, to name a few).

The reason we decided to embark on this emotionally challenging journey was that we saw a clear lack of coherent, all-encompassing research on preventative programs. While there is a lot of research on the subject, there is a lack of material compiled together for a teacher to just grab and use. Current anti-harassment campaigns, such as #metoo, which arose during the writing of this thesis, in the beginning of 2018, further showed us that there is an urgent need for better preventative programs for children that empower us to speak up and say no.

In the past the most commonly known program was a stereotypical teaching method: Stranger danger (Sax 2009, 43). The programs fixated themselves on offenders who have pedophilic tendencies, and are therefore more likely to harass multiple children. While children were only being warned of strangers, knowledge on the perpetrators grew: studies found that the abuser was commonly someone the child knew - a mentor, teacher, or uncle, for example. In order to be as effective as possible, “young” programs were modified to include all types of perpetrators from strangers to known and trusted adults. With this new, modern knowledge, a new approach to the problem was formed.

Most modern child abuse prevention programs are school-based anti-harassment programs delivered, usually by teachers, to primary and secondary school children, as part of the daily school program (Giardino 2016, 4-5). Some programs are provided as a pay-for service, where professionals trained on the topic of child sexual abuse come to the school to give workshops on issues such as personal space, good and bad touches, and so on. We will concentrate our forces on school-based and long-term programs. We will further discuss the reasoning behind this decision in our thesis, but the primary reason for us as future teachers is

definitely the fact that school-based programs are something we can do, by ourselves without an extra budget.

We decided since the beginning that the programs we choose must be, firstly, free to use and easy to access. This was important due to the fact that we want to provide information that is helpful to as many teachers as possible. That is also why we decided on programs that are essentially quite similar, but are based on different cultural contexts. The three programs we choose must represent the most common type of school-based program: facilitated by a teacher with the help of a teacher's manual.

Secondly, what affected our choice was simply easiness of navigation. Some program websites were definitely difficult to navigate, and it wasn't easy to find all the necessary information, although it may have been available. The programs we chose either had a very clear website that thoroughly explained the program, or had a clear manual with a clear path from beginning to end (regardless of language restrictions). This was an important factor, since we know that teachers are often already short on time, and having to navigate a web page or try to make sense of a manual for hours on end is simply something that will demotivate most educators, and either result in only partial coverage of the program, or in a worst-case scenario, no coverage at all.

Once we have chosen our programs and collected our data, we hope to form a clear guideline for the teachers to use in primary schools. We hope that our findings would facilitate their process of choosing the best possible preventative program for their class without having to scour through decades of studies that have not been renewed or compiled into a compact form. Another issue at the moment is that if there is information that has been compiled together, it has been written by the creator(s) of the program itself, or is otherwise written very subjectively. For our goals to be successful we need to answer the following research questions: What are the challenges and possibilities of the three CSA prevention programs? On what kind of theoretical foundations are the CSA programs constructed?

The study is conducted as a literary review and content analysis. We felt that both methodologies were suitable to our research as they solved the problem of the lack of compiled theory and helped provide accumulative knowledge. The methodology used helped us form the criteria that would define and structure how we decide on the program, and collect our data and information. We will begin by looking into the theoretical background of school-based programs, and giving an overview of our three programs of choice. We will then move on to

connecting the theory with the programs we choose, doing a thorough analysis of each, determining which aspects work and which don't, according to the theory.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Definitions

As mentioned in our introduction, the aim of this thesis is to analyze different school programs that combat against Child Sexual Abuse (CSA). To be able to do such a task it is crucial that key terms such as CSA and Child Abuse (CA) are defined, since many of the preventative programs like Cool and Safe are used to combat both forms of abuse.

Once we have defined those terms can we begin to properly analyze components that would aid us in understanding if a preventative program for CSA is appropriate or not, and why. Other factors to assist in the analysis aspect of such a task would be to understand consent, the role of parents and the perpetrator's identity; all of which will be properly defined in this heading. The knowledge of such definitions will play a significant role when critically analyzing each preventative program that combats CSA, as these definitions are the standing stones that help protect and avoid stereotypes that may place the child in danger.

2.1.1 Child Abuse (CA)

The definition of CA is necessary to tackle since the majority of preventative programs will focus on the general term of abuse due to the nature and age group they work with, for instance the program may focus on sexual abuse but also tackle bullying in schools (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 84). For this reason we will briefly define the term CA. According to theorists such as Mennen, Kim, Sang and Trickett (2010, 648), CA comes in many forms, including neglect, or any form of abuse that results in “failure to act on the part of a parent or caretaker which results in death, serious physical or emotional harm, sexual abuse or exploitation or an act or failure to act which presents an imminent risk of serious harm” (US Department of Health and Human Services 2010, 6). An example given by Mennen et al. (2010, 648) would be if the parents or caretaker avoid taking the child to the doctor to receive medical attention, or avoid caring for the child while sick. The Panel of Research on Child Abuse argue that maltreatment can also be the general act of acting “outside the norms of conduct” which risks causing emotional or physical harm (1993, 59). Nevertheless one must keep in mind that the

regulations and guidelines of what is considered CA may vary based on the country and or state (Mennen et al. 2010, 648). Some factors that can affect the very understanding of child abuse is cultural and social values on what is considered to be child maltreatment and if it should be based on the parent's treatment or the outcome of such treatment, to name a few (Mennen et al. 2010, 648; Panel on Research on Child Abuse et al. 1993, 57). Moreover while both Mennen et al. (2010, 648) and Panel on Research on Child Abuse et al. (1993, 57-58) imply the culprits of child abuse to mainly be parents or caretakers, it may also be any person that is close to the child, such as uncles, aunts, cousins, and in our opinion, friends and classmates.

For the purpose of our thesis, we have formulated CA in the following way that better fits our theme: CA is when a child (anyone under the age of 18, as this is what most of our sources, and the UN Child's Right Agreement (1989) use as the definition of adult, even though age of consent may be lower) is touched, with or without sexual intention against their will in a way that is not intended for the child's best interest. This unwanted attention is done by a person with some form of power that is capable of manipulating the child (victim) through emotional or physical techniques; adults (over the age of 18) like parents, relatives, or teenagers (e.g. bullies, older friends, etc). While we recognize that there are different severities to unwanted touching, it is, necessary to make sure that a report of any unwanted touch is to be taken seriously. Therefore we do not want to limit the definition to touching that is deemed unfit by law, but also touches which are unwanted by the child. In other words, giving the child the tools to know how her or his personal space works, and how to defend it from being entered unwillingly. This of course has a risk of facing contradictions such as a child not wanting to hold another classmate's hands. To avoid such contradictions we feel we need to open a space for discussion and development of terms: does holding this classmate's hand hurt the child in question in any way?

2.1.2 Child Sexual Abuse (CSA)

With CA defined we can now begin to dive deeper into our thesis' theme, CSA. The definition may vary based on multiple factors such as the age of the child and the perpetrator, the abusive act, the relationship between the aggravator and victim, to name a few examples. Moreover the social elements, intimate relationships and personalities of the location can modify the definition. (Krane 2003, 75). However Sax (2009, 26) argues that two key figures

must take place: “a person who is an adult or [a] significantly older” or has a position of trust, must, “use a child for sexual gratification”. Kinnear (1995, 2) argues that CSA does not necessarily need to include sexual gratification, it can also be the act of exploiting the child or using coercion. There are more broad and narrow definitions such as; “the exploitation of a child for the sexual gratification of an adult [to...] a child is sexually abused when another person, who is sexually mature, involves the child in any activity which the other person expects to lead to their sexual arousal.” (Fraser, Baker & Duncan cited in MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 5). In addition the broad definitions can also include acts that do not physically sexually abuse the child, for instance voyeurism, taking pictures of children, asking children to touch themselves, showing pornography to a child, and so on (Sax 2009, 25). Unfortunately the definitions all depend and vary based on the country and the laws that define sexual abuse (Kinnear 1995, 2). This is due to the cultural boundaries in each country, for example in some cultures it is natural for parents to kiss their children’s mouth (Kinnear 1995, 2). As a result it is important for educators to keep this in mind, especially if the class they are addressing are multicultural.

The different definitions, broad or narrow, may focus also in either more on defining the act, or the emotional or developmental damages the experience may cause. For example, was the victim touched in their intimate parts to were they penetrated anally (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 5; Sax 2009, 31). Regardless, Sax argues that any form of touching or contact between a minor and an adult that holds the aura of sexuality is sexual abusive behavior (Sax 2009, 31). In Sax’s definition of CSA, he breaks the acts into three parts; sexual assault, sexual molestation and sexual exploitation (2009, 26-27). Sexual assault is defined as the physical act in which the offender receives sexual gratification through penetration, oral copulation, digital penetration by a finger or foreign object. Sexual molestation still has the offender act within an inappropriate behavior but does not necessarily require physical contact, under this category we find two definitions, situational child molesters and preferential child molesters. The situational child molester is an offender that found themselves in a situation where they took advantage of a child because it was possible, or found themselves interested in a minor, an example would be a high school teacher sleeping with one of his or her students. Preferential child molesters on the other hand desire to be with a child and find themselves only attracted to children, and adults as a second choice. (Sax 2009, 26-27). Sexual exploitation, as the name implies, is a person that uses children in manners to personally advance either through profit

or from sexual gratification, an example would be providing child pornography (Sax 2009, 27).

As for the age of the perpetrator, this affects how the event is handled; is it considered abuse if the assaulter is a child or an adolescent him or herself (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 6)? According to statistics provided by the FBI, in 2007 around 40% of the offenders sexually abusing children under the age of six were minors themselves (FBI unpublished cited in Puzanchera 2009, 3). Depending again on the culture, country and or state, if a fourteen year old child has sexual interaction with an eleven year old child, the behavior might be dismissed as sexual experimentation. Unfortunately, one must remember that these statistics are rough estimations that do not begin to cover even part of the full scope of CSA (Krane 2003, 75; MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 6; Sax 2009, 24). Furthermore, the severity of the act may increase if consent was not given, but for this we would need to also define and comprehend what consent is (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 6). In addition, the definitions alter slightly or drastically based on the field that is observing the terms; social workers, psychologist, legal experts, to name a few (Krane 2003, 75).

2.1.3 The Role Of Consent With Minors Involved

Consent is usually thought of as a simple concept in everyday discussion, and yet the term influences drastically how sexual or illicit actions are perceived. In essence, it is a seemingly simple question, that can be answered with one word: did both parties say yes? However, in many cases it is not that simple. For example, there is often legislation dictating the legal age of consent, which fundamentally restricts anyone under the legal age from ever legally consenting to any sexual act (Sax 2009, 33). This means that anyone above the age of 18 (legal adult) having sexual relations with anyone under 15 is legally in danger of being prosecuted with statutory rape, whether the minor consented or not (Annitto 2011, 30). According to Lawmakers in the United States, a minor is unable and “legally incapable of consenting to sexual activity with an adult”, the severity of these laws and the age considered to be a minor all depends on the state and or country (Annitto 2011, 31). Moreover since an adult is considered legally able to give and understand consent, they become complete culprits in a sexual active relationship with a minor (Annitto 2011, 31). In some states in the United States of America, the differentiation between a minor and a teenager can be formed to create different

regulations of consent and legal sexual activity, however most of these regulations still find difficulty in defining and clarifying all sexual activities involved (Annitto 2011, 31).

In addition, if both parties are mentally at a similar level, and there is clear evidence of mutual consent, the adult will not be prosecuted or convicted, but these are rare occurrences (Annitto 2011, 31-32). As a result, in some places such as the states the law has adopted “functional age” and “mental age” to make a judgement if the sexual act was consensual (Sax 2009, 33). However the term is still contradictory as consent is defined as a decision that must occur between two parties that “possess equal power and authority” (Sax 2009, 33). Power also includes sexual maturity, thus a sexually mature child having intercourse with a child that is not sexually mature is considered abusive behavior (Kinnear 1995, p.2). Furthermore, consent in its most basic essence should be a “positive cooperation by both parties where both people can appreciate both the nature of the act and the consequences of the acts they are agreeing to” (Sax 2009, 34). In other words, the experience should not occur under duress or pressure, yet this obligates us to define what would be considered pressure, and additionally how to prove that the sexual relationship was not experienced due to an imbalance of authority. Since we are working with young children, we can assume that there is always a power imbalance. Therefore, for the purpose of our thesis we will not further inquire or define the meanings behind power imbalance or pressure.

Mental age has become a role in consent especially when dealing with minors, regardless of the legal age. According to Sax “people who are mentally or emotionally deficient lack the ability to make clear judgements about such requests for sex and can be taken advantage of by such predators.” (2009, 33). With this in mind children are unable to make the decision of consenting to sexual activities and are even less able to protect themselves; resulting that the act is sexual abuse even if the victim and offender are of the same age (Sax 2009, 33). Many children who are placed in situations in which they are sexually assaulted, end with pregnancy, disease or other “adverse consequences” (Sax 2009, 33). Furthermore the argument is that if a child cannot sign a binding document, how are they able to give consent? This again leads to more contradictions as this definition does not protect certain teenage groups (Sax 2009, 33). In certain states in the United States, the law will factor in the age difference to make a judgement; for example was it consensual if it is between a fourteen year old and a seventeen year old (Sax 2009, 33)? Even between adults, the debate is not simple: one of the parties may have felt pressured to say yes - does this count as consent? For the purpose of our thesis, we

will leave the making of conclusive definitions of consent to the reader, and focus more on how to provide the skills and tools necessary for children to say no, defending their sacred right of not being involved in sexual activities.

2.2 Perpetrator's Identity

The stereotypical child molester is often seen as a male figure who lures children purposely into cars and drives them away. Offenders are often seen as middle-aged sexual predators, pedophiles, who are extremely skillful at tricking children, lurking in the shadows of public places. There is also an idea that most sex offenders are extremely likely to repeat their offense, and harass multiple children. (Finkelhor, 2009; Kinnear 1995, 17). These perpetrators are given multiple names pedophiles, opportunists, molesters, sex offenders, incest offender and even predators; Sax (2009, 31) argues that there is a difference between these names and the identities that go with them. But we must remind the reader that while the stereotypical image of an offender is always a male figure, statistics published after the 1980s have demonstrated that females are equally as capable but not as statistically probable of sexually offending a child. Nevertheless it must be noted that due to the caregiver role a woman has, the rate of victims is estimated to be higher but not reported. (Tsopelas et al. 2012, 306). The following will be an attempt at defining and demonstrating the differences between the pedophiles, opportunists, molesters, sex offenders, incest offender and predators. The knowledge of the variety of sexual assaulters will aid in analyzing the efficiency of the preventive programs, especially in avoiding unhealthy stereotypes of what a sexual abuser looks like. Before we begin one should note that a predator and sex offender are general terms that umbrella all the other names, taking into account that the offense has been done repeatedly; as a result the following definitions will look more into what differences the terms pedophile, opportunist and molester have (Sax 2009, 31).

A pedophile is a person that fantasizes or has a strong unnatural sexual desire to be only with children (Feelgood & Hoyer 2008, 34; Finkelhor 2009; Sax 2009, 28-29). Moreover the definition provided by both the *Diagnosics and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition* (cited in Sax 2009, 28) and Finkelhor (2009) imply that a relationship between an adult and a twelve/thirteen year old would not be considered pedophilia, since a pedophile only finds prepubescent children sexually appealing. However what makes this identity difficult to understand is that a pedophile can be a sixteen year old as long as the child is five

years younger than the perpetrator (Sax 2009, 28). Acts that belong under the pedophile title is the ongoing act of “statutory rape [or] unlawful sex”, though this definition is the leading cause as to why pedophiles are difficult to charge (Sax 2009, 29-30). Since in some states like California a sixteen year old teenager having sex with a fifty year old can be considered a consensual relationship (Sax 2009, 29).

Due to the pedophile’s abstract and complicated definition, the term opportunist was formed; as a solution to contain those perpetrators that did not fit into the pedophile category (Sax 2009, 29). Therefore opportunists are offenders who sexually abuse children but still maintain interest in having sex with people of their own age; normally the act would be a one-time incident (Rebocho 2012; Sax 2009, 29-30). As a result the term opportunist focuses more on the person’s motivation to commit such an act, as usually an opportunist would create relationships with their own age group (Sax 2009, 30). Due to the definition of this term, incest offenders are included, as it is believed that incest may occur more out of laziness to find a child outside of the household than an actual interest to have sex with their own child; nevertheless this argument has insufficient data to be conclusive (Reboucho 2012; Sax 2009, 30). The conclusive definition would be that opportunist offenders will not necessarily plan to harm a child, but more likely come across the child during their daily routine or activities and take advantage of the situation (Reboucho 2012). There are also premeditated opportunists, who would be defined as perpetrators that fantasize and to a certain degree plan how they would go about abusing a child; and when they encounter a child in their daily routine know already to a degree how to respond to their fantasy (Reboucho 2012). A study found that often an opportunist can or cannot be familiar to the child, what distinguishes their approach from other perpetrators is that the abuser does not seek or select their victim but, as the name implies, takes advantage of the ‘opportunity’, resulting perhaps in a more physically aggressive approach (Reboucho 2012). Nevertheless we must not dispatch the understanding that while they may take the opportunity, the incident in itself can still occur multiple times (Reboucho 2012).

Unlike a pedophile and an opportunist, a molester desires only to touch a child unlawfully (Feelgood & Hoyer 2008, 34; Sax 2009, 30). A molester is defined as an adult (eighteen years or older) touching a child (Sax 2009, 30). Touching and or fondling in this context includes also physical contact to the child’s skin, clothes or “any protective layer” (Sax 2009, 30). Moreover a molester may be prone to the “flashing of the genitals, showing of pornography or

sexually explicit materials, and deviant sexual activities (defecation, urination, bondage)”, to name a few (Sax 2009, 30). Furthermore the law is more strict against molesters, even if a child gives explicit consent to be touched by the adult, the act alone is still illegal (Sax 2009, 30). Unfortunately the defining terms of a molester varies from country and state, and so certain definitions might not apply depending on the law used by the context or reader (Feelgood & Hoyer 2008, 34). Nevertheless, Feelgood & Hoyer (2008, 34) argue that while a molester desires to touch a child, the desire to do so has no relation to the psychological or medical state of the molester; unlike the pedophile.

We should however keep in mind that sexual abusers are not necessarily all adults, some can be teenagers, and unfortunately the predator can be a sibling, a parent, an uncle, and or a Boy Scout leader (Kinnear 1995, 17-25). However, the perpetrator is predominantly male, and most likely to be someone close to the child. The perpetrator is perceived to act on these negative behaviors due to his or her need to have authority, power or control in sexual acts, and to be able to experience his or her sexual desires (Sax 2009, 26). In over 25% of all cases, the offender is a member of extended family, such as an uncle. In over 60% of the cases the perpetrator is someone the child has met before in a safe situation. In less than 15% of all cases, the abuser was someone the child did not know before and did not have a preexisting relationship (Finkelhor, 2009; Sax 2009, 39). Due to the trusting relationship, the offender is quite easily able to abuse and exploit the child to reach his needs.

Another point necessary to mention, is that the offender is not always a male. As mentioned previously, while it is statistically more common for the offender to be a male figure, an estimated 5% is reported to be females (Collins & Duff 2016, 112; Tsopelas et al. 2012, 306). Unfortunately it is speculated that one of the probable reasons as to why female sex offenders is statistically low is due to the lack of report by the victims (Collins & Duff 2016, 111; Tsopelas et al. 2012, 306). Due to the lack of victims reporting, very little is known of the reasoning and psychological factors that impact a female sex offender to behave as they do (Collins & Duff 2016, 111). Therefore the female sex offender profile is only a speculation. The following characteristics are some of the behaviors listed; they are younger than male sex offenders, appear to lack emotional regulation, deficiencies in intimacy and or empathy, an interest in sexual exploration, and or pressure by a male co-perpetrator, making the female a victim of the act herself (Collins & Duff 2016, 111; McLeod & Craft 2015, 400). Moreover, unlike their male counterparts commonly active in a variety of methods to sexually offend a

child, female offenders are more commonly involved in incest (McLeod & Craft 2015, 400; Tsopelas et al. 2012, 307)

An adult who prefers to spend a lot of their time with children instead of with their peers is a possible identifier that s/he could be a possible predator. (Sax 2009, 39). Sgroi et al. (Collins & Duff 2016, 111; Tsopelas et al. 2012, 306) claims that “because the power and authority of adulthood are accepted by most children, and because the offender presents his behavior as sanctioned, little else is required to induce the child to comply”. Afterwards the offender uses tools such as threats, bribes, isolation, intimidation or force to continue the abuse. (Krane 2003, 62). The offense is also most likely to happen in a place the child knows; statistics show that between 25-50% of child abuse cases happen at the child’s home (Bolen 2003). This is another fact that adds to the deviousness of the perpetrator: if the parents of the child have let the perpetrator into their home, the child is likely to think of them as a trusted person, and is thus more likely to conform to what the abuser says.

The perpetrators’ age ranges from youth to elderly, but there are two peaks in a person’s life when they are more likely to offend: in adolescence, when they are more prone to any other delinquent activities, and in their thirties, when they generally start being trusted with children, and there are more children around them. About a third of all offenders, however, are juveniles themselves. (Finkelhor, 2009). Moreover, these predators are not necessarily “creepy”, some predators can “appear to be warm, caring, loving, and respectful”, which provides them the perfect alibi to continue their horrifying acts without getting caught (Sax 2009, 39). In addition, child sex offenders have one of the lowest overall crime repetition rates: in a study conducted in Washington 2,8% of perpetrators committed a sexual crime within the next five years. About a quarter of the offenders committed a non-sexual crime within this time. By comparison to the 48% repetition rate for other felony offenders, this repetition rate is undeniably low. Finkelhor states that this may be linked to child sex offenders often being more likely to be educated and employed than other criminals. (Finkelhor, 2009)

As mentioned, the perpetrator’s identity is not the only stereotyped aspect. The location of abuse is often thought to be on the street, or the perpetrator’s home where they take the victim. Studies show, however that about one-quarter of all abuse happens in the victim’s own home as well. (Elliott et al., 1995, 585; Wyatt 1985) In addition to this, Bolen identifies multiple high-risk situations, including walking in the neighborhood (to and from school), public locations in and outside the neighborhood, at the perpetrator’s home or car. She concludes by

stating that no location can be considered safe. This is why it is crucial to ensure that preventative programs talk not only about a multiplicity of offenders, but that the information and skills can also be linked to multiple locations and situations.

Overall, the spectrum of offenders is a lot wider than the stereotype lets us believe. The reason we found it extremely important to mention this, is that as long as wrong stereotypes are the prevalent image of offenders in adults' minds, children will not be educated to protect themselves from the more probable perpetrator (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 86). For this same reason prevention programs need to focus on identifying and determining the identification of an abuser, without falling under the use of stereotyping. Reminding oneself and the children that a predator can be from any ethnic and socioeconomic background, as well as someone "trustworthy" (Sax 2009, 39). However this idea in itself has caused an accumulation of emotions since some adults feel we are forcing children to feel uncomfortable with their relatives (to suspect the worst from their close ones) (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 86). Yet other adults believe that by informing children of the possibility of such a situation that we are opening the channels of conversations by letting the child know that they can talk about being abused by even their closest friend or family member, without feeling guilt (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 86).

2.3 Role Of The Parents In CSA Prevention

Certain prevention programs aim to promote awareness in the parents (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 61). The importance of parents participating and being active figures in preventative programs is due to the idea that; parents could assist in either avoiding the considerable rate in which most CSA occurs from a relative or close family friend, or support the child's need to speak up and feel guiltless of the event (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 27-28, Krane 2003, 61). In other words avoiding the dispute of a parent telling their child that their , for example, uncle would be incapable of harming the child in any manner.

According to Krane, mothers are the sole figures responsible for protecting their children from SA experiences, especially since they are always either consciously or unconsciously aware of the abuse (2003, 38, 71). This mindset, she argues, is what present society feels is the key problem that children experience CSA. If the mother had been aware, she should have taken the correct measures to protect her child, yet she chooses to avoid the problem (Krane

2003, 38, 71). A study produced by Mennarino and Cohen (2000, 991) report that the mother has no direct relation to the level of probability of the child facing CSA, and the studies made claiming mothers are responsible lack proper data to make such conclusive statements. On the contrary, the study claims that both parents have a direct correlation on how the child reacts and handles the situation based on the level of support both parents provide (Wamser-Nanney 2017, 45).

The data on CSA does conclude however that in Western countries children at most risk are: females, physical or mental disabilities, live without their biological parents, or come from an irregular family background; such as one of the parents having a mental or physical disability, the parenting age, either parent is a substance addict, to name a few (Walsh et al. 2015, 7). Furthermore as mentioned multiple times throughout our thesis, the perpetrator is often times a familiar person to the child. Statistics demonstrate that girls specifically are more likely to be sexually assaulted by a family member and boys (step brothers, half brothers, brother's friend, etc) (Walsh et al. 2015, 7). With this being the case, the person with more direct power at stopping the abuse from occurring or re-occurring would be the parents.

Studies have shown that incestuous sexual abuse occurs at a more average rate in dysfunctional families, in which the mother was aware of the situation but did nothing to prevent it (Krane 2003, 65). However Krane also argues that the mother permits such behavior if the mother is absent in the child's life, or/and is or was a victim herself to abuse, in other words a vicious cycle of victims (Krane 2003, 68, 71). Kinnear also argues that mothers who are aware of the act but do not stop the abuse are in no way condoning the action, on the contrary 75% of mothers in this position have experienced sexual abuse and feel helpless and feel unable to help, due to either fear or lack of knowledge in the ways to support their child (1995, 6). By providing prevention programs for children that train parents in dealing with the situation, we provide support for those parents who are themselves victims as well. Krane further supports our claims by arguing that a mother who is aware and has a healthy mental state will be more prone to stopping the actions of CSA, and as a result will not permit the perpetrator to repeat the assault. Thus avoiding the action from reoccurring, since CSA is more likely to be a reoccurring event if the perpetrator feels he or she can get away with it again. (Krane 2003, p.74-75).

Naturally we immediately question what the role of the father is, Krane describes the father figure as an outside force, who is powerful, colourless and unassertive, but by no means

blameless (2003, 71-72, 74). However the argument seems to imply that while the father figure is to blame, the mother figure is also to blame for not preventing the event from occurring (Krane 2003, 73-74). Moreover the arguments Krane (2003, 77) provides seem to perceive that the perpetrator is always a male, or in this case, the father figure, not the mother. Yet while the male figure is blamed for the act, the charge is reduced with the use of words like “found himself” or “he couldn’t help himself”, making him more of a victim as well. We feel that preventative programs need to work on breaking the stereotypes of the mother as a passive viewer and the male figure--specifically the father figure-- as the abuser. CSA can also occur by the hands of the mother with the father being a witness or victim himself. Regardless of who harmed the child, the focus should be placed on removing the feelings of blame in the child not on the abuser.

In spite of the view of the perpetrator, Lajunen also agrees that any kind of violence that can cause shame, guilt and a feeling of worthlessness in the child is the parents’ fault. As the adults close to the child have a big role to play in defining the child’s self-worth and self-image. A lot of cases where a child is not well is rooted in the parent’s lack of well-being, which leads to a long-term impact on the child. (Lajunen, 2012, 22-23). Therefore a preventative program directed to a child with the parent taking on a participatory role could also in an indirect form provide assistance and support to a victimized parent, by offering helplines or knowledge.

Furthermore the role of the parent to participate also has positive effects in the child’s learning process and curve. It is common knowledge that children learn from their models, who are normally their parents, teachers and peers (Guha 2013, 4). Our behaviors and attitudes towards explicit sexual behavior will inform the child on how they should behave. In other words if the parents are clear as to what is bad and good touches, the child will adopt these rules and guidelines. Nevertheless parents who lack or have weak guidelines, affect negatively the child’s safety limits. By collaborating with the parents not only are we educating them in safety skills but also giving the parents tools to adopt in their own lives which the child can later model as well; assisting more in the child’s safety skills development.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE OF CSA PREVENTION PROGRAMS

3.1 Benefits Of Prevention Programs

Prevention programs have been, since the late 70's and early 80's, the primary means of addressing CSA (Bolen, 2003). Prevention programs work by teaching the potential victims, in this case the children, to correctly recognize, react to, and report harmful situations (Kinnear 1995, 64; MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 61). These harmful situations may include anything from a seemingly harmless, but unwanted, touch from an adult, to rape. Moreover these programs are created taking into account the "cultural background of the child and the economic status of the child's family", as well as the country's curriculum and schools, since these factors can either aid or cause negative consequences in the process of implementing the program (Kinnear 1995, 64; MacIntyre et al. 2000, 200). According to Finkelhor (2009) sexual abuse can be avoided by preventing the four preconditions. They are as follows: "the abuser must be motivated to abuse, overcome internal inhibitions, overcome external inhibitions and [...] the child must be unable to resist the abuser's actions" (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 61). Finkelhor (2009) claims that the situation can be easily avoided if the child is cared for by a present and protective mother, socially included in the family, supervised appropriately, the child is not left alone too much, routine sleeping hours, stable and confident, and self-aware of their space and protection against sexual abuse. In the case of CSA prevention programs, the aim is to ensure the child resist abuse, which supports the idea Finkelhor introduces.

To outline the importance and benefits of prevention programs, we will briefly demonstrate the effects sexual abuse has on a child's psychological adjustment and development based on the previous research (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 27). Children who have experienced sexual abuse are more prone to being depressed, withdrawn, and aggressive (Kinnear 1995, 40; MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 28). Many who have experienced sexual abuse (SA) will try to push back the memory increasing their levels of stress (Kinnear 1995, 40). SA also affects the child's sexual identity and habits in their adult life (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 28). Children who have not experienced SA will not normally "display compulsive sexual behaviors", and if they do so, it is at a smaller degree than those who have been sexually abused (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 28). According to Kinnear (1995, 40), children who have experienced sexual abuse will behave promiscuously so that they may overcome feelings of powerlessness .

Children's ability to attach or bond with caregivers is also affected, resulting in the child to be insecure with these relationships and more prone to entering abusive relationships (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 28-29). Furthermore, those who have been sexually abused are also more likely to develop eating disorders, self harming, substance abuse, suicidal ideation and/or delinquent activities in their adolescent years; this is due to their low self-esteem or hatred of their own appearance (Kinnear 1995, 41; MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 45). The closer or more trusted the abuser is, the stronger the effects on the child's psychological well-being are. Breaking a deep trust, such as that between a child and a relative, through abusing the dependence the child has on the adult, can cause extreme sensations of being betrayed, a lot more so, compared to situations where the abuser was a stranger. (Lajunen et al., 2013, pp. 25-26). Therefore if prevention programs can avoid a child from experiencing trauma and negatively affecting their future adulthood, is it not worth implementing it in all schools?

The aim of a preventative program would ensure the child questions some of the things that make them susceptible to sexual abuse (Taal & Edelaar 1997, 399). The program would question the child's views of "stranger danger" and redefine the amount of trust a child should have for an adult (Sax 2009, 43; Taal & Edelaar 1997, 400; Walsh et al. 2015, 8). *The National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse* made a review of 25 studies that demonstrated the positive effects of prevention programs (Kinnear 1995, 65; Walsh et al. 2015, 20). The results demonstrate the children becoming knowledgeable of how to react and behave in a situation in which an adult is sexualizing them, in addition to a drastic improvement of their knowledge on keeping themselves safe (Kinnear 1995, 65; Walsh et al. 2015, 20). Unfortunately the same researches were unable to give conclusive information on how well the children retained the information six or more months after the program had ended (Walsh et al. 2015, 20).

Nevertheless the study demonstrated that children under the age of five or seven did not retain or gain any positive results from such programs (Kinnear 1995, 66; MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 68). Prevention programs have also caused negative side effects to children who are sensitive, by placing an inappropriate burden and stress to the child on how to be self-protective (Kinnear 1995, 66). In addition, after eight months many of the children who underwent the prevention programs retained little to no information (Kinnear 1995, 66). Conte and colleagues argue that for a preventative program to be successful it must have the following ideas:

- ◇ Knowledge of owning their own body

- ◇ Good touches versus bad touches
- ◇ When a secret should be a secret
- ◇ Trust of their own feelings (is this right or wrong)
- ◇ The ability to say no
- ◇ Discovering their support network

(Conte, Rosen & Saperstein 1986).

To reiterate, the focus in a prevention program should be the following: body ownership, touch, saying “no”, escape, secrecy, intuition, support systems, blame and bullying (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 66). Body ownership educates the child to understand that their body is theirs, and as a result the child has the authority to decide how it is handled. Touch and saying “no”, explain to the child the difference between good and bad touches, and the freedom to deny or revoke consent of touching them. Escape and secrecy aid the child to know how to avoid predators, and to know the difference between bad and good secrets. This is a useful skill as the child will follow their instincts and know when they should approach an adult for help. As a consequence, it is important for the prevention program and school curriculum to help the child identify which adults they can approach for any type of problem. And finally, blame, the aim is for the child to be aware that it is not their fault, that they did not provoke it in anyway. (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 66). With such a variety of concepts to tackle, the prevention program can be more effective with the support and cooperation of parents, teachers, law enforces, social workers, to name a few (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, p.66). In thirteen different studies in which they observed different prevention programs in which the teacher and or parents were the instructors, positive results were found. The child was able to develop effective safety skills, skills that were developed over the span of either one 50 minute session to twelve 90 minute sessions (the longer the sessions the more beneficial). (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 68-77). The study also observed that teachers who instructed such programs became more aware and knowledgeable, and were more beneficial to the development of child’s safety skills than parent-focused prevention programs. Nevertheless MacIntyre & Carr argue that prevention programs that have the teachers instruct and work with parents and children have a higher success rate than any other types of prevention methods. (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 70).

It should also be added that prevention programs should also break stereotypes; that boys are victims too, how to correctly deal with strangers, privacy of their own bodies, and awareness to abuse (Research in Practice 2015, 19; MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 66). By opening the plat-

form for boys to talk about such an incident, we also begin to confront male chauvinistic attitudes towards the possibility of males also suffering from SA. The aim of a prevention program should be to break old myths of how sexual offenders look like and that children would lie, this as a result will encourage a healthier and trusting environment to report abuse (Kinneer 1995, 67). While we completely agree with *Research in Practice* in that stereotypes need to be broken, we feel that the theory, as well as the many other aforementioned theories, seem to forget one important issue: the perpetrator is predominantly someone who the child already knows and trusts (Finkelhor, 2009), as a result in relation to all cases, “stranger danger” is definitely a minor issue. Therefore, in addition to some of the factors mentioned previously, we would like to include “making children aware of what kind of behavior is acceptable from any adult”. In other words, provide the awareness and tools for a child to know what their personal space limits are and how to defend them from all, close ones included. For example, if an Aunt wishes to give a kiss to an unwilling child, the tools for this situation would be for the child to express and maintain their unwanted desire for such closeness. This would not exclude warning children of strangers, but also include warning them of people they already know.

3.2 Aims and Guidelines of CSA Prevention Programs

Naturally before we may introduce the three programs we felt were worth analyzing, we would like to discuss the theories and guidelines we followed and used to make our choices. By this point it is clear that the preventative program needs to be appropriate for primary aged children. Furthermore Finkelhor (2009) stated that four preconditions must exist for sexual abuse to take place: the child’s predisposition to abuse, a lack of internal and external barriers when it comes to the offender, and the offender’s access to the child. As Finkelhor quotedly states, removing any of these preconditions should, theoretically, completely eradicate the possibility of abuse. Therefore, the prevention programs should target at least one, if not all, of these preconditions. The aim of any preventative program should be to conclude with an increase in emotional and intellectual awareness of CSA, so that it may provide the necessary task of protecting and preventing the child from sexual abuse.

Nevertheless, it is more than removing the condition but also changing the mindset that leads to the possibility or availability of such conditions. Finkelhor (2009) implies that SA is made possible as children accept naturally an adult’s power and authority. As a result the child

complies to all the adult demands and wishes. Hence the preventative program should also tackle the child's conception of an adult's authority in some form, or provide critical thinking of what is appropriate adult authority demands. Therefore the program should directly or indirectly instigate topics such as body ownership, touch, saying "no", escape, secrecy, intuition, support systems, blame and bullying (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 66). All themes that will directly modify and question correct adult authority, as well as other concepts related to protecting the child from sexual abuse.

Unfortunately, there are multiple aspects that can either make or break a program. As Barron, Miller and Kelly (2015) state, regardless of the recent increase of CSA prevention programs, not a lot of studies have been conducted. This may be due to the difficulty of determining what makes a good program. While we do believe that we have a reasonably comprehensive image of what constitutes as good and what not, this analysis is nowhere near perfect - there are many factors missing, such as cost-effectiveness. There is also very little research on how certain aspects affect the success of a program and its effectiveness in preventing sexual abuse, and the existing research cannot clearly measure the magnitude of the program's effects (Rispen, Aleman & Goudena 1997, 976). It can, however, clearly demonstrate that the use of a preventative program is better than the absence of one (Rispen, Aleman & Goudena 1997, 976). All this in mind, we still believe that the factors that we list below are definitely ones that are widely accepted by a multiple of professionals, and have been deemed as either aiding or hindering a program, almost regardless of the study being assessed. Rispen, Aleman and Goudena (1997, 976-977) group them as child characteristics, intervention characteristics and design characteristics. Furthermore, Nation (et al. 2003, 450) argues that a good prevention program also includes various teaching methods in sufficient dosages, are theory driven, provide opportunities for positive relationships, are appropriately timed, socioculturally relevant, include outcome evaluation and well-trained staff.

3.2.1 Child Characteristics In Planning The Programs

Casper (1999, 109) states that children who are exposed to programs more than once learned significantly more than those who experience them for the first time, even when significant time has passed between exposures. The number of times a program is repeated, or how long it runs for, has great effect on how well information is retained. We feel that these results have much to do also with the child's age and level of maturity.

The programs were also found to be at their most effective when directed at students between the ages of seven to twelve. Studies also show that younger children have a tougher time retaining knowledge than older students do. (Topping, Barron 2009; 433, 448) When it comes to timing, not only is the age of the participants important, but also the quantity, intensity and length of sessions. A study by Nemerofsky (et al. 2008) showed that although the results were better the older the children are, even preschool aged children can be taught personal safety skills. Nevertheless one should consistently keep in mind that the children participating should be willing participants, should feel safe, and accepted (Wolf 1978, 206-207).

While the evidence on the best exact age for students to take part in a prevention program is quite vague overall, what we could deduct is that:

1. Students of all ages will retain at least some information
2. It is more difficult for younger children to retain information
3. Primary school children are old enough to understand and retain the information necessary.

As with any teaching, diversity is a great factor in what type of information is retained, and what the best method is. Studies by Briggs and Hawkins (1994, as cited by Topping & Barron 2009, 433) showed that children from low socioeconomic backgrounds had more difficulties talking about inappropriate touches to adults, recognizing bad feelings, and saying no in potentially harmful situations, when compared to their peers. Another study shows that especially Latino girls wait longer to disclose about abuse (Shaw et al. 2001, 1375). Topping and Barron (2009, 432) also note that some children may not retain knowledge as well as others, due to their cultural and familial background: children from families where sex and sexuality is not an open topic are less likely to talk about the themes at home, and are also less likely to have prior knowledge on the matters discussed. This can lead to a lower level of understanding and retention of knowledge throughout the program. These demographic differences are something that need to be taken into account in a wholesome prevention program, in order to ensure that all students have an opportunity to learn the same skills. It is quite hard to determine how a program takes diversity into account, if it is not one that is specifically directed towards a specific demographic. As a result, we decided to search for signs in which we could clearly see the creators of the programs considering the minorities and different demographics when they were creating the program. These considerations could include anything from the creators directly mentioning or suggesting different methods or approaches that may help cer-

tain demographics to retain information better, to something more subtle, such as a note in the introduction simply recognizing that different demographics have been thought of.

Some studies also report high anxiety in children after a prevention program has been implemented. For example, studies by Pohl and Hazzard (1990) as well as by Finkelhor and Dziuba-Leatherman (1995) reported increased anxiety in children reported both by children themselves and the child's parents or other close adults. (Casper 1999, 99). However Madak and Berg (1992) reported no side effects when assessing a Canadian program called "Talking about Touching". Binder and McNiel, 1987 came to similar conclusions - this program consisted of first a workshop for parents that identified myths of SA and discussed the children's workshop. The kids' workshop was a 2-hour session with roleplay and group discussions. (Casper 1999, 100-101), Casper (1999) himself studied the characteristics of children who tended to be most afraid or have significantly increased anxiety. The main findings were that, first of all, children who were already prone to high anxiety were more likely to also be afraid after attending a SA workshop. Often girls were more anxious than boys, and having an external focus of control added onto anxiety. Casper found that even those children who have high anxiety or fears after taking part in a program do not see the experience as a negative one. Instead, they feel they learnt from it (Casper 1999, 107). The study also showed that in order to minimize unwanted anxiety, enough time should be dedicated for discussion and questions. The instructor should be ready to answer anything and everything in order to show children that there is nothing to be feared. (Casper 1999, 107-112)

3.2.2 Intervention Characteristics

We believe that the best and most cost-effective method for most schools is for teachers to deliver the programs, as opposed to hiring professional outsiders. Firstly, this has the advantage of the programs being delivered by educational professionals who know the children they are working with very personally. The children also most likely trust their teacher, as do the children's parents, which may make discussion easier. On the other hand, the program being delivered by the teacher has its disadvantages: primary school teachers often lack specialist knowledge on the field of CSA, and prevention programs. According to Topping and Barron (2009, 434) teachers with no training on talking about sexual matters may have personal ethical reasons, or other sensitivities to the issue, which hinders their ability to talk about it confidently and comfortably. This may hinder how confidently and openly the chil-

dren are likely to talk about the topic. Lack of training is, of course, an issue, which is why we wanted each chosen program to either provide teachers with appropriate training, or a manual that guides them through the process. We looked at the manuals or training from the point of view of teachers: Does it truly provide the information necessary? Is there enough background information for the teacher to confidently answer questions and teach the topics? Tips on how to discuss difficult topics with children? Pointers on age-appropriate answers?

We also believe that an integral part of being a low-cost option that any teacher can take on, is for the program to be easily accessible. By easily accessible we mean that the materials are either completely online, or easy to find through a provided link. We also did not want there to be geographical access boundaries.

The method in which the prevention program is implemented must also be taken into consideration. Paranal, Thomas and Derrick (2012, 518) conducted a study and deduced that while online platforms have advantages, there are a few things that do have to be taken into consideration: Some participants prefer facilitated trainings. This preference, however, is found to be a result of a desire to share discuss and interact with other people. The researchers concluded that this need can be fulfilled by including a possibility to blog, have group discussions, or chats within the program. As for the user friendliness, it is important that tutorials and the program itself go hand in hand, instead of forcing the user to navigate between multiple pages to find instructions (Paranal, Thomas & Derrick 2012, 518). Paranal, Thomas and Derrick (2012, 518) found in their study on internet based prevention programs that video components were, as reported by the participants, the most engaging part of the training, and the key mechanism to understanding the concepts. The study by Paranal, Thomas and Derrick (2012, 519) also found that online participants did not use online supplementary materials as much as face-to-face participants had. Paranal and her colleagues suggest that clear descriptions of materials, and instructions on how to use them in day-to-day life should be provided. This may further prompt users to truly engage also outside the online setting.

3.2.3 Design Characteristics

According to studies cited by Topping and Barron (2009, 433, 454), the longer and more comprehensive the program, the better, and more long-lasting the results. Short programs were found to also have an impact in the students' ways of thought, but the impact was signif-

ificantly smaller. A comprehensive program was defined as one that lasts for at least four sessions. Effective programs do not only have one dose of exercises, but should also do follow-up, or booster sessions. The follow-up sessions are especially important as studies have found that the effects of programs tend to decay over time. (Nation, et al. 2003, 452).

According to Nation and colleagues, successful prevention programs use varied teaching methods. This includes interactive instruction and hands-on experience that increases the participants' skills. It is recommended that programs include verbal or written practice. What should not be relied on too much is knowledge, information or group discussions - skills are the most important aspect to develop in order to have an effective program. (Nation, et al. 2003, 450-451). A study by Blumberg (et al. 1991) found that children learning through multimedia (films or puppet shows) did not learn as well as children learning through live plays. They suggested that "programs including role-play and discussion can make children less suspicious" and "more realistic about nurturing touch, rather than increasing children's fears". Another research (Tutty 1992) quoted in the same study found that children who participate in a program with theatrical performance retained information a lot better when compared to programs that did not have performance. (Casper 1999, 100). Nevertheless as mentioned previously, any teaching method chosen needs to be done to a certain limit, since the desire of the prevention program is to educate and reach the student's learning needs.

As mentioned in the chapter "Role of the Parents", SA is more likely to reoccur if the perpetrator thinks they can get away with it. Additionally Whatley and Trudell (1988) state that "programs might inadvertently be giving children the message that they are to blame if abuse does occur" by empowering them to act in cases of SA, and therefore giving the responsibility of "doing something" to the child. Therefore it is important for programs to, firstly, emphasize that there is no guilt in the child, and secondly, prompt children to talk about "bad secrets" and "bad touches" with a trusted adult. In all the programs we looked into, talking to a trusted adult was an integral part of the process. And so, a good preventative program should aim at empowering a child to speak of the situation without fear and, if possible, avoid a situation in which a "bad touch" could occur. We believe that if a child feels responsible for not doing something, that perhaps the approach of the preventative program was not clear and concise enough (for example the language used directed the child to feel they must react correctly to such a situation).

And finally, the manner in which perpetrators is presented needs to change. Perpetrators are often stereotypically and wrongly described as strangers and pedophiles who lure children into cars. As this is most often not the case, we find it extremely important for the programs to take into account that there are multiple kinds of perpetrators, the majority of whom are close and trusted adults, or even peers. The programs should take into account not only that the abuser is most often someone trusted, but also that the abuse most often happens in a place that is familiar to the child. (Finkelhor, 2009; Sax 2009, p.39)

3.2.4 Other Types of Preventative Actions

This chapter will very briefly overview methods of combating CSA outside the spectrum of school-based prevention programs. While school-based programs are definitely one of the most prominent forms of CSA prevention by numbers of recipients, they are not the only way to combat the issue. School-based programs also have their downsides: for example, Bolen (2003) states that the pervasiveness of abuse and the variety of abusers makes it extremely difficult for children to effectively learn to resist actual real life situations. Bolen (2003) argues that it is therefore nearly impossible to actually teach children the necessary skills, and that a more efficient method may be targeting potential abusers. This is something that is being widely done in the USA, for example. There are multiple actions taken, on local and national levels, tackling the issue while concentrating on the abuser instead of the victim or potential victim. Finkelhor (2009) lists multiple actions that are already being implemented, to ensure children are safe; they include:

1. Offender registration
2. Community notification
3. Residency restrictions
4. Mandatory background checks
5. Sentence lengthening and civil commitment
6. Enhanced detection and arrest
7. Mental health treatment
8. Community reintegration and supervision

Finkelhor (2009) analyzed all these methods, based on research, and made conclusions based on the evidence (or the lack thereof). In most of the cases, the actions taken are not preventa-

tive in the sense of preventing any assault from taking place overall. They are aimed at caught offenders to prevent them from repeating.

We have divided the methods into three very rough categories, to give a summary on what Finkelhor (2009) found:

The first three methods on the list would fall under our first category: Methods that raise awareness around the community and help parents and other adults take action. According to Finkelhor's findings, the first three methods on the list would fall under this category. The prevailing theme between all was that they highlighted the perpetrators inside the communities. While these methods are the most popular within the general public, they turned out to be some of the least effective: Prior offenders found it very difficult to find a job, apartment, or form any social circles within their communities. They become their own type of outcasts. Instead of preventing perpetrators from repeating their offense, these methods seem to actually lead the offenders to repeat more often (whether it be sexual offense, or other crimes), as they feel like they have no other choice.

The second group, as per our division would be methods that are aimed to help catch and/or sentence violators. This group would include methods four to six on the list. This group, just as the first, has its issues: while these methods may not cause offenders to repeat, there is no evidence whatsoever that any of them work. As Finkelhor (2009) described, while some of these methods may logically seem useful, there are no real studies conducted on whether they actually work or not; mostly he sees them as what may be a waste of resources. Especially if the aim of these methods is to punish the offender by "giving them a time out" without any form of therapy support or treatment.

The third and last group of methods are the ones that are aimed at helping perpetrators regain their regular rhythm of life after being prosecuted. While Finkelhor (2009) stated that more studies are needed for conclusive results, it does seem that mental health treatment may be effective in preventing juvenile criminals with sexual behavior problems from sexual offense. Mental health support can also prevent prior offenders from committing new sexual crimes. Out of all the eight methods, the eighth and last one seems to be the most studied method. In addition, it is the most effective, as far as current methods aimed at the perpetrator are concerned. According to a study cited by Finkelhor (2009), offenders who gained social contacts through volunteer circles were 70% less likely to repeat offense, than those who had no help.

As can be seen, a great majority of these methods address the issue when it has already happened. They also do not help the victim directly, but instead concentrate on the perpetrator not repeating their offense. While especially the last group of methods have been found to be somewhat effective in preventing the perpetrator from doing just that, we felt like prevention programs are still what we can best use our time and expertise on. Since we will both be educators in the future, we feel that unlike the other methods, prevention programs are what we can take full advantage of in our daily lives. In addition, while school-based programs provenly have their flaws, it is important to note that they do have positive effects as well, that we feel outweigh the possible negative effects.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

When we began brainstorming and forming our research questions and goals we were also considering what methodology we would use to answer each enquiry. Thomas (2005, 1) and Keeves and McKenzie (1997, 238) suggest that the method should be suitable to the research; claiming that a research should solve a problem or answer a question that has not yet been answered and provide a cumulative knowledge. In that sense our research was answering questions that had not been directly tackled before, and providing details for future teachers, ourselves included, to implement the knowledge in our own classrooms. For that reason the methodology would have to support the technique of collecting the most data precisely to compare and analyze with proficiency. Due to the nature of our research we also needed to consider the criteria we would use to collect the data we felt was relevant to answer our research questions (Thomas 2005, 47). As a result the criteria would define and structure what method we would need to use to collect data and information (Thomas 2005, 47).

With our research questions guiding us, we looked into different ways we could go about collecting data. Considering the nature of our research, we decided to use a qualitative approach. While we considered the possibility of interviews and questionnaires, we found that they are often expensive, time-consuming, and inconclusive, due to the ambiguity of the repliers, (Kothari 2004, 99-101) especially when trying to get a vast sample, as was our goal. Moreover the nature of our research was so personal, it would be difficult to find willing participants to discuss and answer questions openly. Kothari (2004, 112) recommends the use of primary data when possible, but he also recognizes that due to financial or time limitations, primary data is not always the best route to take. These limitations definitely factored in greatly when we made our final choice to simply use secondary data, and conduct a comprehensive literature review of the research that had already been conducted.

While methods, such as interviews and questionnaires would have given us an opportunity to go in deeper within one demographic, we felt it was more necessary, for the results to be as practically implementable as possible, to come up with a way of gathering myriad data that spreads not only geographically, but demographically and through time. There is already a vast array of research conducted on prevention programs, and we found that what is more needed than anything is a way for educators to have a comprehensive overview of all the information available, without having to use too much time doing so. In realizing all this, and

the financial and time limitations we have, for us there was no other choice than conducting a literary review and content analysis.

Content analysis is conducted by grouping a set of vocabulary or pieces of text together from a set of data, and then by coding and analyzing it. (Weber, 1990) As our topic is on CSA and how to prevent it from occurring, and our information would not be gathered in the classroom but from professional literature, we would analyze the theory behind the activities for CSA prevention and how the components interact with the activity's goals (Thomas 2005, 63). In our study we used methods of content analysis through examining different programs and their settings, and finding common themes. These themes include use of vocabulary, role of the teacher or educator, parental involvement, teaching materials, and so on.

As the content analysis method is limited by being a descriptive method. In other words, the data collected only shows what there is, not what it means. (Weber, 1990) Therefore the content analysis method is only sufficient to collect some of our data and conclusions, as a result we felt the need to find another method for analyzing a variety of theories and programs in an unbiased manner. In this sense we combined it with literature review that is a method that focuses on collecting, analyzing, reporting and revealing the findings and illustrations of the application of the research (Thomas 2005, 75). Its aim is to "learn what conditions influence such applications", which as a result will support our decisions on choosing the best program to analyze (Thomas 2005, 75). Oliver states that an essential part of a literature review would be to find what has already been researched and written on a broad topic, and see how it connects. Additionally, it is stated that if a lot of research has already been conducted, the topic must be one of importance. (Oliver 2012, 5-7) Oliver (2012) also mentions some limitations to this method: there is a high risk that the data collected is either not relevant, or reliable. Additionally, in some areas, data is also scarce. (2012, 58-74) Fortunately, as we have stated, the topic of CA and CSA are quite widely researched. Additionally, we have put great effort into ensuring that our sources are reliable and relevant to the topic - a process which we describe more in the "Reliability and Ethical Discussion" section of this thesis. We began our research by looking into studies conducted since the 80's, and worked our way forward finding CSA related topics and issues that had been tackled in a myriad of sources. These issues then formed the basis of our theoretical framework and analysis.

As for our data, we used the programs themselves: their descriptions, contents and aims, as well as research literature. The descriptions and aims helped guide us in the practical side of

matters: who the program is aimed for and why. The content of the programs was looked at from a more pedagogical point of view in order to see how, in practice, the programs were to be executed. The research literature was used to find and back up arguments on whether the data collected from the programs was valid. We analyzed the programs based on the theoretical knowledge gained through the research literature. We also used whatever previous research on the programs we could find. Research literature on Turvataitokasvatus and Cool and Safe was scarce due to them being relatively young programs, but there has been extensive research on Stay Safe.

4.1 Criteria for Choosing the Programs and Data

Staying mindful of the possible limitations of conducting a literary review and content analysis, we started the research by, first, reading research on what makes a successful prevention program. We chose to focus specifically on school-based programs, that would also help narrow our research and view point, after which we started looking for three programs to include in our study. In choosing the included programs, we kept in mind that we wanted them to be similar enough to compare, and to be relevant to us. Some of these characteristics were:

1. School-based
2. Good availability - easily accessible online
3. At least partly free materials
4. Created by educational professionals
5. Able to be implemented in any type of primary classroom setting
6. Supported by theoretical framework

The characteristics that we wanted to separate the programs were:

1. Geographical context - what country they are based in, or created in
2. Accessibility and facility to be implemented in the classroom
3. Pedagogically different approaches in tackling the issue
4. Focal point (e.g. protecting/preventing, breaking the stereotypes, etc)
5. Length it has been running (new program vs. old program)

The three programs we decided to use for our thesis was Stay Safe, Turvataitokasvatus, and Cool and Safe. Each program originates from a different area of Europe, and as a result in-

cludes different cultural understandings of safety and SA; Stay Safe is from Ireland, Turvataitokasvatus is Finnish, and Cool and Safe is German. Moreover they were all made during different periods which also gives more interest in how age and experience influences their approach and perhaps success. The Stay Safe program has been running for twenty-seven years, making it the oldest program compared to the others we chose which are much younger; Turvataitokasvatus only six years old and Cool and Safe only five years old. We must also not exclude that a heavy factor towards our choice was the availability of information on these particular programs. There were other programs to choose from but unfortunately they had little or no research done on them.

Moreover we had other factors that sparked our interest in the programs that were particular to their geographical origin. For Stay Safe, we were interested in choosing an Irish program, as Ireland has for many years been popular in the media for their CSA cases in church, schools and other child-friendly environments. As for Turvataitokasvatus, we chose a Finnish program due to Finland's reputation as one of the leading countries when it comes to education. Finland is also extremely safe, and children's rights have been strongly exercised culturally and legislatively for a fairly long time. For example, Finland was the second country in the world to ban children's physical punishment by law (Lajunen et al., 2012). It is also based on previous programs, such as *Tenavien TurvaTaito*; which means that Turvataitokasvatus is based on a program that has been tested and used, and that has shown positive results before (Kempainen & Pakkanen, 2002). We felt that altogether this program would be perfect to compare and highlight the difference with Stay Safe. As for the German program Cool and Safe, we wondered how the Germans would place their culturally recognizable order and organization into a preventative program. Moreover what sparked our interest in this particular program was its wildly recognized reputation. The Cool and Safe program has won two awards, the Erasmus Euromedia awards in 2014 and the Comenius Edumedia Medalle in 2015; and is also EU funded.

Due to their different locations the programs are also available in different languages, nevertheless with the help of online translation services and dictionaries, and our own language abilities, we were able to understand the aims and guidelines, and the lessons plans. Apart from the slight language barrier the programs are all available to all users online. What separates each program can vary from the amount of support, as well as the amount of information available to prepare the teacher to implement the lesson plans or themes in class. For instance

the Stay Safe program follows very closely the prevention and clinical intervention models (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 79-80). Therefore the program encourages the use of the child's peers to participate, an aspect that all three programs have in common (Lajunen et al. 2012, 19; Müller et al. 2014, 60).

In the Stay Safe program, parents and teachers will have close contact with child healthcare professionals, with the end goal of facilitating the reporting of abuse cases if the event were to arise (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 81). On the contrary, Turvataitokasvatus and Cool and Safe both provide the teacher manuals and teaching materials, but have no direct support with professionals. The material is meant to be presented to students by teachers, but with Turvataitokasvatus and Cool and Safe, it can be done by other adults as well, if needed. The authors include not only teachers, but child psychiatrists, special need education professionals, to name a few. In addition, Turvataitokasvatus and Cool and Safe strongly prompt the children to call the children's help line whenever they feel the need to, something the Stay Safe program theoretically encourages but has no mention during the actual lesson plans.

All three programs have been created by educational professionals with strong connections to a variety of theoretical concepts that we also use or mention in our own theoretical framework. The aims of each preventative program is to provide the child with safety skills, and awareness of the possible dangers of strangers or familiars. Furthermore, Turvataitokasvatus and Stay Safe share the concept of the importance of parents having a role in developing the safety skills of these children. Cool and Safe, on the other hand, only provides the permission slips but place no effort in having the parents involved. The Cool and Safe program, unlike the other two programs, has part of their platform online. This was done with the response to integrate modern media in the approach of preventing CSA (Müller et al. 2014, 60).

All three programs have been structured so that they may take place in the classroom, with Cool and Safe having the alternative choice of taking place also at home, and Turvataitokasvatus taking place with smaller groups or with different age groups if the educator is able to modify the lesson plans appropriately. Both Cool and Safe, and Turvataitokasvatus have an ongoing and flexible lesson guide that allows the lessons to be ongoing and repeated throughout the year. On the contrary, Stay Safe implements their prevention program either by twelve sessions for Junior cycle (four to eight year olds) or ten sessions for senior cycle (nine to twelve year olds) which is only repeated annually (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 83). The age range is also a differing factor between the three programs, nevertheless around the same

suggested ages Finkelhor (2009) recommends. While Stay Safe focuses between four to twelve year olds, Turvataitokasvatus is aimed for five to eleven year olds, and Cool and safe for seven to twelve year olds. The classroom size vary between each preventative program and the law's the country has in place. Stay Safe suggests that their program not be implemented to a group bigger than thirty-five children. Contrarily, Cool and Safe does not have a recommended group size and provides a flexible guide that alters depending on the German's teacher-to-student ratio in class. Nevertheless in the research studies the classroom sizes in the school Cool and Safe were implemented in were around twenty-one to twenty-five students (Müller et al. 2014, 60). Turvataitokasvatus does not explicitly mention a preferred group size in terms of numbers, but it implies that without modifications, the exercises are meant to be delivered in a regular-sized classroom, which in Finland would most commonly constitute of around 25 children.

As mentioned previously, the different cultural values of each country have an impact on how the program tackles CSA in the classroom. For Stay Safe, the Irish culture is more sensitive and so the program focuses more on the behavioral aspects and not the verbal definitions of SA; for instance using terms like personal safety skills (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 80-81). For Turvataitokasvatus, the vision is not only to report the abuse but also not to abuse others, tackling both sides of the spectrum (Lajunen et al. 2012, 19). And so the approach of dealing with CSA in the three preventative programs is different regardless whether they share the same themes or not. In other words, while each program does tackle stranger danger, unwanted touching and so forth, the focal point and goals are different. And so for a clearer understanding of exactly how this is done, we will explain more thoroughly how the lessons are structured in each program separately. Nevertheless one similarity the programs all share is that the subject is introduced to the children as safety skills, and within the knowledge and scope of safety skills, implying SA and the general spectrum of "unwanted touching" (Lajunen et al., 2012, p. 19; MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 80-81; Müller et al. 2013). The following headings will explain how Stay Safe, Turvataitokasvatus, and Cool and Safe implement their prevention tactics.

Another main focus for us when choosing our programs was that they were to be either easily repeatable - no expensive licensing or extremely age- or time-tied material - or long-term programs that cannot be woven into everyday teaching throughout the school year. What we did not want to end up with either were programs that were meant to be presented once, and then

forgotten about. These kinds of programs for us would include ones that require hired professionals to come to the school to go through the material. We believe this raises the bar for teachers to repeat the same program, as often it can be a stretch to extend the budget enough to get the team in once. It may be difficult to explain why the same fee needs to be paid twice in order to repeat the exact same program. And so the three programs we chose follow perfectly under the category of easily implementable for the classroom teacher throughout the school year.

4.1.1 Stay Safe

The Stay Safe program presents itself with five distinguishable goals: Feeling safe and unsafe, bullying, touches (their private parts should only be touched for hygiene or medical reasons and will not be done in secret ever), telling (understanding who is their safety network), and strangers (who and how to deal with strangers) (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 92). Each topic has around one or two lessons each that tackle different aims depending on the age group (MacIntyre & Lawler 2016, 51-60). For example when discussing feeling safe, discussions and activities will focus on what makes them feel safe and what does not, bringing awareness on what can bring upon those feelings, to give an example (MacIntyre & Lawler 2016, 51-60). The program's lesson plans, are divided into four categories: infants, first and second graders, third and fourth graders, and fifth and sixth graders. We decided to critically analyze the fifth to sixth graders guide, since the knowledge and lessons are about the same for all grades. The only difference is that the lesson material and knowledge increases in level as the child gets older.

The skills are passed to the child through cartoons, videos, role-plays, discussions and homework during approximately a twelve 30-40 minutes lesson cycle, twice per week. (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 80). The main goal is to assist the child in determining the difference between “potentially abusive situations and quite similar situations in which the risk of abuse [is] not present” (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 83). As mentioned before, the lessons are divided into five different topics, but the one we will focus on is how the program tackles CSA. The third theme “touches” is divided into two lessons, and the structure begins as the norm with a picture or a short video clip that the educator can use to lead a conversation. From there onwards the children will discuss what are appropriate forms of touching that we can use to express our sympathy or our excitement for another person. Naturally the conversation then continues

onto talking about what are inappropriate ways to touch and how they can protect themselves from such forms of unwanted touching.

The lessons work on the language and knowledge of the children, and so whatever is shared in class is what the teacher will tackle. Otherwise the most inappropriate touch can be a brief kiss on the lips by your stepfather and his hand slowly running over the front of a girl's shirt (a girl is used as an example in the video clip). Before ending the topic, the teacher must then hold a concluding discussion that summarizes and focuses on the main points of the lessons. After each topic the child also receives homework that needs to be completed with the parent, the aim of the homework is to further expand on the child's knowledge of safety with their parents, for example writing down the top five people the child can seek help from. (MacIntyre & Lawler 2016, p.51-60).

4.1.2 Turvataitokasvatus

Lajunen (et al. 2012) has divided their manual's exercises under three themes: "I am valuable and unique", "We are good friends" and "I can do it". (Translated from Finnish titles: "Minä olen arvokas ja ainutlaatuinen", "Olemme hyviä kavereita", and "Kyllä minä pärjään".) The first theme, "I am valuable and unique", strives to create a safe environment in the classroom. It begins with children presenting their favorite objects, getting to know each other, then moves on to students recognizing their own value through various exercises. After this, there are various exercises that help the students recognize their own emotions, and the situations they feel those emotions in - beginning with good and bad, and moving on to safe and unsafe. The last chapter of this theme, titled "Right to be safe", includes discussions on what safety is, when the student feels unsafe, and who they can talk to when they have these feelings.

The second theme, "We are good friends", starts off by discussing what friendship is - who are the child's friends, what makes them friends, what loneliness is, what are good friends, what bullying is, etc. This theme ends in making a common agreement with the class to end bullying. While we see the undoubtable importance of this theme (Lajunen et al. 2012, 123-140), it does not tackle the issue of sexual harassment in itself at all, and therefore we will not discuss it further in this thesis. We will concentrate on themes one and three, as they are more related to the topic of the thesis.

The last theme, “I can do it”, is most clearly related to sexual harassment. It begins by discussing different types of touching. The authors divide touches into two categories green light (good) and red light (bad) touching. Students are encouraged to define what kinds of touches they define as green or red - the teacher doesn’t necessarily dictate the definition for either one. Instead, they are taught skills to resist and react to different, potentially harmful situations, such as being asked to enter the car of a stranger, someone unknown knocking at the door, etc. Additionally, there is information on what to do if someone you do know, and like, touches you in an unwanted manner. In the end of this theme, the teacher and students discuss friendly, and good touches. The authors emphasize the importance of loving and caring touches, that are deemed good by the student - every child needs love and care, but not all get it.

Each theme begins with an overview of what is going to be discussed. Each sub-theme begins with notes and comments on what children may be experiencing in relation to the theme, what kind of behavior is common, and tips on how to discuss the issues in a child-friendly, child-centered way. In addition to the separate themes, the manual has stories and games that can be used during discussions. Not only this, but the manual also includes tips and instructions on how to contact parents when about to discuss difficult topics in class, exercises that the child should take home with them for parents to fill, and a very extensive manual on what to do and how to raise the topic if there is any suspicion that a child is being mistreated at home in any way.

4.1.3 Cool and Safe

Cool and Safe is an internet-based safety program that tackles themes such as; cyber bullying, sexual solicitations, avoiding inappropriate content on the internet, and CSA, especially through the internet (Müller et al 2013). A unique aspect of Cool and Safe program takes place through an internet game where the child goes through multiple themes: what emotions are good and bad, what secrets are good and bad, what to do when strangers talk to you, internet safety, and how to be safe at home. In other words, the focus is to improve the child’s knowledge and awareness on what is safe behavior and interaction on the internet, with strangers and familiar people (Müller et al. 2013). Furthermore, the program places focus on the child’s support network, making the child aware of all the people they trust in their life that they can talk to (Müller et al. 2014, p.61-62). The children are also provided with a help-

line they may call whenever someone is hurting them - even if that someone is a close friend or a loved one. They can also call to talk about bad secrets, or if they just feel bad, placing a great importance in the child's sense of emotional awareness (Müller et al. 2014, p.61).

The game can be played all at once which has a duration of two hours, or bit-by-bit. Each player signs in with a username and password, that are easy to create, and the system saves the player's progress (Müller et al. 2014, 61). Most themes begin with a "theoretical part" - the kids are taught their rights when it comes to different situations. They are also told what to look out for in potentially dangerous situations. The program also uses lots of videos, where the player has to choose what to do. The reasoning behind what is decidedly the right or wrong thing to do is always given after the player gives their choice. To support the whole process, there is a teacher's manual with exercises, and games that can be played before, during and after completing the game. An activity booklet is also available for students to use while playing the online game, if they chose to use it.

The following example is on an activity to deal with good and bad secrets that is found in the teacher's manual. The teacher along with the children will read through a list of secrets, and then discuss which are good and bad secrets and why. Some examples are: "Lisa's parents have planned a surprise birthday party for Lisa and have asked everyone to keep it a secret", "Luke goes to ballet and has asked his friend not to tell anyone", "Caro sees a boy in class take a wallet from someone's bag, and asks her not to tell anyone. Later that day the school announces that Marie's wallet has been stolen.", etc. The activity suggests the teacher of implementing it through a variety of ways such as using the classroom space to move from the "bad" corner to the "good" corner depending on the secret, or simply talking about it together. The continuation of the activity then asks the children to write down their own examples of good and bad secrets, which should not be seen by others. The teacher can then read them aloud and again follow the same discussion routine; is it a bad or good secret, why do you think so, who could you ask help from, and so on. (Müller et al. 2013).

FINDINGS

In this part we will further discuss the programs we have chosen. First, we will go into more detail on why we chose to include the program in our study. While in our research methodology we already listed some of the criteria we used to choose programs, here we will further explain why these programs made the cut as opposed to others that may, in the end, have been just as good, or better. After explaining our choices, we will discuss both the advantages and disadvantages of each program separately, in order to connect the overall theory with the specifics of each program. Once we have discussed each program separately, we will compare all three together to see whether there are similarities and differences in the pros and cons - is there something that all programs are lacking in? Is it possible that there are aspects that the program creators have not thought about, or is there a reason these aspects are left out, or do not work as theory and studies would suggest they should.

5.1 Stay Safe

When we were searching for prevention programs one of our goals was to find a program that was old, and had been efficiently meeting its goals abroad. The Stay Safe program, which originates from Ireland and has been running since 1991, was meeting our goals efficiently. Firstly, it is a program that was created in Europe in a country that has met its share of child sexual abuse scandals (Macintyre et al. 2000, 200).

Secondly, it has proven to have success throughout their running years, which a variety of medias have gladly covered, for instance The Irish Times newspaper. An Article by The Irish Times (2002) argued that since the implementation of the Stay Safe Program, the amount of sexual predators getting away with abusing children, and the amount of children staying quiet with the event, has reduced. The effects of the Stay Safe program has shown positive results in providing the school and the children with the necessary tools to openly discuss about the matter and deal with the problem (The Irish Times 2002). An empirical study was also done with 772 children of second and fifth grade, 374 parents and 28 teachers participating in five different schools in Dublin over the span of three to five months. The research had a before and after follow up to see the effects of the program. The results showed that children were more aware of their safety, and their responsive skills improved showing a 92% improvement. However MacIntyre and Carr (2000) noticed that this knowledge only improved for the short

term period, and may slowly deteriorate as the time goes by. Nonetheless MacIntyre and Carr (2000) argue that the parents' knowledge also improved, which would support the child's knowledge in the long term, as long as the parents continue to maintain this knowledge. (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 108-118). Furthermore the bridge to communicate had been opened which the study noted, claiming that children were talking more about the subject with either parents or teachers, even approaching an adult to discuss a problem (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 122-123). Unfortunately some negative effects were observed such as a 23% increase in children becoming more sensitive to general touches, 6% paranoia of strangers and 2% implemented the strategies of the program incorrectly. In addition 10% of the participating children found some themes very upsetting, such as the discussion on the touching of private parts either due to the material used or the discussion in itself. (MacIntyre & Carr 2000, 123).

Thirdly, another reason to its years of success has been its strong theoretical framework, that takes into account age of participation, length, and role of parents to name a few- theories we also include in our thesis to analyze the programs. Yet while it may support the theories we use to justify our choice as well, the program has inherently also implemented methods that work with the Irish culture and educational curriculum. This means that when it would come to comparing and contrasting it with the other programs of our choice, we would see the variety of methods one can execute a prevention program against CSA.

And lastly, the reason we chose this particular prevention program was also the facility it demonstrated when implementing it in a classroom. The descriptions and plans seemed sensibly made with the considerations of how a classroom is. It appeared to take into account the teachers abilities and timeframes, as well as the classroom space and equipment.

Advantages & Disadvantages

A study by MacIntyre et al. (2000) was produced to list all the positive results of the Stay Safe prevention program, however one must keep in mind that the evaluator is also the creator of the program. We shall list some of the points mentioned that we feel are worth discussing, and which we also agree based on other theory we produced to be able to measure each program. The point that is most heavily emphasized in MacIntyre's (et al. 2000) article was the success in creating a program that not only took into consideration Ireland's cultural values and language when dealing with CSA, but also completely fits perfectly with the Irish school curriculum. As a result this means that the implementation of the program in the schools will

be more successful than an American program that does not take into account the country's values (MacIntyre et al. 2000, 200). When viewing the program in a general manner, it still shows strength as the program is made to fit a class in which no auxiliary assistance can be found and the class ratio is thirty five to one (MacIntyre et al. 2000, 204). This means any teacher with any type of class situation would be able to carry out the program without the usual setbacks (e.g. classroom management). On the contrary, a disadvantage was the program's perfect fit to the Irish curriculum. Naturally the program should fit the nation it was made for, but that might cause difficulties if a teacher from another country wishes to implement it in their own school. Apart from this minor setback, the program should be easily implementable since the language, while is culturally sensible to the Irish culture, is in no way vague that would cause the student's to misinterpret their meanings or understand CSA safety differently. Additionally, the teacher should be able to mold the language to better fit their classroom's needs.

The program also insists on training the teachers so that they may feel comfortable and confident during the instruction of CSA. The training is done with other mental healthcare professionals, to give the teacher all the tools required to deal with children who have been sexually assaulted, and to recognize children suffering through it. In addition, by training the teachers, the teachers would be more aware of the use of their language and how to ensure that the children do not feel guilty for the experience (MacIntyre et al. 2000, 206). MacIntyre et al. (2000, 202) also claims that another reason to why they wanted trained teachers to implement the program, and not outside professionals implementing the program, was for the purpose that after or during the program if a child wished to disclose their experience they could do it with the teacher and at any point. If the program was done by an outsider there could be the risk that if the child finally found the courage to express their experience they would search for that professional, who might not necessarily be at the school anymore.

Furthermore during the trainings, parents are also encouraged to participate, tackling the cycle of victims that can sometimes be the cause of children being vulnerable to SA (Krane 2003, 6; MacIntyre et al. 2000, 209-210). Within the parent training, the professionals aim to break myths and explain the importance of the prevention program. In addition to the information and preventative behavior parents can take into practice with their children, the parents were also informed on how to handle any disclosures their children might give them. In this sense the program is unique as it not only asks for parents to assist during the prevention program

implementation, but also educates the parents which in turn keeps the program running long after the teacher has finished the lessons at school. Overall, in this aspect the Stay Safe program tackles Finkelhor's preconditions to avoid CSA. As mentioned, the four preconditions to avoid CSA are: the child is cared for by a present and protective mother, socially included in the family, supervised appropriately, the child is not left alone too much, routine sleeping hours, stable and confident, and self-aware of their space and protection against sexual abuse (Finkelhor 2009). By informing the parents of their important roles and giving the tools for the child to speak up and be self-aware of their boundaries; the program is quite thorough at CSA prevention.

While the Stay Safe program tackles SA well since it includes all important members of the child's network, a critical point is the program's refusal to use SA terms. Some terms they use to discuss on the problems can be viewed or considered too broad. This can mainly be found under the topic Strangers. The lesson itself in our opinion does not do a good job at dealing with strangers. Firstly, it avoids cultural differences of what a stranger can mean to different members in the class, especially students in this age and time. Furthermore, considering that the lesson plan is for fifth and sixth graders where peer pressure can be a defining factor for taking safety precautions, suggesting safety sentences like "My dad hasn't given me permission" seems to be cause for failure. Moreover the stranger danger while it briefly covers and discusses some overall helpful methods, for instance helping strangers without putting yourself in harm's way, does not do much else, especially in preventing also SA from that aspect.

Moreover the program does well at avoiding predator stereotypes, none of the examples given in all the lesson cases are of a middle aged white bald man harassing children. Nonetheless it does not do well either on informing the variety of potential abusers. In a variety of topics the program tackles what a bully might be like, but in the end a lot of the stereotype breaking responsibility is given to the child during the activities. For example in the Touches lesson, the example given is of the girl's mum's boyfriend sexually abusing her. After the discussion, the teacher is expected to ask how they would feel if someone close to them would do something like that. The immediate assumption or thought process may be for all the children to imagine all the male members or their families or all the close males in their lives. Few would imagine a potential mother sexually abusing or assaulting any of them. Furthermore the acts they discuss are physical, what of the molesters who ask the children to touch themselves or pose for an unsolicited sexually implicit picture? The discussions do not either attempt to destroy the

stereotypical idea that SA is an ongoing event, that perhaps it could occur once and never happen again.

The materials of the prevention program are quite old and in that sense can be considered a disadvantage. Nevertheless it tackles different types of learning styles and methods of teaching the subject. Moreover the program provides a variety of ways to experience safety skills, through role-plays, games, discussions, videos, and pictures. One of the strongest aspects of this program itself is the amount of time children have to discuss and debate about their views on a variety of safety skills, for instance on bullying, feeling safe, avoiding danger, good and bad touches, to name a few. In addition, the program with certain topics also forms a class agreement to avoid hurting or making others feel unsafe, a feature that we felt was a useful addition to the program.

According to MacIntyre et al. (2000, 208) the program has a variety of goals it attempts to reach, and in the majority of cases it appears to be successful. Nevertheless one of their key components is improving the child's self-esteem; since according to their theoretical framework children are more vulnerable to abuse if the child has a low self-esteem, yet the program in no way tackles this issue (Lajunen 2012, 22-23; MacIntyre et al. 2000, 208). Of course the lessons aid in empowering the child, reminding them they are the ones who have the last say about their bodies, and how they should or should not be treated, but the lessons in no way tackle self-esteem. In general, to claim to improve self-esteem is an ambitious goal, as the concept alone could be a program itself. The closest the program gets at improving self-esteem is indirectly providing the child with the awareness of their safety network, opening the channels of communicating with their parents and loved ones, and providing them with the power to control their lives if placed in a situation as scary as SA. But the actions or discussions in themselves during the program do not guarantee the improvement of the child's self-esteem.

The Stay Safe program also provides throughout each lesson tools to stay safe, and people they can talk to. Throughout the program there is also a constant reminder of not blaming the victim, for example in the Touches lesson, the lesson is aimed to remind the students that they are not at fault. Moreover, the program creates a natural space for the students to question the correct behavior of the adults, assisting them to consider what behavior they should allow and not allow. In our personal experience, when you know something to be true or not true, one is quicker to react to the behavior than when you are unsure and you need time to consider and

question it. For example with the Strangers topic, some of the examples are very likely to happen, and place a child in an uncomfortable situation, by discussing it in class the child avoids the need to consider it if the event were to occur. Instead through the discussion the child knows how she/he would like to react. Additionally, the lesson allows the students to practice the responses, and to be more assertive.

The last disadvantage we noticed for the Stay Safe program was the duration and the possibility to repeat the program. Depending on the age group there could be ten or twelve lessons, each with the duration of about thirty to forty minutes that are implemented twice per week. The program occurs at a particular point of the year so to better align itself with the curriculum expectations and goals. Therefore the possibility of repeating the program again during the year or at different points of the year is impossible, once done it is impossible to repeat the whole program again before the following year. Of course, this disadvantage is minor and as explained previously for a teacher not teaching in the Irish educational system, borrowing or placing the activities at different points of their lessons is possible as long as the right adjustments are taken to maintain the goals and safe environment required.

Conclusion

Overall the Stay Safe program is quite good and efficient at meeting the need to prevent CSA and informing students around Ireland on how to stay safe; especially considering how old it is. While ambitious with some of its goals, the program has been able to provide positive changes in their country of origin, with certain political figures retracting their hateful messages towards the program itself (The Irish Times 2002). Moreover, it tackles a variety of safety concerns, resulting in the development of techniques to assist the child in preventing abuse in their life or to protect themselves if it were to unfortunately occur. The most beneficial aspect of the program is the cooperation and training that the teachers and parents undergo for the student to receive the best results. And the best results for the student are not spoon fed but pulled out of the child from a diverse list of activities that allows each student to reflect and consider the different examples and questions that may arise during the program.

While we have listed quite a few cons, none define or deter the achievements this program has had and continues to make. On the contrary, the issues with the program are either cultural issues that arise since we are not Irish, or problems that with small updates could make it

even better; for instance the video clips or reviewing the variety of stranger danger possibility examples.

5.2 Turvataitokasvatus

Our first impression of Turvataitokasvatus was very positive. From the point of view of future educators it seemed very clear and easy to follow. The explanations of the theories used and research behind the program itself is well-structured, and connected to the topics and methods. The methodological part of the manual is very practical, has lots of tips and tricks, and truly seems like something made by teachers for teachers, but still keeping the child in mind.

In addition to teachers, the creating team of the Turvataitokasvatus manual consists of other childcare and educational professionals, which was an important factor for us when including the program in our research. Not only does the fact that the creators are professionals in their field add credibility, it also means that the program is exactly what we were looking for - something that would be practical and a useful tool to work with in our future. The program was also designed with the Finnish educational system in mind, which in addition to being the one we are collectively most familiar with, is pedagogically very advanced. Therefore we believed that the program would also go hand in hand with the most recent theoretical developments in the educational field. While there are many quite advanced programs, Turvataitokasvatus is completely available online to anyone who is interested. Access is not limited to only teachers: any parent who feels that the CA or CSA prevention education of their child is not up to the level they wish can print out the manual at home, and work on the exercises together with their child. The material is completely free, and we believe that the explanations and theory are so clear and simple that there is no need for the reader to necessarily be an educational professional.

What further helped us make our decision was the fact that the program has been tested and studied, not only on part of the theoretical background, but also the methods have been tested by teachers. Turvataitokasvatus is also based on multiple other programs, that have similarly been tested and proven to be quite functional. Contradictory to what has been said by other researchers, such as Bolen (2003) on the topic, Lajunen (et al. 2012) claims that according to their experiences this form of education has not caused children to unnecessarily fear adults, or abuse. The data or methodology of the research they base the claim on is not available, so

we are unsure of whether this is just the writers' perception, or actually something that has been studied and proven. As an additional merit, parents and students both report that they feel the program has helped them discuss more difficult topics at home. Teachers have also reportedly felt that these topics and themes are important to discuss in school. (Lajunen et al 2012, 17).

As a side note, it must be mentioned that the manual we are using as reference is the 6th (2012) edition of the 2005 version. There is a renewed 2015 version of the manual called "Tunne- ja turvataitoja lapsile" (Lajunen, Andell, Ylenius-Lehtonen 2015). Many of the new themes introduced in the renewed material, such as internet safety, would have been good to review, but unfortunately the new one is not available for free. Since one of our requirements for the programs was free and easy access, and the first version is still very much relevant, we felt inclined to continue its use. For future research, however, it may be useful to obtain and include the new material.

Advantages and Disadvantages

One of the greatest strengths we found is that the program does not solely concentrate on CA or CSA prevention, but also touches on emotional education. More specifically, the program includes techniques to teach children to recognize their emotions, and the situations in which they arise. They are also taught to analyze whether the emotions are good or bad. Not only this, but the students are taught to respect one another's space, and to understand why it is important to treat others with respect, when it comes to their physical and mental personal space. While these skills are helpful especially in potentially harmful situations, emotional intelligence is an important life skill overall. Emotional education skills and recognizing your own emotions are skills that can be built upon throughout life - whether or not the individual is ever in danger of sexual, or any other type of harassment. Another positive aspect is that the methods used are child- and not adult-central. For instance, the children are asked to talk about what kinds of emotions they feel, and describe the situations they feel said emotions in. The use of open-ended questions here ensure that the children are not being fed answers that may be desired by the teacher, and the conversation is truly based on the children's needs. Another strength of the teaching materials and manual is that they can be either reviewed in the order they are presented (going from one theme to another in the order recommended by the authors), or bits and pieces can be used here and there as single lesson plans. Additionally,

even though the authors do not mention it themselves, these sessions can definitely be used as booster sessions or as additional tasks together with other programs.

As mentioned in the *Role of the Parents* heading, the active participation of parents is a key element in sexual harassment prevention. While it is not uncommon for programs to include parents by prompting children to talk to them when afraid, or after having experienced harassment of any kind, Turvataitokasvatus takes the parental aspect a step further. In the manual, multiple exercises are dedicated to helping the parent and child communicate better. In addition to this, there is “homework” to be completed in cooperation with a parent. Some of these homework exercises include simply discussing with a parent what has been discussed at school, others require the parent to take an active part in completing the task. One of the exercises, for instance, prompts the parent to play a board game with their child. After the game the parent and child are to discuss what playing together felt like. In addition to methods directed at bettering the child’s relationship to the parents, and vice versa, there are extensive instructions and tips on how to be in contact with the family, and even example letters for the teacher to send them before starting the program. There is also a chapter on instructions on what to do in case of suspected abuse.

When it comes to special needs and diversity in terms of learning styles, the manual does, again, provide tips, tricks and alternative methods that can be executed if the teacher or program executor feels like the proposed exercises do not fit their own style, or the group they are leading. A variety of suggested methods take into account different types of learners. For example, to describe a frightening situation students can write a story, draw a comic, or a picture. This also helps when trying to accommodate different skill and age levels. We do believe that, since the program is aimed at educational professionals, the mere action of providing alternative methods is enough to ensure adequate diversity, and providing excessive details on how to differentiate the practices would be impractical. Especially considering the Finnish context, where teachers are very much trusted with all of the decisions made in the classroom, with the material provided, any professional educator should be able to modify the sessions enough to take all different demographics into account.

However, one peculiarity that we found quite undiscerning was the wording in the program at times: the Finnish language is completely gender-neutral, and therefore it is very easy to avoid situations in which anyone is referred to as specifically a girl or a boy. In the manual, however, there are occasions in which the children were unnecessarily split into groups of

boys and girls. For example exercises in “getting to know each other”, in the beginning of the first activity the manual specifies very clearly to look for “a boy or girl” to work with, when the authors may have just as well said “another student”. There is also a writing exercise with the provided titles: “The world’s coolest boy” and “The world’s loveliest girl” (Originally: *Maailman makein poika, maailman ihanin tyttö*), which are arguably quite supportive of gender stereotypes. Additionally, in some instances the discussion aids mentioned “a trustworthy adult”, but the fill-in exercises that were to be handed to the students mentioned “mom and dad” as the assumed trustworthy adult - why is it that the neutral lingo could not have been continued throughout the entire manual? However, it must also be said that there are multiple instances where neutrality is consciously emphasized: in an exercise that includes pictures where children must imagine their own bodies into the position of a drawn image, the pictures are purposefully drawn as gender-neutral, as to make it easier for children to relate to the picture. All this taken into account, it has to be considered that the original edition of the manual was written in 2005. While it is only six years ago (at the moment of writing this thesis), the discussion on gender neutrality has only surfaced in the past couple of years. In addition, we feel that an educational professional who is updated on current issues should be able to work their way around the vocabulary used - especially with the majority of the manual being as neutral as it is.

As mentioned under the *Perpetrator's identity* heading, the perpetrator is most often someone who is known to the child. Therefore it is extremely important that children are not warned of just “stranger danger” (perpetrators who are unknown to the child). The discussion should be kept on a more general level - concentrating on acceptable touches, no matter who the toucher is. Fortunately Turvataitokasvatus has specific activities that are directed towards ensuring the child is protected from all harmful touches, no matter who the potential offender is. Again, this is done from a child-centered perspective, taking into account how the child feels about the touches. Overall, when talking about red light touches, it is emphasized that whoever the toucher (or the person who makes the child touch them), the child is never to blame. While we feel that there could always be even more emphasis on unguilting the child. Since feeling guilty about what has happened is one of the possible negative effects of these programs, we could conclude that making sure the issue is discussed every time after talking about touches is a reasonable action.

Where the program is lacking is teacher training. As we quoted Nation (et al- 2003. 450), a good program should have well-trained staff. While the manual provides a lot of information for teachers, there are no training possibilities or actual teacher training materials provided. While the material is easily understandable, and quite usable as is, if the program is to be implemented widely, it would be helpful if there were online trainings or some other self-teaching materials, as talking about the topics with absolutely no prior training can turn out to be quite difficult. However, the authors have made up for this lack to a reasonable extent by referring to other sources that can be used for self-training. In addition there are tips on how to prepare for difficult discussions and confrontations, as well as a paragraph on useful topics to study before starting. This comes to show that this disadvantage is not one that cannot be overcome.

While there is a good variety of methods in the knowledge section, we found that at times there was a lack of practicing of skills. Most of the program concentrates on ensuring children have the necessary knowledge and information to resist in potential abusers, but there is not much chance for them to put this knowledge into practice. We feel that even in discussion, children should be prompted to apply what they have learnt instead of merely acting as an echo for what has been discussed. Given that according to research, discussion and information or knowledge should not be relied on too much, but the emphasis should be more on the development of skills (Nation et al 2003, 450-451), we feel that it would be beneficial to add some less abstract exercises into especially the part of the manual where touches are discussed. Yet again, it has to be taken into account that the recipients are children, which means that the exact method of going into more detail, or having more practical exercises, is not especially easy to choose. While we did find in our theoretical framework that discussion is one of the best ways to minimize anxiety in children, we do still feel that there should be a wider variety of methods used. To be precise, a wider variety of active, non-conversational methods would be helpful.

What we found interesting and worth mentioning - although somewhat unimportant to the program itself - was the fact that it has been available for years, but there is no Swedish translation of the program. Swedish is the second official language of Finland, and all official papers are always available in both languages. The fact that the program is not translated means that a large minority of the Finnish population is unable to use the program as is. Most Swe-

dish-speakers in Finland are able to fully communicate in Finnish, however, which is why we did not deem this detail worth more than a short mention.

Conclusion

Overall, Turvataitokasvatus is a good and comprehensive program that takes into account most of the problems that arise in our theoretical framework and in many of the previous studies conducted on similar programs. While it is lacking in some aspects of diversity, the problems are mostly quite superficial, and do not in themselves hinder the viability of the program. When it comes to methodology, the program is also very inclusive, and it takes into account not only different kinds of learners, but there is a chance to modify the content for minority groups as well. The program also takes into account the child's parents, and any problems the teacher may have with relaying the idea of SA prevention education to adults. There is help for contacting the adults in form of a letter template. Turvataitokasvatus also takes into account that emotional education is very important: there is an extensive section on teaching children to recognize their own feelings.

5.3 Cool and Safe

There are multiple reasons as to why we chose Cool and Safe as our final prevention program. The first reason was the list of rewards, achievements and recognition it had earned through the European Union. For a program to receive such recognition especially when it was only implemented in 2013 obligated us to take it into consideration, and to use it as a contrast for the Stay Safe Prevention program that has successfully been meeting its own goals for years.

Furthermore, what captured our attention was the program's approach towards CSA. Unlike Turvataitokasvatus and Stay Safe, Cool and Safe uses online activities to meet its goals. Its uniqueness was a defining reason as to why we decided to consider it in our thesis. In addition, the goals it tackles are also unique; naturally it focuses on the same themes related to SA. Nevertheless, Cool and Safe also focuses on more modern issues such as cyberbullying, messaging strangers and the abuses that come with that. Additionally, studies such as one led by Kenny (2007, 677; Müller et al. 2014, 61) have demonstrated that online prevention programs could be used effectively to inform and improve knowledge on different aspects of health and prevention, permitting the children a safe and anonymous environment to ask and learn questions at any hour of the day that in public they may shy away from.

We also chose Cool and Safe for its flexibility. The previous programs mentioned in this thesis have a timeframe and clear instructions as to how it should be implemented; and while Cool and Safe has a specific order of how it should be done, the length of the program is in its own way up to the user. In other words if the player wishes to play the game in an interval of every two years it is technically possible. If it is implemented by a teacher, the time taken as well as the structure of how and when it is implemented might be different and vary, than if the child chooses to play the educational games at home during their free time.

Advantages and disadvantages

An immediate advantage of the Cool and Safe program is its ethical evaluation, in other words all the content found in the program has undergone an ethical evaluation by a group of specialists to insure that it is appropriate for children. Unfortunately, apart from their names and position, little else is told, so one either trusts their qualifications blindly or not. Moreover the program also works closely with other big organizations like SMOG (Schule Machen Ohne Gewalt, School Without Violence) and Mecom Group that also strive to avoid violence and victimization in general. The positive side of working with big companies is the support and the extent of use and attention this program receives, making it more likely for schools to use the program.

For the program itself, the most immediate advantage is its availability to all. Parents, children and teachers can all have access to the program from anywhere around the world. This also makes the program cost effective since once downloading the program, it is accessible at “any time and any place” for anyone interested; be it a child, parent or teacher (Müller et al. 2013).

At the same time, however, the independence it comes with is also the biggest disadvantage of this program. The students are able to play the game in one sitting, which then questions how much information is really retained, and how much the child actually learns and understands. Without any teacher guidance the child could play it for the mere fun of winning, which then removes the aim of learning the skills to prevent SA. Moreover even with the teacher’s guidance there is no security of its success as the teachers are not trained. One could argue that the advantage is that anyone can implement the program, but due to its harsh themes we felt the children would benefit from a trained teacher who felt confident in the material. Additionally, as mentioned in the previous heading, it would be beneficial for the pro-

grams to include a well-trained staff, especially as this can facilitate better relationships with the students and teacher (where a student might feel safe in disclosing personal information) and creating a safe environment to speak freely about the topics (Nation et al. 2003, 450).

The use of the program itself is very easy, one only needs to log into the Cool and Safe page and from there onwards all the steps are explained and marked clearly. This same clarity continues onwards into the games with clear short questions which are also read out loud by their mascot Smoggy. Unfortunately the program is only offered for children between the ages of seven to twelve; which is comprehensible since the game format makes it perfect for this age group.

Nevertheless, one cannot help feel that it is excluding younger children who could also benefit from this knowledge; regardless Kinnear (1995, p.66) and MacIntyre & Carr (2000, p.68) claim that children under the age of five or seven do not retain or gain any positive results from such preventative programs. We felt that with parent supervision a child under the age of seven could easily participate and still learn from the tasks in an enjoyable and stress-free manner. The program is diverse enough that even second language learners could participate and learn the language as they went along, even though the program does have a heavy German cultural perspective: a study on Cool and Safe showed that children, regardless of their socioeconomic status, were able to participate and show the same results (Müller et al. 2014, p.62).

The structure of the program is unique, as mentioned previously, it is online based and in its own right very different from other prevention programs. The aims are also quite unique as they not only wish to give the students the ability to prevent and protect themselves from danger; but also provide the ability to avoid the negative pattern of violence and victimization. The approach is also quite ingenious as both parents and children can participate and learn together. Furthermore, unlike other prevention programs, during the activities the child also gets informed their lawful rights, as well as their basic safety rights. As a result, the program deals with dangerous behaviors that have arisen with the increased use of the internet, something quite unique to this program (Kenny & Wurtele 2010, 6-8). The definitions start off small and obvious, and slowly increase into more abstract ideas. The way the information is presented is also fun and light, with the game's mascot Smoggy helping and informing the children out. Unlike Stay Safe, the program is modern and the interaction with the game is more pleasant. In addition, the children are able to turn off the game at any point and their

achievements are not lost. While the majority of the learning occurs on their game platform, the children can also be given a work booklet that is filled with puzzles, games and tasks to be completed at the child's own time. Briefly looking through it, it supports the game wonderfully as it goes deeper into the concepts. For example the first game activity is to talk about where is it ok to be touched, and in the booklet one of the tasks is to write down the different body parts and to circle the places that are alright for the child to be touched.

The results are also astonishing in the sense that while the students get more concrete knowledge about their rights and safety, research shows that the children do not become scared or fearful of adults, nor does their trust in them deteriorate. (Müller, Röder & Fingerle 2014). This however may have something to do with the way in which the information is provided, through games and colouring books. Additionally, "results showed an increase in knowledge about secure behavior and secure behavioral intentions. Furthermore, children of the treatment group reported to hide their emotions less." (Müller, Röder & Fingerle 2014). However the studies were not clear if these results were based on the children using the online platform with or without a teacher or adult instructor to guide their learning, as perhaps an adults presence may have an effect on the child's overall learning outcome (e.g. emotional distress, suspicion, etc). Overall this program unlike the previously mentioned ones is quite different in its nature and approach, and shows quite promising results when it comes to combating CSA. Nevertheless there are some drawbacks to the program, for example the possibility of interacting with the program without an instructor and not being able to place the learnt skill into a practical way (Müller et al. 2013).

The solutions provided in the game are also very empowering to the child, unlike the Stay Safe and Turvataitokasvatus program where a lot of the safety features were always related to searching for help from the parents. In the tasks some issues produce other forms of safety such as running towards a crowd, asking help from a nearby crowd, shouting and physically pushing the perpetrator, to name a few. The act of providing more solutions we felt also helps develop the children into safe and smart adults. Since if we reflect from an adult behavioral perspective, when one is placed in a dangerous or unsafe situation you will not shout out "my parent's do not give me permission to do that". Instead by providing children with other safety skill approaches, when growing into adults they will also have a stronger sense of security on how to handle the situation, such as screaming no and pushing away your harasser or running into a busy shop. The children are also given access to information to other adults they

can speak with if they feel unsafe or hurt such as organizations fighting against violence (Müller, Röder & Fingerle 2014)

In general the wording and phrasing of the program's game is good, much critical analysis of the language cannot be done since most of our understanding of the program is through translated snippets produced by online translation programs and dictionaries. Nevertheless certain sentences, regardless of the translation, still have a meaning that could be misunderstood. An example is one of the rights introduced to the child on the platform: the child has the right to his or her own belongings that cannot be taken away from them. A child reading this sentence could believe that their parents confiscating their phone is against their rights, which is incorrect. The images are also quite similar in that they might give the child the understanding that, for example, a harasser is a white bald man. Thankfully certain sections of the game contains text that breaks these stereotypical thoughts, but even this structure is repetitive. The structure of each topic is the same: information, questions with picture or video support, and conclusion. Some may provide an active task but if the child is playing the game at home, she/he may not be able to participate in the task asked.

Differentiation is slightly eased by the fact that everything is also read out loud, and everyone can work at their own pace. The teacher's manual also has clearly explained exercises that are divided up by theme. Additionally each exercise specifies what grade level it is meant for, as well as how long it takes. As a result one can argue that this program while not directed towards special needs, can be modified to suit all types of learning difficulties.

In our theoretical framework we strongly emphasized the importance of parent involvement during the preventative program. Unfortunately Cool and Safe does not necessarily give them active roles. In other words, all the activities support the concept that parents or adults should be integrated when searching for a solution to the problem, either by talking to find solutions or handing over responsibility of the situation to adults who will know what to do. A manual of what a parent should do or how to deal with the situation is not provided, instead the manual contains a summarized text of what the program is, what it will teach and how it is implemented. As a result if the child were to discuss SA with the parent, the parent might not know how to deal with the issue or support the child through the conversation. Moreover if the problem is caused by a parent due their lack of well-being as Lajunen (2012) suggests, then the program is inefficient in avoiding the violence since it is the guardian who is creating the unsafe environment for the child (Lajunen, 2012 22-23).

While the teacher's manual and the activity booklet have a variety of methods, the online platform only focuses on videos and questions. Some studies have found that children learning through multimedia do not learn as effectively as children learning through live plays (Blumberg et al. 1991; Tutty, 1992). This could, to an extent, mean that Cool and Safe is not as effective as some other program with live plays could be. However, another, more recent study by Paranal, Thomas and Derrick (2012) stated that the main issue with online platforms is that most participants simply prefer human-to-human interaction due to it being more interactive - there is a chance to share one's feelings. What could be deduced from this is that as long as there is a chance for children to discuss, there should be no issue with using mainly videos as teaching materials. Paranal and colleagues (2012) actually found that videos tend to be the most engaging part of programs. This is why we see that it is crucial for anyone working with Cool and Safe to use not only the online platform, but the teacher's manual as well, to ensure that children get the verbal interaction they crave.

Conclusion

Cool and Safe in itself is breaking the structure of how we can teach and approach preventative programs on CSA. Unlike other programs it tackles the themes through a mix of online games, activity booklets and school teaching manuals. According to research done by Müller, Röder & Fingerle (2014) the program has a high rate of success without causing any form of anxiety or distrust towards adults in the child's life. Moreover the material provided shows strong hand on content that leaves little room for the students to misunderstand or feel clueless as to how to stay safe. Nevertheless, while the program shows plenty of promise in tackling CSA, there are also shortcomings such as the level of independence the program offers and the level of guidance the program provides to all parties.

What it is lacking is in essence a clearer link to ensure that the online users do not focus on only the online aspects, but also take into account the very extensive teacher's material. From the game itself it is not completely clear how and when the manual should and could be used as a supporting measure for the online platform.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Table 1

Category	Stay Safe	Turvataitokasvatus	Cool and Safe
Duration and repeatability	12 sessions for Junior cycle & 10 sessions for senior cycle (Repeated annually)	Ongoing program with multiple sessions. Easy to repeat.	Possibility to spread over multiple sessions. Easy to repeat.
Age of participants	4 - 12	5-11	7-12
Support for teacher (manual, training possibility)	Teacher & Parent training and manual	Manual	Manual
Accessibility	All material free online (English only)	All material free online (Finnish only)	All material free online (German and French only, to be translated into English)
Diversity	No, however includes lesson plan adjustments for “Special Educational Needs” (e.g. hearing impairments)	Easy to modify for diverse groups, but sometimes normative.	Very tied to the German cultural context
Perpetrator diversity	Basic	Different perpetrators are taken well into account	No
Un-guiling child	Yes, after each session	Yes	Almost not at all
Emphasis on skills	Yes (e.g. assertiveness, avoiding feeling unsafe, etc.)	Partial focus	No in the online materials but yes in the teacher manual
Prompt to talk to adult	Yes	Yes	Skills learnt prompt adult interaction

Table 1 demonstrates and summarizes the key features we identified as important based on our analytical framework in a CSA preventative program. We decided on these key features based on our theoretical framework, and the table is simply here for a simple review of what the main differences and similarities between the three programs are. These key features have an impact on the success or failure of the program, which we will explain more thoroughly in the discussion below.

By briefly observing the table we can see key similarities such as the accessibility of the program and the need to interact with an adult. However the rest of the features are different. Regardless of their differences the analysis of the prevention programs demonstrated an overall positive result. The studies suggest that our various programs do achieve certain goals, such as teaching the concept of SA (be it abstract or concrete terms) and skills in self-protection (Finkelhor 2009; Bolen 2003). The programs tackle the main objectives that Finkelhor & Strapko (1992 cited in Bolen 2003) and Conte and colleagues (1986) suggest when creating a CSA preventative program. The points are as follows:

- ◇ Teaching children the concept of abuse. Including:
 - Knowledge of owning their own body
 - Good touches versus bad touches
 - When a secret should be a secret
- ◇ Teaching children how to react to such situations. Including:
 - Trust of their own feelings
 - Having the ability to say no
- ◇ Discovering their support network. Including:
 - Encouraging children to report abuse to an adult

6.1.1 Theoretical Background and Evidence on Success

Regardless of our three preventative programs providing activities with strong theoretical frameworks and concrete examples, there is a lack of conclusive evidence to show that these programs have brought the number of victims down (Finkelhor 2009). Particularly when we remember that one of the key issues of SA in general is the lack of people disclosing the information or seeking out professional help. (Bolen 2003; Finkelhor, 2009). Nevertheless we

feel that the programs have definitely achieved the goal of sparking and opening the platform to discuss CSA and other similar violence. Particularly in the Stay Safe program, a study was made that demonstrated the number of children who were speaking up about their experiences had increased since the launch of Stay Safe (The Irish Times 2002; Macintyre et al. 2000, 200). Unfortunately there are no similar studies conducted in the context of the preventative programs, but we feel they are similar enough in content. Therefore we believe that if a study were to be conducted, similar results would arise.

In addition, Finkelhor and Dziuba-Leatherman (1995 as cited by Bolen 2003) state that while the child may enjoy and feel very informed during the program, the final product is an anxiety-induced child. Unfortunately studies have shown that children who undergo preventative programs have more fear of future abuse, and of adults in general (Finkelhor and Dziuba-Leatherman 1995, 132). While this may be partially true with the Stay Safe program, with studies showing a small percentage of children feeling anxiety towards their safety; the Cool and Safe and Turvataitokasvatus programs promise positive results (Lajunen et al. 2012; Macintyre et al. 2000, 200; Müller, Röder & Fingerle 2014). This might have a lot to do with the culture both programs are set, however it seems doubtful as the Finnish program is more abstract when compared to the German program that is clearer and more specific with the dangers. Nevertheless one could argue about the space of discussion. In other words, while the three programs have an open discussion time during the lesson, the way it may be implemented might differ in Germany and Finland due to the open culture, when comparing it to the Irish (catholic) culture. The space to discuss and share opinions might be more restricted resulting in more anxiety for the students in Ireland.

6.1.2 Cultural Influences Affecting the Program

Another example of what we deducted as a cultural difference between the programs was the approach to topics, for example, abduction. In Turvataitokasvatus, the Finnish program, while there are concrete examples as well, most issues are discussed based on feelings: if the child does not feel safe, they should not act. However, in the German Cool and Safe many situations are talked about very directly through very specific scenarios. The teacher's manual goes as far as suggesting an exercise where the students are taken out to the parking lot, where the teacher is to show how far away they need to stand from the car in order to ensure an adult cannot reach them from the window. While Stay Safe does not go as far as Cool and Safe, it is

definitely on the more practical side: they work with specific examples, such as how far away you should stay from a stranger's car, they do not go into the specifics of showing children exactly what could happen. A similar pattern can be seen in other instances as well. Taken the information we have, and the studies that are available, we are unfortunately unsure whether this difference in approaches is simply a cultural one - and will therefore yield similar results if all countries were to be compared directly - or if the skills the children learn actually end up being significantly different. If the latter is the case, we believe that it would be important to ensure the implementation of all these different methods and approaches regardless of the culture to ensure that all aspects are optimally covered.

6.1.3 Consent, Empowerment and Un-guiling of the Participants

Rispens (et al, 1997, as Cited by Bolen 2003) raised the question of whether children are able to relate what they learned to the situations that actually take place. From what we can deduct one would assume that the children should have no problem in putting into practice their learnt knowledge. This is due to the fact that each lesson or topic the children learn during the program is very practical, with concrete examples on how to handle the situation. An example of how the information is dealt with in all programs is; the child is at the park when a stranger approaches them, what should they do? The lesson continues to then discuss and collect information on how to deal with the situation and why. What we would argue is the methods and tools that the children receive to deal with the situation. Both Turvataitokasvatus and Stay Safe aim at having the child rely on their parents or familiar adults for help, with safety skill suggestions such as call your parents, talk to your teacher, to name a few. The German Cool and Safe provides further tools to deal with the problem without solely relying on their parents. We felt this is aimed at empowering the child since these skills will more likely to be used--as they are not embarrassing to use in front of other peers--and are useful for when they become adults. An example we provided previously would be of when you are in an unsafe situation to seek out a busy street or shop for safety, or to even shout out for help.

In our theoretical framework we also talked about the importance of consent. As a term, "consent" is not introduced to the children in the vocabulary of the programs. Consent could be defined as a "positive cooperation by both parties where both people can appreciate both the nature of the act and the consequences of the acts they are agreeing to" (Sax 2009, 34). When it comes to the legal side of what constitutes as consent and what not, we believe that since

these programs are directed towards 4-12 year-olds, there is no need to get into the details of legislation: when talking about minors in their late teens, this is often a topic of discussion when the minor has consented, but the other party is 18, or older. However, the children in our target group are so young, sexual touches of any kind from an adult or an older minor are always wrong. Taking all this into account, we believe that in the case of such young children, what is most important is to ensure that the children know they 1) have the right to say no, and 2) are not to blame if their “no” is not respected.

Whatley and Trudell (1988) state that empowering children to say no may also make them feel guilty if they, in an abusive situation, are unable to say no, or something happens regardless of their resistance. According to Finkelhor (2009), the child may feel that they should have known what to do, should have prevented it, so on. Therefore, it is important to ensure that the child understands they are not to blame for anything that happens to them. It is also important for all programs to remind children of this. Stay Safe prompts un-guilty discussion after every session. Turvataitokasvatus does it as well, but only with the sessions that are specifically on unwanted touches. Meanwhile the Cool and Safe manual does not prompt this type of discussion at all, and the game only had a pair of pop-up windows, where the child is reminded not to blame themselves.

6.1.4 Terminology Used in the Program and Manuals

The terms the instructors use in each of our programs also differ. For example both the Stay Safe and Turvataitokasvatus implement their lessons without using concrete words to explain bad touches and good touches. The Stay Safe program with fifth and sixth graders did expect the children to know the body parts but unless the child used the words the instructor was suggested to use the term “private parts” to explain bad touches. We felt that this decision to maintain the terms abstract was understandable due to their catholic culture but for Finland to follow suit was difficult to understand the reasoning. Based on the manual, we deduced that Turvataitokasvatus chose to use abstract terms as their activities are supposed to be child-led, which consequently would mean that the terms used would need to be familiar to the child. The Cool and Safe on the other hand had more concrete visual support regardless that their age group is children: Throughout the manual the instructor appears to have the need to make a difference between the male private parts and the female private parts, which we saw no reason to separate especially when the age group is young children and the parts referred to as

“private parts” are located in the same area of the body. We also felt that by removing the gender neutrality of the activity it became an emphasis of the differences between the genders, which should be irrelevant when it came to good and bad touches. Kenny and Wurtele (2010) support the need to pay attention to vocabulary in prevention programs by stating that children should be taught the real name for their genitalia: this may even protect them from abuse, as perpetrators who notice a child using the correct terminology are more likely to realize that the child has been educated in CSA prevention.

6.1.5 Training Staff

Out of the three programs we used for our thesis, only Stay Safe has requirements for staff to be trained in order to be a facilitator. Having to have trained staff to execute the program is a difficult concept: on one hand, the pros of having training is that the facilitator is more likely to be comfortable discussing difficult topics, will most probably not be baffled with questions, and will be able to read the symptoms in students who may have been abused. Casper (1999, 107-112) supports teachers or staff being as knowledgeable as possible by stating that in order to reduce anxiety, the facilitator must be able and ready to answer any questions in order to show that there is no reason to fear. However, programs that need a trained professional are often offered as a paid service where the staff comes to the school and gives a workshop, or an information day.

This fortunately does not apply for Stay Safe, as, first of all, training is freely available for primary schools all over Ireland through sponsors. Secondly, as mentioned, the facilitators are not outside staff, but training is provided directly to the teachers. Unfortunately, in countries where this is not the case, many times schools in lower income areas cannot afford these workshops, and as we have pointed out, children from low-income families are already the ones with underdeveloped safety skills. While the situation in Ireland would be optimal, as this way teachers would both know the children personally, and be trained to deliver workshops and lessons, it is unfortunately simply not realistic in most cases. Additionally, Topping and Barron doubt whether training will actually leave teachers confident enough to feel like they can successfully deliver the program (2009, 434). For school programs to be cost-effective, teachers should be given enough tools, and a manual to work with, in order to enable and support them in the discussions they are to have - as has been done on part of Cool and Safe as well as Turvataitokasvatus.

6.1.6 Role of the Parents

An issue that some teachers can face when talking about difficult topics is either the resistance of parents, or possible misunderstandings or miscommunications between school and home as to what is going to be discussed. All three of the programs addressed the issues of contacting parents in a similar manner: they had either a template for an info letter, a guide on how to contact parents in order to ensure they understand what and why is being discussed, or both. The programs supported the idea of keeping communication between school and home, especially when talking about potentially very emotional topics such as CA, nonetheless we feel it is simply not enough in itself. Since parents are always a role model for children's learning (Guha 2013, 4), we strongly believe that parents should be included in the learning process. Unfortunately while Cool and Safe does not prevent parents from taking part in the online game, neither do they actively encourage parents to work on the topics at home with the student. Stay Safe and Turvataitokasvatus, on the other hand, both have "homework exercises" that can be sent home for the student to complete with a parent. This in itself already actively involves the learning process of their child, which according to MacIntyre and Carr (2000, 70) could lead to a higher program success rate. However, some programs only prompted adults to tell the children to talk about it, while others actually had exercises for children to take home, in order to ease the opening of the metaphorical conversational door. This is why we see that it is important for programs to not only prompt children to talk, but aim to provide them with tools and skills necessary to open the conversation - a task that is not always easy, even for adults. We also felt that this as a result would assist again in removing the child's guilt over the situation, as parents would be burdening the weight as well.

In addition to homework, the Stay Safe program provides not only teachers, but parents with training on how to tackle the issues of CA and CSA. This training could have a double positive effect on the success of the program: Krane (2003, 74-75) argues that this type of training can also provide support for parents who were possibly victims, which would in turn lead to them being more prone to stopping the cycle of abuse. Training parents also enables them to speak of the topics at hand more freely, to recognize signs of abuse in their children, and be able to react to any potentially harmful situations in a manner that will be of a good example to the child. What Topping and Barron (2009, 432) say further supports the inclusion, if not training of parents in the process: as stated in our theoretical framework, especially children from families where sex and sexuality are not an open topic are less likely to retain

knowledge, as they are not prone to further discussing the matters at home, nor do they often have prior knowledge on the issues.

6.1.7 Perpetrator's Identity

We have talked about the importance of the perpetrator's identity being portrayed realistically. Out of our three programs we felt that Turvataitokasvatus fulfilled the goal of ensuring a wide spectrum of perpetrators was portrayed: the examples almost never specified the gender or looks that should be attributed to a potential abuser. While Cool and Safe did good overall, especially in the manual, our main issue was that the videos in the first three modules of the internet platform game were very stereotypical: they portrayed the "bad people" (potentially threatening situations) as 30-40 year-old men, and "good people" (non-threatening situations) were often older women. However, the last module did emphasize that no one, even your own grandmother, is allowed to touch you if you do not wish to be touched. The program we had most issues with when it comes to portraying the perpetrators was Stay Safe. Most of the time, when the perpetrators were verbally discussed or depicted it was implied that they were male. When they were clearly identified, it was always the uncle, stepfather, or mother's boyfriend, in the family context. Most pictures were also of presumably an Irish man with a hat, reinforcing the original "stranger danger" stereotype of a perpetrator. We felt that especially in the cases of Cool and Safe and Stay Safe it would be crucial to ensure that the perpetrators are portrayed in a more diverse manner. Overall, all three programs still concentrated excessively on "stranger danger", especially when taking into account that only about 15% of cases are a result of abuse by someone the child has no prior connection to (Finkelhor, 2009; Sax 2009, 39).

In addition to issues with the diversity of perpetrators, something we noticed all programs have is that they mostly concentrate on adults as abusers. According to Finkelhor (2009) and Kinnear (1995, 17-25) about a third of all offenders are minors. While all programs did, to some extent, mention that unwanted touches are bad even from other children by talking about good and bad touches on a general level, when it came to actual examples the perpetrator or toucher was most often an adult. We feel that these examples, paired with the programs almost always talking about the "adult" (not the "perpetrator" or "toucher", as a more general and neutral term) as the responsible one, could cause children to assume the perpetrator is always an adult.

While the representation of perpetrators may not have been as diverse as would have been optimal, we do believe that overall all three programs did a reasonable job when it comes to protecting children from different types of offenders. Although some examples insinuate that the abuser always fits a certain demographic, the main message that all programs bring forth is to ensure that children are empowered to say no whenever and wherever they feel unsafe.

Another insinuation that the programs also make is the location. In Stay Safe the location is, in many examples, the mall. In Cool and Safe the location in almost all the videos is a park. As with the perpetrator's identity, while the location is not specifically limited to just parks or malls, always using similar examples may cause students to misunderstand and believe that they do not need to be careful in locations other than the ones mentioned. We believe the programs should use a myriad of different examples, not only in the case of the location or the perpetrator. This would ensure that the fears of the likes of Bolen (2003, 176) and other theorists, who believe that there are too many variables in abuse for children to be able to effectively learn to reject the abuser in all situations, would be unfounded.

It must be added that the breaking of stereotypes is not only important in ensuring that children are able to relate to all types of situations, but it also ties together with empowerment: for instance, breaking the stereotype of only girls being victims further empowers boys who have been victimized to speak up (Research in Practice, 2015). The same applies not only to boys as victims, but also the location, the perpetrator, and the situation the abuse happened in. Through stereotyping, society and the prevention programs only reinforce the idea of what does and does not constitute as abuse. As long as it is insinuated that only tall, bald men in trench coats with a van and candy can be perpetrators, we are not empowering victims of all kinds to speak up.

6.1.8 Conclusion

In order to draw a conclusion we must refer back to the beginning of this chapter of the thesis. We deduced that there are three main points that should be filled for a CA prevention program to be successful:

1. Teaching children the concept of abuse
2. Teaching children how to react to such situations

3. Discovering their support network

(Adapted from Finkelhor & Strapko, 1992 cited in Bolen 2003 and Conte, cited Kinnear 1995, 67)

In conclusion, we can say that each of our programs are different in their approach on discussing and tackling the issue. However, they all share the common goal of teaching the concept of sexual abuse, skills in self-protection, and ways to implement it. They all teach children what abuse is by talking about good and bad touches. Although slightly varied from one to the other, they all instruct children on what to do, were they to come across a potentially harmful situation. All programs encourage children to talk to adults. All programs have areas in which they were either clearly lacking, or that the others simply did better. One fault that all programs had was the excess of insinuation towards who the perpetrator is, and in the future, we do see a need for yet more diversity when it comes to the examples given.

In addition to the main points above adapted from Finkelhor and Strapko (1992, cited in Bolen 2003) and Conte and colleagues (1986) do not take into account the cultural aspect: the success of the program depends highly on whether the program is culturally relevant or not. Regardless of these flaws, we felt that the majority of them were minor enough to still enable any teacher from any part of the world the possibility to implement the lesson plans in their own classroom making small adjustments to better consider the cultural context of their classroom as, in the end, the teacher is the best expert on what the children within their four walls need, and how they may react to it. While here no one is correct in the way to implement a preventative program, our findings will hopefully help teachers avoid the most commonly agreed upon flaws in order to ensure the best possible result.

RELIABILITY AND ETHICAL DISCUSSION

While Kirk and Miller (1986) describe objectivity as “the essential basis of all good research”, Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) remind us that there is no such thing as absolute objectivity – our opinions, feelings, thoughts and backgrounds are interwoven into everything we do, say and see, thus affecting how we conduct research, or analyze and interpret the results. They state that without objectivity, the reader has no real reason to trust the researcher’s outcomes – unless they have some already established respect for the researcher in question. Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) also state that it is not about removing our subjectivity from the research, but recognizing it in everything we do and interpret. All four authors agree that to reach the highest possible outcome in objectivity, validity and reliability must be maximized. At its best, ensuring that your research measures what it is supposed to, ensuring that the researcher’s subjective desires don’t affect the outcome and results. (Auerbach & Silverstein 2003; Kirk & Miller 1986). And as a result avoiding extreme perspectives and falling into stereotypical thought processes (Wilson 2013, 92).

While we can very well recognize our own biases, what we cannot completely account for are those of the original researchers. As our chosen method of research relies completely on other researcher’s work and, arguably always subjective points of view, we see that ensuring not only our own objectivity, but that of the original researchers - to the greatest extent we possibly can - is something we need to look into carefully. Initially, we were somewhat concerned about what we called “double subjectivity”, or applying our subjective analysis on research that was already subjectively conducted – therefore risking a complete misrepresentation of the facts. Furthermore we need to ensure that the activities and the analysis of the components of the activity are done so that it is not difficult for other teachers to implement them into their own classrooms if they choose so (Thomas 2005, 65).

As mentioned, tight scrutiny of sources was, throughout the process, more important than anything in our case. We paid careful attention to make sure all our sources are preferably peer-reviewed, or otherwise reviewed or written by experts in the field. Using multiple sources, comparing the results carefully between one research and the other, and using all the information available, we determined which sources were reliable and consistent enough to

include in this thesis, in order to increase the reliability and validity of our research. Whenever a piece of research that did not comply with what we had previously read came up, we looked into what caused these differences, and whether they could be explained simply by how the study was conducted, or whether one, or all, of the studies is invalid or unreliable. What additionally aided us was working together as a team. While we collaborated fully, we still worked as our own individual selves, and therefore were able to point out each other's subjective conclusions, before they altered the results of the entire thesis.

Furthermore, we attempted to insure that the literature we used did not discriminate other arguments, providing us with a balanced and varied argument (Wilson 2013, 41). The attempt to maintain a balanced argumentative thesis was difficult since some of our information was not available in the academic literature section, nevertheless we ensured that the material used from what is considered "grey literature" was relevant and necessary for our thesis. This was done by looking at the information provided closely and seeing how it worked with the information previously found from what could be considered more reliable sources; for example in the preventative programs heading where the information was at times limited we established a list of requirements so that the headings were balanced.

If an argument or a point of view was missing and we could not find it in the academic literature section, were we then permitted to search under other non-academic sources, keeping in mind that the information may be biased and molded to sell the program for the reader, or that the generalizations have no proper support (Wilson 2013, 54). We also recognize that only using secondary data has its limitations. For instance, Kothari (2004 111) warns that researchers must be careful when using secondary data, as we do in this research: it is not always easy to tell if the data is reliable, suitable and adequate. In essence, the researcher should be very mindful of who the data was collected by, when, for what purpose, and whether that purpose was fulfilled to a satisfactory degree. We were at times forced to also use secondary sources as many of the studies we would have found interesting to include directly in our thesis were blocked from our use either due to financial or geographical reasons: we often found the original source but it would have cost to fully access it. Some sources would have been available at libraries in places we were unfortunately unable to access due to time constraints.

Keeves and McKenzie (1997, 236) argue that another risk that may arise with our research is the lack of proper coherent theory. Much of a teacher's theoretical base is "highly fragmented" and only aims to point out the "priority areas" (Keeves & McKenzie 1997, 236). If we

consider our own criteria of how we picked the programs, one could argue that it is based on fragmented theories and does not fully have theoretical support. Nevertheless we must also consider that the programs are directed towards children, and as a result much of our choices are also based on experience. Since theory can only go so far to understand the perplexities and needs of the human race. Therefore, while we did create our criteria to a certain extent based on our own personal knowledge formed by our experience, we also used the limited theoretical fragments that support our choices. And as mentioned previously, the advantage of working in pairs is that we can both observe and question each other to ensure that the theory and criteria we follow is as coherent as possible.

CONCLUSION

We have finally reached the end of our thesis. The journey has been long, but educational and fruitful. We are left with a few points of discussion that we believe are outside the spectrum of our thesis, but crucial to the discussion on preventative programs. These are some issues we believe should and could be addressed in future researches.

The first point we wish to address is the independence, or lack thereof, the students have in terms of working throughout the programs. While Turvataitokasvatus and Stay Safe have no possibilities for students to do any independent work without the teacher explicitly giving them the task, the Cool and Safe program, for instance, allows the students to work independently on the internet platform, as well as the activity booklet. However, even with this level of independence, the aims of the exercises do not come across without the discussions led or facilitated by a teacher or other adult. Nevertheless the studies led by Müller and colleagues (2014) show that independent work could be successful, as there is not always an adult capable of guiding the learning process. We see a need for researching the possibilities and benefits of creating a more independent program where the student can investigate safety skills without the need of supervision. On the other hand, part of this research would be to find a way to ensure students are motivated or inclined to do said independent work.

Our next point ties very well with the previous statement, as not only do the students need to be motivated, but so do the parents as their collaboration supports the success of the preventative program. The question is, however, how do we get parents to see the benefits of completing the “homework” that comes with the program? Turvataitokasvatus already had examples of tasks that can be sent home with the students. Stay Safe tackles the problem through teacher-parent trainings, showing the parents the importance of their parent’s participation. What would be interesting to find out whether parents actually see this type of collaboration as meaningful, and whether they are ready to put in the effort in order to see the positive results.

Melton (1992 as cited by Bolen 2003) points out that the power discrepancy between child and adult is often so great that no matter what the children are taught, it may not be enough to empower them to actually take action. Elliott, Browne and Kilcoyne (1995 as cited by Bolen 2003) actually found that “teaching children to say no was only effective if they were not alone when they were first approached. Once the offender was alone with the child, resistance was likely to lead to injury.” However MacIntyre (et al. 2000, 202-204) states that by provid-

ing these preventative programs we are breaking the adult-child dynamic, by allowing the child to know that they can be right, and that the adults can be wrong as well. The issue with MacIntyre's (2000) statement here is the fact that she is one of the creators of Stay Safe, so the dilemma arises as to how true and unbiased is her statement. More research opposing or supporting Melton (1992) would be necessary before any final conclusions could be drawn.

During our research in the seek of what consent means, and the role it has in producing preventative programs, we came across a dilemma. Much of the concept of consent is contradictory and abstract, we would suggest more research on defining power balances and maturity levels is required. The knowledge of clearer terms would help programs aimed towards teenagers or secondary school children who are beginning to actively seek out sexual relationships. It is common to find in the news teenagers who have had sexual intercourse with their teacher, and admit to loving each other--even after the law has reinforced the rules upon them. Would that not then signify that their actions have been done by two "consenting adults" who are both mature enough to share power and enjoy the sexual actions? While we discussed on the matter, we realized that our verdict changed depending on our cultural background as well as the country we used to view the case. When we read further the theory that would give a concluding answer to our questions we found that there was a lack of information. And so for the sake of secondary school children, a research expanding these terms, we feel, would drastically improve programs aimed towards preventing CSA for them.

As our final point, we would like to challenge future researchers to seek the following answer: Are preventative programs the most cost-effective method of reaching the desired learning outcomes to prevent CSA? The reason we ask this crucial question is because in Finland, for instance, there are already laws in place dictating that cities and municipalities are required to arrange preventative child protection measures, through youth work, education, at a pediatric office, to name a few (3§a Lastensuojelulaki cited in Finlex.). In the Finnish context, most schools already apply some sort of CSA prevention education system in place. It would be interesting to find out, however, if school-based programs are in fact the most efficient solution in making a difference.

Whatever conclusions or research made we must always keep in mind that the results will never be definitive since the topic of CSA is one that many do not disclose openly. Nevertheless any information we gather in the search for answers brings us closer to forming stronger opinions and programs to tackle the current dilemma.

In conclusion it has been a pleasure working together and creating a thesis that can support and assist teachers in implementing CSA preventative programs in their classroom setting. We can only hope that the information we felt was useful was helpful for them as well. Altogether we have worked well together, supporting our learning styles and learning process. Moreover we have encouraged each other to question the variety of sources we found to produce the most unbiased material possible. If for reasons unbeknown to us this thesis results to be useless to a teacher we wish to impart a small suggestion, each classroom is a different world, and there is so much theories can assist in producing programs fit for each class. We encourage teachers to use materials and modify them to fit their children and their diverse classrooms, regardless of how the program is planned out. The most crucial aspects of a preventive program should be to reach every child's learning needs, provide a safe environment in which open discussions and questions can arise (to reduce anxiety) and develop their safety skills; such as saying no, dealing with unsafe environments and so on.

REFERENCES

- Annitto, M. (2011). Consent, Coercion, and Compassion: Emerging Legal Responses to the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Minors. *Yale Law & Policy Review*, 30(1), 1-70.
- Auerbach, C. F., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative Data : An Introduction to Coding and Analysis*. New York: NYU Press.
- Barron, I. G, Miller, D. J, & Kelly, T. B. (2015) School-Based Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Programs: Moving Toward Resiliency-Informed Evaluation, *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 24(1), 77-96. doi: 10.1080/10538712.2015.990175
- Bolen, R. M. (2003). Child Sexual Abuse: Prevention or Promotion?. *Social Work*, 48(2), 174-185.
- Casper, R.M.S. (1999) Characteristics of Children Who Experience Positive or Negative Reactions to a Sexual Abuse Prevention Program, *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 7:4, 97-112, DOI: 10.1300/J070v07n04_07
- Cohen, J. A., & Mannarino, A. P. (2000). *Predictors of treatment outcome in sexually abused children* doi:[https://doi-org.pc124152.oulu.fi:9443/10.1016/S0145-2134\(00\)00153-8](https://doi-org.pc124152.oulu.fi:9443/10.1016/S0145-2134(00)00153-8)
- Collins, S. & Duff, S. (2016) The Precondition Model as a Method for Developing Understanding of Female Contact and Non-Contact Sex Offending: A Single Case Study, *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 15:1, 111-124, DOI: [10.1080/14999013.2016.1138345](https://doi.org/10.1080/14999013.2016.1138345)
- Conte, J., Rosen, C., Saperstein, L. (1986) An analysis of programs to prevent the sexual victimization of children. *Journal of Primary Preention*, 6:3, 141-155.
- Elliott, M., Browne, K., & Kilcoyne, J. (1995). Child sexual abuse prevention: What offenders tell us. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 19, 579-594.
- Feelgood, S., & Hoyer, J. (2008). Child molester or paedophile? sociolegal versus psychopathological classification of sexual offenders against children. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 14(1), 33-43.
- Finland, Finlex. (2007, April 13). *Lastensuojelulaki*. Retrieved May 12, 2018, from <http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/2007/20070417>
- Finkelhor, D. (2009). The Prevention of Childhood Sexual Abuse. *Future Of Children*, 19(2), 169-194.
- 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.

- Giardino, A. P. (2016). *Child Maltreatment : Emerging Issues in Practice, Care and Prevention*. Hauppauge, New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Guha, S. (2013). *Today's Youth, Tomorrow's Leaders : How Parents and Educators Can Influence and Guide the Learning Process*. Lanham, Maryland: R&L Education.
- Kenny, M. C. (2007). Web-based training in child maltreatment for future mandated reporters. *Child Abuse & Neglect: The International Journal*, 31(6), 671-678.
- Kenny, M. C., & Wurtele, S. K. (2010). Child sexual abuse prevention: Choosing, implementing, and evaluating a personal safety program for young children. In K. L. Kaufman (Ed.), *The prevention of sexual violence: A practitioner's sourcebook* (pp. 303-317). Halloway, MA: NEARI Press.
- Krane, J. (2003). *What's Mother Got to Do with It? Protecting Children from Sexual Abuse*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated.
- Kinnear, K. L. (1995). *Childhood Sexual Abuse*. Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO.
- Kirk, J. & Miller, M. L. (1986). *Qualitative Research Methods: Reliability and validity in qualitative research*. SAGE Publications Ltd
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology : Methods & Techniques*. New Delhi: New Age International.
- Lajunen, K., Andell, M., Jalava, L., Kemppainen, K., Pakkanen, M., & Ylenius-Lehtonen, M. (2012). *Turvataitoja lapsille* (6th ed.). Tampere: Juvenes Print.
- Lajunen, K. Andell, M & Ylenius-Lehtonen, M. (2015) *Tunne- ja turvataitoja lapsille*. THL.
- MacIntyre, D., & Carr, A. (2000). *Prevention of Child Sexual Abuse in Ireland: The Development and Evaluation of the Stay Safe Programme* (Vol. 38). Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Macintyre, D., Carr, A., Lawlor, M., & Flattery, M. (2000). Development of the Stay Safe Programme: Child Abuse Review 9:3, 200-216. *Child Abuse Review*,9, 200-216. doi:10.1002/car.709
- MacIntyre, D., & Lawlor, M. (2016). *The Stay Safe Programme: 5th and 6th Class*. Child Abuse Prevention Programme. Retrieved February 17, 2018, from <http://www.staysafe.ie/teachers/56%20class.pdf>
- Maureen C. Kenny , Sandy K. Wurtele & Laura Alonso (2012) Evaluation of a Personal Safety Program with Latino Preschoolers, *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 21(4), 368-385, DOI: 10.1080/10538712.2012.675426
- McLeod D.A. & Craft, M.L. (2015) Female Sexual Offenders in Child Sexual Abuse Cases: National Trends Associated with Child Protective Services System Entry, Exit, Utiliza-

- tion, and Socioeconomics, *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 9:4, 399-416, DOI: 10.1080/15548732.2015.1064849
- Mennen, F. E., Kim, K., Sang, J., & Trickett, P. K. (2010). Child neglect: Definition and identification of youths experiences in official reports of maltreatment. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 34(9), 647-658. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2010.02.007
- Müller, A. R., Hein, S., & Fingerle, M. (2013). *Web-based Trainings for the Prevention of Child Sexual Abuse*. Reading presented in Goethe Universität, Frankfurt.
- Müller, A. R., Röder, M., Fingerle, M. (2014). Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Goes Online: Introducing “Cool and Safe” and its Effects. *Computers & Education*, 78, 60-65.
- N.A. (2002, October 22). Stay Safe scheme is due an apology. *The Irish Times*. Retrieved May 10, 2018, from <https://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/stay-safe-scheme-is-due-an-apology-1.1101278>
- Nation, M., Crusto, C.A., Wandersman, K., Kumpfer, L., Seybolt, D., & Morrissey- Kane, E. (2003). What Works in Prevention: Principles of Effective Prevention Programs, *American Psychologist*, 58, 449-456.
- Nemerofsky, A. G., Carran, D. T., & Rosenberg, L. A. (1994). Age Variation in Performance Among Preschool Children in a Sexual Abuse Prevention Program. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 3(1), 85-102. doi:10.1300/j070v03n01_06
- Oliver, P. (2012). *Succeeding with Your Literature Review : A Handbook for Students*. Maidenhead. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Panel on Research on Child Abuse and Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences, and Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences E & National Research. (1993). *Understanding Child Abuse and Neglect*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.
- Paranal, R., Thomas, K. W., & Derrick, C. (2012). Utilizing Online Training for Child Sexual Abuse Prevention: Benefits and Limitations. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 21(5), 507-520. doi:10.1080/10538712.2012.697106
- Opetushallitus (2014). *Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelma*. Retrieved June 25th from https://www.oph.fi/download/163777_perusopetuksen_opetussuunnitelman_perusteet_2014.pdf
- Puzzanchera, C. (2009). Juvenile Arrests 2007. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Retrieved May 27th, 2018 from <http://www.ncjj.org/pdf/225344.pdf>
- Rebocho, M. F. (2012). Sexual predators and prey. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(14), 2770-2789.

- Research in Practice (2015). *Working effectively to Address Child Sexual Exploitation: An evidence scope*. Retrieved June 26th from https://www.rip.org.uk/download/283/CSE_evidencescopeupdateOct17_v2.pdf
- Rispens, J., Aleman, A., & Goudena, P. P. (1997). Prevention of Child Sexual Abuse Victimization: A Meta-Analysis of School Programs. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 21(10), 975-987. doi:10.1016/s0145-2134(97)00058-6
- Sax, R. (2009). *Predators and Child Molesters: What Every Parent Needs to Know to Keep Kids Safe: A Sex Crimes D.A. Answers the 100 Most Asked Questions*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Shaw, J., Lewis, J., Loeb, A., Rosado, J., & Rodriguez, R. (2001). A comparison of Hispanic and African-American sexually abused girls and their families. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 25(1), 1363-1379. doi:10.1016/s0145-2134(00)00224-6
- Taal, M., & Edelaar, M. (1997). *Positive and negative effects of a child sexual abuse prevention program* doi:[https://doi-org.pc124152.oulu.fi:9443/10.1016/S0145-2134\(96\)00179-2](https://doi-org.pc124152.oulu.fi:9443/10.1016/S0145-2134(96)00179-2)
- Thomas, R. M. (2005). *Teachers Doing Research: An Introductory Guidebook*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Topping, K. J., & Barron, I. G. (2009). School-Based Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Programs: A Review of Effectiveness. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 431-463. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/214115490?accountid=13031>
- Tsopelas, C., Tsetsou, S., Ntounas, P., & Douzenis, A. (2012). *Female perpetrators of sexual abuse of minors: What are the consequences for the victims?* doi:<https://doi-org.pc124152.oulu.fi:9443/10.1016/j.ijlp.2012.04.003>
- United Nations (1989), *Convention of the Rights of the Child*. Retrieved December 5th, 2017 from <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/ProfessionalInterest/crc.pdf>.
- US Department of Health and Human Services. (2010). *The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act*. Retrieved May 27, 2018, from <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/cb/capta2010.pdf>
- Walsh, K., Zwi, K., Woolfenden, S. & Shlonsky, A. (2015). School-Based Education Programs for the Prevention of Child Sexual Abuse: A Cochrane Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 28(1).
- Wamser-Nanney, R. (2017) Maternal Support Following Childhood Sexual Abuse: Links to Parent-Reported Children's Outcomes. *Child Abuse & Neglect*. 67, 44-53. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2017.02.023>.

- Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, [Calif.] ; London: SAGE.
- Whatley, M., & Trudell, B. (1988). The Role of the Family in Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Programs. *Journal of Education*, 170(1), 95-106.
- Wilson, E. (2013). *School-Based Research: A Guide for Education Students*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Wolf, M.M. (1978). Social validity: the case for subjective measurement or how applied behavior analysis is finding its heart. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 11, pp. 203-214
- Wyatt, G. E. (1985). The sexual abuse of Afro-American and White-American women in childhood. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 9, 507-519.