

**TRAUMA EXPERIENCES OF THE GROUP MEMBERS
AND HOW THEY ARE DISCUSSED IN THE
JYVÄSKYLÄ MODEL**

Katja Thitz
Anni Tikkakoski
Master's thesis in psychology
Department of Psychology
The University of Jyväskylä
June 2021

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

Department of Psychology

THITZ, KATJA & TIKKAKOSKI, ANNI: Trauma experiences of the group members and how they are discussed in the Jyväskylä Model

Master's thesis, 55 pages, 2 appendices

Supervisor: Juha Holma

Psychology

June 2021

Despite the many findings that indicate that perpetrators of domestic abuse often have traumatic experiences, structured and specific intervention strategies of the trauma aspect aren't usually targeted into IPV treatment programs for perpetrators. Not including these strategies might limit the effectiveness of these treatments. The aim of this study is to determine whether or not the perpetrators talk about their possible traumatic experiences in the Jyväskylä Model and if they do, what kind of experiences they have and how these topics are discussed. We used videotaped therapy sessions and questionnaires for perpetrators as our data. The group consisted of ten participants and three facilitators, one of which served as a substitute. There are very few studies targeted at the therapeutic interventions used in violent behavior treatment programs and few studies of how the traumatic experiences of the perpetrators are discussed by both the perpetrators and the facilitators.

The group members had many adverse childhood experiences as well as some adulthood traumas and these traumatic events were discussed in the group program. The facilitators either focused on the trauma issue or ignored it. When focusing on the trauma topic the facilitators used the traditional methods which can be seen in many different therapeutic interventions. Other ways to focus on the trauma issue were bringing forth the responsibility of the group member, asking questions about the support network of the group member, and the use of humor. When facilitators ignored the trauma talk by leading the conversation to other topics the group members usually followed the facilitators lead. When focusing on the trauma topic the group members usually continued talking about their traumatic experiences.

Keywords: Intimate partner violence, trauma experiences, batterer program, trauma talk, therapeutic discourses, adverse childhood experiences

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Psykologian laitos

THITZ, KATJA & TIKKAKOSKI, ANNI: Jyväskylän ohjelmaan osallistuneiden traumakokemukset ja niistä keskusteleminen ryhmässä

Pro gradu -tutkielma, 55 sivua, 2 liitettä

Ohjaaja: Juha Holma

Psykologia

Kesäkuu 2021

Vaikka tutkimukset osoittavat, että parisuhdeväkivallan tekijöillä on usein taustallaan traumaattisia kokemuksia, strukturoituja interventiostrategioita ei kuitenkaan yleensä sisällytetä tekijöiden hoito-ohjelmiin, mikä saattaa rajoittaa ohjelmien tehokkuutta. Tämän tutkimuksen tarkoituksena on selvittää, puhuvatko ryhmäläiset mahdollisista traumakokemuksistaan istuntojen aikana, ja jos puhuvat millaisia nämä traumakokemukset ovat ja miten niistä keskustellaan. Aineisto koostuu videoiduista istunnoista, sekä tekijöiden alkuhaastattelulomakkeista. Ryhmäläisiä oli kymmenen ja ohjaajia kolme, joista yksi toimi sijaisena. Tutkimusta väkivaltatyössä käytetyistä terapeuttisista menetelmistä on melko vähän. Sitä miten väkivallan tekijöiden omista traumoista keskustellaan väkivallan tekijöille suunnatuissa ohjelmissa ei ole nähtävästi aiemmin tutkittu.

Traumakokemuksista käytiin ryhmässä keskustelua ja ryhmäläiset puhuivat paljon lapsuuden traumakokemuksistaan, sekä myös aikuisuudessa koetuista traumoista. Ryhmän ohjaajat joko keskittyivät ryhmäläisen tuottamaan traumapuheeseen tai sivuuttivat sen. Ohjaajat käyttivät perinteisiä terapeuttisia menetelmiä keskittyessään ryhmäläisten traumapuheeseen. Tämän lisäksi he käyttivät apunaan huumoria, sekä toivat esille väkivallan tekijän vastuuta ja pyrkivät varmistamaan, että ryhmäläisellä oli saatavillaan tukea myös ryhmän ulkopuolella. Ohjaajat kyselivät aktiivisesti ja pyrkivät antamaan kaikille mahdollisuuden puhua. Kun ohjaajat sivuuttivat traumapuheen ja sen sijaan ohjasivat keskustelua muihin aiheisiin, ryhmäläiset yleensä vaihtoivat ohjaajan aloitteesta puheenaihetta.

Avainsanat: lähisuhdeväkivalta, traumakokemukset, lähisuhdeväkivallan tekijöiden hoito-ohjelma, traumapuhe, terapeutitiset puhetavat, lapsuuden haitalliset kokemukset

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Domestic violence.....	1
1.2. The connection between trauma experiences and domestic violence.....	2
1.3. Batterer intervention programs take on trauma experiences.....	4
1.4. Therapeutic discourse practices in perpetrator programs.....	5
1.5. Aims of this study.....	6
2. DATA AND METHODS	7
2.1. The Jyväskylä Model for perpetrators.....	7
2.2. Data and participants.....	8
2.3. Content analysis and conversation analysis as research methods.....	8
2.4. Research process.....	9
3. RESULTS	11
3.1. The group members traumatic experiences.....	11
3.1.1. Physical violence.....	11
3.1.2. Emotional violence.....	12
3.1.3. Sexual violence.....	13
3.1.4. Physical and emotional neglect.....	13
3.1.5. Living with a family member who has mental illnesses.....	14
3.1.6. Living with a family member who has an alcohol addiction.....	15
3.1.7. Witnessing a mother being abused.....	15
3.1.8. Being a victim of bullying.....	16
3.1.9. Witnessing violence outside the home.....	16
3.1.10. Witnessing a sibling being abused.....	17
3.1.11. Parental separation.....	17
3.1.12. Unsafe ambiance of the home.....	18
3.1.13. Sibling abuse.....	18
3.1.14. Traumas experienced in adulthood.....	19
3.2. Group members manners of speaking following the facilitators' talk.....	20
3.3. The facilitators' ways of responding to the group members trauma talk.....	21
3.3.1. Reflective listening.....	21
3.3.1.1. Repeating.....	21

3.3.1.2. Reflecting the emotion of the statement.....	22
3.3.1.3. Summarizing.....	23
3.3.1.4. Rephrasing.....	24
3.3.1.5. Presenting a new point of view.....	25
3.3.2. Linear questions.....	26
3.3.3. Reflexive questions.....	27
3.3.4. Psychoeducative talk.....	28
3.3.4.1. Introducing the commonness of group members experiences of domestic violence in their childhood.....	28
3.3.4.2. Defining violence.....	29
3.3.5. Positioning.....	31
3.3.6. Strengthening the agency of the group member.....	32
3.3.7. Bringing forth the responsibility of the group member.....	33
3.3.8. Confrontation.....	34
3.3.9. Ignoring the trauma talk.....	36
3.3.10. Backchannel responses.....	38
3.3.11. Humor.....	39
3.3.12. Asking questions about the support network.....	41
4. DISCUSSION.....	42
REFERENCES.....	49
APPENDICES	

Appendix 1: The questions regarding to perpetrators´ childhood experiences from the interview form in english and in finnish

Appendix 2: The original text extracts in Finnish

1.INTRODUCTION

1.1. Domestic violence

DoH (Department of Health) has defined domestic violence as verbal, physical, and sexual violence which can include as much as rape and murdering (Department of Health [DoH] 2000). Domestic violence can be very diverse and it can include different forms of physical, sexual, emotional, and economic violence. The severity and prevalence of the violence also vary (Shipway, 2004). In some relationships, domestic violence may occur as episodic and in others, violence is always present. Domestic violence can be seen as gender-based. This does not mean women can't be perpetrators or that men can't be victims of domestic abuse, but that violence is predominantly perpetrated by men towards women (FRA, 2015).

According to the data from Statistics Finland, there were 10 600 victims of domestic violence and intimate partner violence offenses reported to the authorities in 2019 (Suomen virallinen tilasto (SVT), 2019). This is 7 percent more than in 2018. In domestic violence and intimate partner violence directed at adults 76,8 percent were females and out of all the victims 24,6 percent were minors. Domestic violence directed by parents against their children has also increased and in the year 2019, there were 2 600 reported cases of parental violence against their children. The growth compared to 2018 was 200 cases. Almost 600 cases of violence between siblings were reported in 2019. In 30 percent of these cases, the victim was underage. It is notable that these statistics include only the cases reported to the authorities. All cases of domestic violence are not reported. This is why it is important to also look into studies that use self-assessments to examine the prevalence of domestic violence. In a nationally representative victimization survey of Finnish women carried out by Piispa, Heiskanen, Kääriäinen and Siren (2005) half of the women who had a past relationship had experienced violence in the said relationship and 45% had experienced physical violence. Threatening the ex-partner with violence was also found to be common. 20% of the women currently in a relationship had at least one experience of being the victim of their partner's violent behavior. Within the past year, eight percent of the women have experienced violence in their relationships. 15% had a past experience of domestic violence but had not experienced it during the past ten years. Within 12% the violence had started at most two years ago and they had experienced violence from their partner during the past year.

The violence is then considered to be ongoing. 12% had a relationship in which the violence had started at least seven years ago and they had experienced violence during the past year. This group suffered from long and ongoing violence and had experienced different kinds of sexual and physical violence and threatening with violence more often compared to other groups. In a report based on interviews with 42,000 women across the 28 Member States of the European Union (EU) it is estimated that 13 million women in the EU have experienced physical violence during the past twelve months and estimation of 3.7 million women have experienced sexual violence during the past twelve months (FRA, 2015). The report shows how 22 % of the women have experienced physical and/or sexual violence by their current or previous partner since the age of 15.

1.2. The connection between trauma experiences and domestic violence

There are several studies focusing on the link between trauma experiences and domestic violence. Trauma can be defined as a disordered psychic or behavioral state which is a consequence of mental or emotional stress or physical injury (Pomeroy, 1995). Ruglass and Kendall-Tackett (2014) define psychological trauma as a cause of extreme stressor which has a negative effect on emotional or physical well-being. Serious threats to life or physical integrity are related to traumatic events of life (Henriksson & Lönnqvist, 2017). These traumatic events can be experienced in different periods of life. General types of trauma are child abuse (physical, sexual and psychological), emotional neglect and abandonment, assaults by peers, community violence, events associated with homelessness and/or prostitution, witnessing violence towards others, traumatic loss, exposure to serious accidents, and disasters, and serious medical illness or injury (Briere & Lanktree, 2011; Lanktree et al., 2012).

Sacks, Murphey, and Moore (2014) define adverse childhood experiences as potentially traumatic events which occur before the age of eighteen. These experiences may have lasting effects on health and well-being. Felitti et al. (1998) have studied different childhood traumas in the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study. These childhood traumas and their consequences studied by Felitti et al. (1998) are physical, psychological, and sexual abuse, living with a family member who has an alcohol addiction or addiction to other substances, living with a family member who has mental illnesses, witnessing a mother

being abused, and having a family member who is incarcerated. Following ACE studies added physical and emotional neglect and parental separation as ACEs (Anda et al. 2002; Flaherty et al. 2009). Later for example bullying, witnessing violence outside the home, living in an unsafe neighborhood, involvement with the foster care system, witnessing a sibling being abused, witnessing a father or other caregiver being abused, witnessing parents arguing very often, and property victimization are also studied as adverse childhood experiences (Finkelhor, Shattuck, Turner & Hamby, 2013).

Men's experiences of childhood trauma are found to be associated with their perpetration of intimate partner violence (Fulu et al. 2017). Askeland, Evang, and Heir (2011) studied the link between childhood and adolescence victimization and the perpetration of domestic violence. They found that 60% of the participants had been a victim of family violence. Murrell, Christoff, and Henning (2007) found that men who witnessed domestic violence as children committed the most frequent domestic violence, and men who were abused as children were more likely to abuse children themselves. These findings are consistent with previous findings (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986; Kaufman & Zigler, 1987) and there are several ways in which childhood trauma and violence against women intersect (Fulu et al. 2017). Emotional abuse and neglect in childhood can be seen as important risk factors. When children feel abandoned by their parents it may increase the risk of violent behavior (Leibman, 1992). Men who have experienced physical or sexual violence in their childhood, and men who had faced multiple types of child maltreatment have a higher risk of domestic violence (Fulu et al. 2017; Stevens, 2017). Men's witnessing of their mother being abused has also been found to be associated with physical intimate partner violence and some findings indicate that batterer's fathers have much more likely been violent than non-batterers (Fulu et al. 2017; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). In their study McFall, Fontana, Raskind, and Rosenheck (1999) showed that inpatient Vietnam war veterans with PTSD were more likely to report violence they had used than inpatients with a mixed psychiatric diagnosis without PTSD. Neller, Denney, Pietz, and Thomlinson (2005) also found that trauma can be a predictive factor of future violent behavior. In their study, the following two types of traumas were found to be predictive factors: being the victim of a violent crime and experiencing at least one other severely traumatic event. Other types of traumas studied with The Traumatic Events Questionnaire were not found to be predictive factors of future violent behavior. One-third of the men participating in the perpetrator group of the Jyväskylä Model had at least one parent who suffered from alcohol addiction, and half of the men had witnessed violence

between their parents or fell victim to violence in childhood themselves (Keltikangas & Laaksamo, 2012).

Wolfe & Jaffe (1999) have collected together studies regarding the different possible reasons behind the use of domestic violence. Two reasons linked to trauma history are the following. Firstly, biology could explain violent behavior as a consequence of childhood trauma changing brain functioning (Perry, 1997). Secondly, witnessing domestic abuse or being a victim of abuse in childhood may affect one's ability to trust and then shape their behavior (Dutton, 1997).

It is notable that not all men who grow up in violent homes engage in domestic violence and not all men who act violently in their relationship have experiences of childhood violence (Delson & Margolin, 2004). While studies show how men's experiences of childhood trauma are found to be associated with their perpetration of intimate partner violence women with plenty of adverse childhood experiences have a higher risk of being abused instead (Stevens, 2017). It is still notable that the perpetrators of domestic violence are not always men and women can act violently in intimate relationships too.

1.3. Batterer intervention programs take on trauma experiences

Despite the many findings that indicate that perpetrators of domestic abuse often have experiences of childhood maltreatment and trauma (Fulu et al., 2017; Kaufman & Zigler, 1987; Murrell et al., 2007) incorporation of structured and specific intervention strategies of the trauma aspect is not usually targeted into IPV treatment programs for perpetrators (Condino, Tanzilli, Speranza & Lingriardi, 2016). According to Condino et al. (2016) not including intervention strategies of trauma, personality disorders, and substance abuse is limiting the effectiveness of these treatments. A study carried out by Karakurt et al. (2019) supports this claim. The effectiveness of different batterer intervention programs in reducing violence for male IPV perpetrators was investigated. They found that incorporating substance abuse or trauma components into the interventions led to better results compared to programs that didn't include these components. In their study, they conclude that treatment strategies that address trauma issues and substance abuse of perpetrators may work more effectively in preventing violence. According to Stevens (2017) traditional batterer intervention programs are good at describing what kind of violence the perpetrators do and what they should do to

end this behavior. These programs should focus on the reasons why men and women abuse their partners and adverse childhood experiences might be the reason for this behavior.

If properly addressing these issues could improve the effectiveness of the programs why are they generally not incorporated into the treatment? There have been conversations about how batterer intervention programs should relate to perpetrators' adverse childhood experiences and other traumatic experiences. The pro-feminist orientation has influenced the development of traditional batterer intervention programs, which underline men's responsibility for their violent behavior (Dobash, Dobash, Cavanagh & Lewis, 2000). Pro-feminist orientation also sees domestic violence as an abuse of power, and how patriarchal structures of society influence the use of violence (Partanen, 2008). Trauma talk has been associated with taking the position of a victim, which hinders the responsibility of the perpetrator's violent behavior (Partanen & Wahlström, 2003). According to Stevens (2017) many people may think that the perpetrators will use their adverse childhood experiences as an excuse.

In traditional batterer interventions, recidivism rates range from 20 to 60 percent (Babcock, Green & Robie, 2004; Shepard, 1992). Instead in newer programs recidivism rates are much lower (Stevens, 2017; Zarling & Berta, 2017), for example, 3,6 percent in ACTV in Iowa (Zarling, 2017). These newer programs focus on what happened to perpetrators in their childhood and educate them on how these ACEs and the stress from those experiences have influenced their brain and behavior (Stevens, 2017). It seems that these programs which focus on perpetrators' trauma experiences are more effective to decrease domestic violence.

1.4. Therapeutic discourse practices in the Jyväskylä Model

There are some previous studies regarding the discourse practices used by facilitators in the Jyväskylä Model. Liikamaa and Tantarimäki (2005) have studied the discursive performance of therapeutic interventions in the Jyväskylä Model. They found four major categories which were talk designed to increase the reflexive self-understanding of the clients, talk designed to offer new perspectives to the clients, forms of talk where acts of violence were specified and concretized, and talk where the therapists question and confront accounts of violence given by the male clients. The first two categories were generic forms of therapeutic intervention talk. In the talk of increasing the reflexive self-understanding of the clients, the therapists

asked questions concerning the clients' thoughts, feelings, dispositions, or possible alternative ways of behavior in different situations. The purpose of these kinds of questions seemed to be to offer the client new positions in relation to their way of action, and the questions were asked in a supportive and empathic way. The perspective offering talk seemed to add explanatory views to the clients' accounts. The facilitators invited the clients to reconsider their understandings of the actions and events under discussion. The therapist's role is active and neutral in these presented ways of talking. The last two categories found by Liikamaa and Tantarimäki (2005) were forms of discourse used when discussing actual violent acts and episodes. When using the concretizing talk the facilitators asked concrete and specified questions from the clients concerning their history of violence or their behavior in violent episodes. The facilitators take an unambiguous disapproving position towards the use of violence for managing stressful or conflicted situations. This philosophy is the main principle of the treatment for violence (Holma, Laitila, Wahlström & Sveins, 2005). The confronting talk pointed the given accounts as not suitable and asked for a correction.

Päivinen, Siltala, and Holma (2021) have studied positioning as a tool when working with fathers who have acted violently in their families. They define positioning as inviting another interlocutor to take on a conversational stance and to make assumptions about the respective rights and duties of each interlocutor. This way they can relate to issues like responsibility and accountability, which are important regarding violence and its treatment. Therapists can for example invite clients to see themselves in their children's shoes or to position themselves as children. A study carried out by Päivinen and Holma (2012) showed how the positioning of the female therapist in the group program may create possibilities for men's increased empathy towards the female partner.

Previous research (Partanen & Wahlström, 2003) has shown how male clients in group treatment tend to ascribe themselves in a victim position, and how therapists intervene in these constructions either by ignoring or confronting them or occasionally by joining the construction before engaging in a deconstruction process.

Discourse practices used by facilitators have been studied but it seems that there aren't many studies of how traumatic experiences are discussed in this program.

1.5. Aims of this study

The aim of this study is to determine whether or not the group members talk about their possible traumatic experiences in the Jyväskylä Model and if they do, how are these topics discussed. There are very few studies of the therapeutic interventions used in violent behavior treatment programs and of how the traumatic experiences of the perpetrators are discussed by both the perpetrators and the facilitators.

The research questions of this study are the following:

1. Do the group members bring up their possible traumatic experiences and if so what kind of traumatic experiences do the participants of the Jyväskylä Model talk about?
2. How do the facilitators respond to the trauma experiences brought up by the group members and what follows the facilitators' response?

2. DATA AND METHODS

2.1. The Jyväskylä Model for perpetrators

The Jyväskylä Model was established in Jyväskylä in 1995 in collaboration with the crisis center named “Mobile” and the Psychotherapy Training and Research Centre of the University of Jyväskylä (Holma, Partanen, Wahlström, Laitila & Seikkula, 2006). The program consists of three divisions which are male perpetrators and battered women procedure in the crisis center, secondly building the network of authority which allows right services to all be involved and, thirdly the groups for male perpetrators. The program begins with intervention and individual sessions at the crisis center, and this phase lasts from one to six months. After these individual sessions, the perpetrator is interviewed after which he can continue to the perpetrators’ group sessions. The groups are open-ended which means when participating in the group the perpetrator engages in 15 meetings but can also stay for longer. The duration of each session is 90 minutes and sessions are organized once a week. There are two facilitators in a group: one male and one female facilitator (Holma et al., 2005). The orientation of the Jyväskylä Model is profeminist and there are elements from different therapeutic orientations (Partanen, 2008). When working in the group the principles and practice solutions of the program have molded. The basis of the groups is to prevent domestic

violence directed at women (Holma et al., 2005), and to focus on violence and the responsibility of the perpetrator (Partanen, 2008).

2.2. Data and participants

The research material of this study consists of ten group members who have participated in the Jyväskylä Model during the years 2016-2017. During the year, 2016 the group gathered every two weeks and once a week during the year 2017. We used the video recordings of these sessions and the questionnaires (see Appendix 1) that had been filled based on the interview perpetrators attended before entering the group. There were a total of 40 sessions, each lasting 90 minutes. One of the recorded sessions was missing audio so it was left out. In the interview, the group members were asked questions regarding their parents' use of alcohol and physical or sexual violence in their childhood home. The possible ways of response were yes, no or I don't know. In addition to the video recordings, we used these interview responses as our data for research question 1.

We decided on the recordings of the said years based on a file in which the main topics of each session had been written down by the group facilitators. During these years there were several sessions in which the traumatic events had been discussed thus we chose them as our research material. We watched each recording of these two years and narrowed our data down to twelve sessions in which trauma was discussed. Our research focuses only on the eight group members who brought up their traumatic experiences either during the sessions or in the interview. One of these group members was a woman and the rest were men. In this study we use the pronouns he/him when talking about the group members. We refer to the female group member with these same pronouns to protect her anonymity. In addition, we focused on the actions of the facilitators of this group program, studying their responses to the participants' trauma talk and seeing what followed these responses. Our data consist of two male facilitators and one female facilitator.

2.3. Content analysis and conversation analysis as research methods

Our study is based on qualitative methods that aim to describe the occurrence and to understand certain actions, and constitute a theoretically reasonable interpretation from a phenomenon (Eskola & Suoranta, 1998). We used data-based content analysis and conversation analysis as our research methods. Content analysis is a method used to make repetitive and valid conclusions from data (Krippendorff, 1989). The data can consist of talk, written documents, or visual representations. According to Tuomi and Sarajärvi (2013) before starting the content analysis an analysis unit should be defined. The analysis unit can be a single word, a sentence in conversation, a part of the sentence, or a set of ideas. The aim of the content analysis is to arrange data to a compact and clear form without losing information about the studied phenomenon. The data is scattered into parts, conceptualized, and combined again forming a logical entirety. In this study, content analysis was used to find out what kind of traumatic experiences the group members of the Jyväskylä Model talk about.

Conversation analysis was developed in the early 1960s and the work was started by Harvey Sacks and his collaborators (Have, 2007). CA studies the video- or audio-recorded, naturally occurring talk-in-interaction and it focuses on the issues of meaning and contexts linking them to the idea of sequence (Heritage, 1998; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). Recordings are transcribed very precisely so that the design, exchange, and coordination of actions within social interaction can be analyzed (Hutchby, 2019). In CA the meaning of an action emerges from the sequence of previous actions and it is heavily shaped by them (Heritage, 1998). Social context is seen as dynamically created and it is expressed in and through the sequential organization of interaction. So the aim of CA is mostly to study how participants respond and understand one another and how sequences of action are generated (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). In this study, we were interested in how sequences of action were generated after and before traumas were discussed.

2.4. Research process

We started our research by going through each of the recordings and by picking out every part in which traumas were discussed. We watched these recordings together and separately and compared our notes. We both kept a research diary to keep track of how our understandings were formed. After narrowing our data down to trauma discussions we went

through these recordings multiple times transcribing them carefully. After transcribing every part we categorized the trauma experiences using ACE-research (Anda et al., 2002; Felitti et al., 1998; Finkelhor et al., 2013; Flaherty et al., 2009). In addition to the ACE-categories, we found the following categories: traumatic experiences in adulthood, unsafe atmosphere of the home, and sibling abuse. For each category, we looked up an example from our data.

After categorizing each trauma experience used conversation analysis and went through the recordings multiple times again this time focusing on the facilitators' responses to the trauma talk and what followed these responses. We carefully went through every turn of talk in which traumatic experiences were discussed. We categorized the facilitators' responses as well as the group members' responses following the facilitators' say. When going through the facilitators' responses we looked into the research and literature of the traditional ways facilitators use in their work comparing them to our data. We also looked into the methods typically used when working with perpetrators. We categorized the facilitators' responses into two main categories which were responses ignoring the trauma talk and responses focusing on the trauma talk. These main categories also had subclasses. When looking into what followed the facilitators say we categorized the responses and saw whether or not the group members continued talking about their traumatic experiences. We also defined each response category for a better understanding. In addition, we formed two tables. In one we looked into the meaning behind the facilitators' responses and in one we saw what followed the facilitators' say and if there was any pattern to be found within the facilitators' responses and what followed them. There were organized peer seminars with our supervisor and other students who did their master's thesis for the same project. The reliability of this study has improved by discussing the analysis in these peer seminars.

When working with this kind of data and a topic as sensitive as this, paying attention to anonymity and data protection is extremely important. In this study, it was made sure the research material was handled properly. Video recordings and questionnaires can only be handled at the research center and taking them outside the said building is not allowed. All of the notes must be written in a way that the participants remain anonymous. The transcriptions are precise but no names, locations, or any other aspects from which identification could be made possible are written down. Both the notes and transcriptions must be destroyed properly when the research is done. Meaning they must be taken into the research center and into the safety bin.

3. RESULTS

Transcription symbols:

FM = Male facilitator

FF = Female facilitator

G1-9 = Group members 1-9

[= Beginning of an overlapping talk

] = End of an overlapping talk

(- -) = Unclear section

\$ (...) \$ = Suppressed laughter or a voice with laughter

(...) = A part of the text is removed

(.) = Time in seconds between the end of a word and the beginning of the next one

hehe = Laughter

3.1. The group members traumatic experiences

Almost every group member had some traumatic experiences and most of them were adverse childhood experiences. Our results showed fourteen different traumatic experiences which are presented below.

3.1.1. Physical violence

Six of the group members had experienced physical violence in their childhood. All six reported physical violence in the interview, but only five of them brought these experiences up in the videos. The group members talked about discipline violence such as spanking, hair pulling, and being grabbed rough-handed as well as about being assaulted, strangled, and punched.

Extract 1

(I/3/00:17:00-)

FM: "Was physical discipline used? Pulling the hair or spanking?"

G3: "Yes it was used. One time I made the mistake of calling my father gay. It was a big mistake and the consequences of that are really stuck in my mind."

FM: "What were the consequences?"

G3: "Well...I basically got beaten up by my father."

FM: "Did he use fists or an open palm?"

G3: "Yeah. He grabbed me by my hair and slammed my head against the car a few times and then pushed me to the ground. He told me that this better be the last time I call him that. I think that might have been the worst one. But I was already fifteen or sixteen years old at the time."

In Extract 1 above the facilitator asked whether physical discipline was used during the group members' childhood. The group member answered that physical discipline was indeed used and gave an example of a situation in which he called his father gay and how that situation had long-lasting consequences. The facilitator asked a specific question about these consequences and the group member continued talking about how he got beaten up by his father. The facilitator asked a specific question about the way this happened. The group member continued to talk about the situation. He also added that he was fifteen or sixteen years old at the time.

3.1.2. Emotional violence

One of the group members had experienced emotional violence such as threatening, yelling, and aggression in his childhood. He brought these experiences up in the interview and the videos.

Extract 2

(III/16/00:18:30-)

G7: "I also had those kinds of experiences in my childhood. My father was always aggressive and he easily lost his temper. I don't remember him ever hitting me or

grabbing me but he has broken things and I remember him being very threatening. I think that's where my own behavioral patterns are coming from.”

In Extract 2 above the group members have introduced themselves and talked about their situations to the new member of the group. One group member talked about his father who didn't use direct physical violence towards him but used it indirectly by breaking things. The group member told how his father was aggressive and threatening. He also thought that his father's behavioral patterns have influenced his own behavior.

3.1.3. Sexual violence

In the interview one of the group members reported having experienced sexual violence at the age of seven or eight. His father had gone to sleep next to him and proceeded to put his hand into the group member's pants. The group member didn't talk about this in the videos.

3.1.4. Physical and emotional neglect

In the videos, one of the group members brought up physical and emotional neglect he had experienced in his childhood. He did not bring this up during the interview.

Extract 3

(IV/37/00:22:00-)

G3: “My own parents didn't really...They were at work and I was alone awfully lot in that high-rise. I never really learned that kind of stuff and sometimes if someone asks about my well-being I might get anxious.”

(...)

G3: “...but then all those bad things happened and I think I would've needed that emotional support but there were no parents. They were constantly at work and I was left alone with these things...With my fears and stuff. I didn't really talk to my parents about these things... They were so awful.”

In Extract 3 above the group member talked about how he didn't learn the handling of emotions from his parents and how the parents were often at work. The facilitator and the group member discussed these experiences and the change which has happened in his way of thinking. Then the group member came back to mention how he would have needed emotional support from his parents.

3.1.5. Living with a family member who has mental illnesses

In the videos, two of the group members brought up how during their childhood they had lived with a family member who has mental illnesses. They did not bring this up in the interview.

Extract 4

(III/19/00:54:00-)

G4: "Well yeah at home there were these male figures who had drinking problems and there was also violence on their part. So that is one thing but then my mother didn't really have a drinking problem but she had partners who did. But if I think about her home it was quite broken. My grandmother was mentally ill and my mother couldn't stay at her home. So I think that's where this thing has started and is recurring. I think she has been afraid as a child since there was alcohol and psychical illness in her home."

FM: "It sounds to me that there is this fear that comes fast and is impossible to control. Is this what happens?"

G4: "Well."

FM: "The one that comes when you hear something from the kids' room?"

G4: "Yeah I think it might be fear and then of course fear is also linked to the need of having control. Sometimes if I'm feeling bad I have these weird moments where I just get annoyed and feel like I haven't gotten anything done. That's when I take out all my cleaning supplies and start to mop and polish every corner. I try to reduce my anxiety by cleaning and doing something, otherwise, I will just get angry and anxious if I just

stand there doing nothing. When I hear something knock in the kids' room I feel like it breaks the harmony. But then I storm in there and shout so loud you can hear the windows rattle so It's a little contradictory really. When I think back to my childhood I think my mother tried to hide her anxiety by keeping the house perfectly clean. She changed the sheets twice a week and I think she was a bit neurotic. I'm not as bad as her but sometimes it pushes through when I'm having a hard time."

In Extract 4 above the group member has talked about the partners of his mother and how they had problems with alcohol and mentioned how his mother didn't have a drinking problem. Then the group member talked about how his mother's childhood home and how it was broken. There were problems with alcohol and the grandmother suffered from mental illness. The facilitator asked about the fear associated with earlier experiences and how the feeling appears fast and is hard to control. The group member recognized this fear and the link between the fear and the need for having control. He gave an example of how cleaning the house is a way to reduce anxiety. The group member talked about how his mother tried to hide his own anxiety by keeping the house perfectly clean and how she was also neurotic.

3.1.6. Living with a family member who has an alcohol addiction

Three of the group members reported in the videos and the interview that during their childhood they had lived with a family member who has an alcohol addiction.

Extract 5

(III/19/00:54:00-)

G4: "Well yeah at home there were these male figures who had drinking problems and there was also violence on their part."

In Extract 5 above the group member has talked about his mothers' partners who had drinking problems and how one of these partners also used violence.

3.1.7. Witnessing a mother being abused

In the interview, five of the group members reported having witnessed their mother being abused. Three of these group members talked about these experiences in the videos.

Extract 6

(I/6/00:30:00-)

G1: "Well it's that we both have experienced that same childhood. Where we saw somehow. Our father was an alcoholic and beat our mother. So we both have witnessed that of course."

In Extract 6 above the group member talked about how he experienced the same childhood as his brother. They both witnessed their father beat their mother.

3.1.8. Being a victim of bullying

In the videos, three of the group members brought up that they had been victims of bullying. The group members didn't talk about this during the interview.

Extract 7

(IV/37/00:51:00-)

G3: "I didn't really talk to my parents about these things... They were such awful things like getting beaten up and getting my bike and money stolen from me."

In Extract 7 above the group member talked about his experiences of being bullied telling how he experienced violence and got his money and bike stolen. He didn't talk to his parents about these experiences.

3.1.9. Witnessing violence outside the home

One group member reported witnessing violence outside his home. This was brought up in the video recordings but not during the interview.

Extract 8

(III/16/00:03:40-)

G3: "After that, I was involved in gang violence and used intoxicants."

In Extract 8 above the group member mentioned being involved in gang violence and that he used intoxicants.

3.1.10. Witnessing a sibling being abused

One group member reported having witnessed his sibling being abused. The group member talked about the said event in the video recordings but did not bring it up in the interview.

Extract 9

(I/3/00:39:00-)

G1: "Not towards me but my other older brother. My father died when I was five but when my brother was fifteen there was this incident when someone had taken my fathers liquor and in the end, the bottle was found right where my father had left it but before he found it he had hit my older brother and the mother of my second cousin was yelling at my father."

In Extract 9 above the group member described a situation in which his fathers' liquor had disappeared and how it led to his father hitting his older brother. The group member said that the bottle was later found to be right where his father had left it.

3.1.11. Parental separation

One group member brought up his parents' separation both in the interview and in the video

recordings.

Extract 10

(I/3/00:27:00-)

G4: "My father isn't really...I don't have a recollection of my father as a parent."

FM: "Was he not present or did he pass away?"

G4: "No they divorced when I was two years old."

In Extract 10 above the group member talked about how he doesn't remember his father being a parent and that his parents divorced when he was two years old.

3.1.12. The unsafe ambiance of the home

One group member reported having experienced unsafe ambiance in his home. The said group member spoke up about these experiences in the video recordings but did not bring them up in the interview.

Extract 11

(III/19/00:54:00-)

G3: "Having to be afraid at home too and you feel so unsafe all the time. At some point, I became aware of how I can influence my surroundings and I didn't want to feel unsafe anymore. I thought I would put things in order."

In Extract 11 above the group member brought up how afraid he was at home and how unsafe he felt all the time. He talked about how at some point he realized he could influence his situation and decided to put things in order so he wouldn't have to be afraid anymore.

3.1.13. Sibling abuse

Two of the group members talked about their experiences of sibling abuse. One of the group

members also mentioned this during the interview.

Extract 12

(IV/35/00:33:10-)

G8: "Well I would say the worst injuries were caused by the fights I used to have with my sister when I was a little boy"

FM: "[Okay]."

G8: "They have been the ones where I disagreed with my sister"

G9: "My fights with my brother have also been like more like that."

G8: "Yeah"

G9: "Hmh."

FF: "Mm."

G8: "Yes"

FM: "It is just kind of or I think I just today talked about how we all come from a normal family and the ways of our own family, for a long time they seem like the normal family ways (...)"

In Extract 12 above the group member has talked about physical discipline he experienced as a child and goes on to mention how the worst injuries were still caused by the fights he used to have with his sister. Another group member replies by saying that he also had fights with his brother.

3.1.14. Traumas experienced in adulthood

One group member brought up traumatic events he had experienced in his adulthood. This group member talked about the said events in the video recordings but didn't bring them up in the interview.

Extract 13

(II/7/01:19:41-)

G5: "There is this one story I could talk about that still bothers me in a way. He was a good coworker of mine and a friend of ten years and his son who was the same age"

as my own and they played in the same team. They both died on the midsummer eve in an accident. I had just spoken with (name) a couple of days prior and we often saw each other. There was a funeral for them and it has been pretty tough being at work and seeing...”

FF: “Mm.”

FM: “Yeah.”

G5: “It was it was quite a shock. I didn’t get much support at home. Me and (name) called each other maybe once a week or once every two weeks. At home, I was just told that we were not that close of friends.”

In Extract 13 above the group member talked about an accident in which his friend and the friend's son died. The group member was not present when the accident took place but heard about it later on and had talked with his friend just a couple of days before the accident. The group member brought up how shocking it was and how he didn't get the support he needed at home.

3.2. The group members manners of speaking following the facilitators talk

In this study, we found the following manners of speaking from the group members which followed the facilitators’ response: the group member continued to talk about his traumatic experiences, gave an example of a traumatic event, gave a very brief answer, accepted a new point of view presented by the facilitator, defended the behavior of his parents, agreed with the facilitator, gave some kind of statement, compared his current self to his past self, started to notice his own agency, criticized his own behavior during the traumatic event, criticized the behavior of his parents, came back to talk about current events/other topics or didn't reply at all. When giving a very brief answer to the facilitator the group member answered very shortly and did not continue talking after. When the group member agreed with the facilitator the answer was sometimes very short. A simple “yes” could be seen as an agreement, but not as a short answer if the talk of the group member continued after. In these very brief answers, the group members didn't continue the discussion themselves. When noticing his own autonomy the group member started to see how he could affect his own behavior. There were

also instances in which the group member didn't reply to the facilitator at all. Either one of the facilitators or another group member started talking if there was no reply.

3.3. The facilitators' ways of responding to the group members trauma talk

3.3.1. Reflective listening

The facilitators used reflective listening by repeating or rephrasing what the group member said, reflecting the emotion of the statement of the group member, summarizing together the group members' various statements, or by offering them a new point of view. These reflections were not questions but statements and they were used to encourage group members to keep talking.

3.3.1.1. Repeating

By repeating what the group member said the facilitators encouraged him to keep talking about the traumatic event he had experienced. This is what happened each time the facilitators used this way of talking. The group member either continued talking straight away or agreed with the facilitator first and then continued. There was one instance in which the group member continued talking but also gave a new example of a traumatic event he had experienced.

Extract 14

(III/14/00:24:10-)

G5: "And and well speaking of violence at Christmas Eve there was I fell a victim to violence myself while I was at work."

FM: "Okay."

FF: "Mm."

G5: “A client attacked me and hit me a couple of times so that I chipped two of my lower teeth and he punched me on the back of my head. He tried to strangle me for half a minute. This dude was very trained and I couldn’t have gotten out on my own hadn’t his relatives come to my aid. I managed to get out from under his arm and my colleague, who is a female, we went out and two police patrols were called.”

(...)

G5: “It was quite...You know it was Christmas Eve when I got home and I was a bit shaky and thinking man that could have ended quite badly.”

FM: “It could have ended quite badly.”

G5: “Yeah luckily he didn't have any kind of weapon at hand he was at that kind of mental state that if he just had something in his hands.”

In Extract 14 above the group member talked about a situation in which he became a victim of an aggravated assault. The group member was at work and got strangled by a patient. Afterwards, he thought how badly it all could have gone. The facilitator repeated a part of what the group member just told him after which, the group member continued to talk about the assault.

3.3.1.2 Reflecting the emotion of the statement

In this way of talking, the facilitators reflected the emotion beneath what they just heard the group member tell them. Most of the time the group members continued talking about their traumatic experiences after the facilitators used this way of talking. There were individual cases where the group member started talking about a different topic, made a statement, or didn’t answer the facilitator at all.

Extract 15

(I/3/00:42:11-)

G1: “Then I had my own from the elementary school that I have chased my classmates with a knife and.”

(...)

FM: "How old were you?"

G1: "Nine years old third grade."

FM: "Okay sound pretty rough."

G1: "Yeah it was there was bullying that I was being bullied and then I also bullied back and that's where the bullying stopped. I have later thought that it was a pretty radical solution."

In Extract 15 above the group member has talked about an event in his childhood where his father had been violent towards the group members older brother. The group member also mentioned how he had been bullied in school and how he also bullied back. The group member had chased his classmates when he was nine years old. The facilitator reflected the emotion of what he had just heard the group member tell them and after this, the group member continued talking about his traumatic experiences.

3.3.1.3. Summarizing

In this way of talking the facilitators summarized what they heard the group member tell them. The facilitators might bring up things from the group members' talk they thought were important. Most of the time this resulted in the group member agreeing with the facilitator and then continuing to talk about his traumatic experiences or one or the other. There was one instance where the group member agreed with the facilitator, continued to talk about his traumatic experience for a moment, and then changed the subject himself.

Extract 16

(III/19/01:03:24-)

G3: "I felt so unsafe there all the time. At some point, I somehow became aware of how I can affect my surroundings and didn't want to feel unsafe anymore. I thought I would put things in order around me. That's how I have experienced it and thought that was the cause of it."

FM: "Mm."

G3: "That it was because of all these unpredictable things happening and those make me easily nervous. I can't handle them."

FM: "Those feelings that these unpredictable things awoke are fear and that unsafe feeling and."

G3: "Yes."

FM: "Something like that."

G3: "Before I couldn't admit that it was because of them. I thought showing fear was a sign of weakness and it was shameful to be afraid. My values and attitude back then were like that. I tried to raise my own son to be tough and I probably have caused terrible mental harm on him."

In Extract 16 above the group member has talked about the unsafe environment of his childhood home. The facilitator summarized the various statements of the group member after which the group member agreed with the facilitator, continued to talk about his childhood, and eventually came back to talk about how he had raised his own son.

3.3.1.4. Rephrasing

The facilitator rephrased what the group member had told him. Usually, the group member continued talking about his traumatic experiences or agreed with the facilitator after the facilitator had rephrased what the group member said. There was one incident in which the group member did both of the above and one in which the group member stopped talking after the facilitators say.

Extract 17

(1/3/00:33:13-)

G4: "I haven't experienced as severe violence as the one you just described but I was just thinking how bitter I feel about the things I went through myself."

FM: "You have noticed those effects it had later on."

G4: "Yeah yeah and I was just talking about how this said person who was violent died."

In Extract 17 above the group member mentioned how he is resentful of the experiences in his childhood and the facilitator rephrased this by saying how the group member has noticed the effects his childhood experiences have had on him. After this, the group member continued to talk about how this violent person from his childhood has passed away.

3.3.1.5. Presenting a new point of view

The facilitators presented a new point of view for the group members. This is done gently without questioning the thoughts the group member has expressed, but by offering a new point of view for the group member to consider. In two cases the group member accepted this new point of view the facilitator was presenting and in one case the group member just continued to talk about his traumatic experience and in one case there was no reply from the group member.

Extract 18

(III/19/00:54:01-)

G4: "That it has been very aggressive and I still could argue that in a way that is where a certain model of how to behave in certain situations is coming from but."

FM: "Yes it can be a model or then I wonder if you got scared in these situations as a child? When there was this reaction from your parents?"

G4: "Yes I got scared."

FM: "And the same fear can be seen here. It is more of a reaction than a model in which you would purposely want to repeat your parents' behavior."

G4: "Well yeah it is automatic in a way that there is nothing happening yet when there already is a reaction."

In Extract 18 above the group member talked about his father and the behavioral patterns that he has learned in his childhood. The facilitator presented a new point of view for the group member and proposed that maybe he was afraid as a child. The facilitator did not question the group members idea of learned behavioral patterns but suggests that maybe it could also be a reaction to fear and not how the group member purposely wants to act. The group member took in this new point of view and agreed with the facilitator.

3.3.2. Linear questions

The facilitators asked linear questions to increase their understanding of the group members' traumatic experiences. Specific questions were an example of linear questions. These kinds of questions encouraged group members to continue their talk about the traumatic experiences. In two cases the group member gave an example of a traumatic experience. In one case the group member defended the behavior of his parents and felt that he deserved the punishments he got. There was also one case where the group member continued talking about another topic.

Extract 19

(I/3/00:20:32-)

G3: "Yeah I can't handle things the way my father did."

FM: "It was a quick and short way."

G3: "Yeah. I remember..."

FM: "Was physical discipline used? Pulling of the hair or spanking?"

G3: "Yes it was used. One time I made the mistake of calling my father gay. It was a big mistake and the consequences of that are really stuck in my mind."

FM: "What were the consequences?"

G3: "Well...I basically got beaten up by my father."

FM: "Did he use fists or an open palm?"

G3: "Yeah. He grabbed me by my hair and slammed my head against the car a few times and then pushed me to the ground. He told me that this better be the last time I

call him that. I think that might have been the worst one. But I was already fifteen or sixteen years old at the time.”

In Extract 19 above the group member reflected that he can't do things the same way his father did. The facilitator used a linear question asking whether or not hair pulling or spanking was used as a way of discipline during the group members' childhood. The group member told that these ways were used and gave an example of a situation where he called his father gay and the facilitator asked several linear questions to get more information about the said situation. After these questions, the group member continued talking about his traumatic experience.

3.3.3. Reflexive questions

Reflexive questions are open questions which purpose is to get the group members to reflect on their behavior and different perspectives and to consider new perspectives. The facilitators asked the question “What do you think about that?” several times. The purpose of such a question was to awaken group members to think about their parents' behavior. Questions about change were also reflexive questions. These kinds of questions often caused the group members to criticize the behavior of their parents or they came back to talk about current topics. In single cases, the group member gave very brief answers, agreed with the facilitator, agreed with the facilitator, and recognized his own agency, or compared his current self to his past self.

Extract 20

(I/3/00:35:10-)

G4: “He never hit me but grabbed and moved me and once he grabbed me by my pipe. It was this potato cellar show where I was told to get the potatoes from the cellar and I just told my little sister to get them.”

(...)

G4: “He grabbed me by the pipe”

FM: “Is grabbing you by the pipe the same as strangling?”

G4: "Yes he came and grabbed me by my pipe but then my mother (- -). Yeah but I more often saw my mother being targeted not me so much but it is."

FM: "What are your thoughts on strangling your own child today?"

G4: "I definitely don't accept it."

FM: "\$How about stepchild? \$"

G4: "What?"

FM: "\$Would strangling be more acceptable if it was your stepchild? \$"

G4: "No absolutely not."

In Extract 20 above the group member talked about a situation in which his stepfather strangled him. The facilitator asked a linear question about the strangling to make sure he understood them correctly. The group member agreed and talked about how he more often saw his mother being the victim of violence. The facilitator asked a reflexive question which purpose was to get the group member to think about his attitude toward discipline violence. The group member criticized his stepfather's actions and said that he doesn't accept one's child's or stepchild's strangling.

3.3.4. Psychoeducative talk

The facilitators used psychoeducative talk by introducing how common it is for the group members to have experienced domestic violence during their childhood, or by defining violence.

3.3.4.1. Introducing commonness of perpetrators experiences of domestic violence in their childhood

The facilitators talked about how perpetrators' childhood domestic violence experiences are common. These statistics might help the group members to notice the hereditary nature of the violence. This way of talking was used two times by the facilitators and the group member continued talking about his traumatic experience or

started talking about another topic. It is good to note that this kind of talk was not intended to make violence seem like a normal behavior but simply to adduce that the facilitator is familiar with this kind of talk and topic and is used to hearing similar stories.

Extract 21

(IV/34/00:30:30-)

G8: "Mostly by talking but I remember that I have been spanked and pulled by my hair at home but nothing more than that and after getting spanked once I pretty much knew I didn't want to experience that again. I remember a situation in which I had to retrieve a branch from the birch outside and place it on top of the piano. It was waiting there in case I would behave badly so that I only had to glance at it to remember what I was and was not allowed to do."

(...)

G8: "Never before and I would never do such a thing that I would place a branch in there as a deterrence."

FM: "Mm."

FF: "Mm it was a deterrence."

FM: "What you are saying sounds very familiar to me. I have heard many similar stories before. A familiar way of doing things."

G8: "Well I would say the most injuries have been caused by the fights I used to have with my sister as a little boy. [hehe]"

In Extract 21 above the group member talked about discipline violence which he had experienced in his childhood. His parents used spanking and hair pulling as a punishment and once forced him to get a branch of the birch from outside which was then used as a deterrent. The facilitator mentioned how this phenomenon is common for them and how he has heard many similar stories before. After this, the group member continued to talk about his childhood experiences and mentioned how the fights with his sister caused him the most injuries.

3.3.4.2. Defining violence

In their talk, the facilitators defined what kind of actions are considered violence. The aim was to help the group members to recognize the violence which they had experienced. This was done by defining the violence after the group members had started talking about their traumatic experiences. The facilitators used this way of talking in two cases. In one case the group member continued to talk about his traumatic experience and in another, the group member didn't answer at all.

Extract 22

(IV/34/00:30:30-)

G8: "Mostly by talking but I remember that I have been spanked and pulled by my hair at home but nothing more than that and after getting spanked once I pretty much knew I didn't want to experience that again. I remember a situation in which I had to retrieve a branch from the birch outside and place it on top of the piano. It was waiting there in case I would behave badly so that I only had to glance at it in order to remember what I was and was not allowed to do."

(...)

FM: "What you just described how you had to retrieve a branch from the birch and place it on top of the piano as a deterrence the thought of that feels horrible."

G9: "Even if it's just a deterrence but raising someone with fear."

(...)

FM: "Threatening with violence is enough. It is the goal of violence."

G9: "Yeah."

FM: "That threatening is enough."

In Extract 22 above the group member (G8) has told how in his childhood home the branch of birch was used as a deterrent. The facilitator reflected the awfulness of this way of intimidation. Another group member (G9) agreed with the facilitator. Later in the same session, the facilitator said that threatening with violence can already be considered violence. Another group member (G9) agreed with the facilitator but the

group member (G8) who had told them about his childhood experiences answered nothing to the facilitator's comment.

3.3.5. Positioning

The facilitators offered different positions to the group members to observe things from another perspective. The facilitators often used positioning from the parent's perspective. Especially the group members' experiences of childhood violence were subjects in which the facilitators used positioning and emphasized the child's perspective. This was done by either focusing on the group members own perspective as a child in these traumatic events or the perspective of their own children. After positioning was used by the facilitators the group member always came back to talk about current events.

Extract 23

(I/3/00:21:28-)

G3: "Yeah. He grabbed me by my hair and slammed my head against the car a few times and then pushed me to the ground. He told me that this better be the last time I call him that. I think that might have been the worst one. But I was already fifteen or sixteen years old at the time."

...

G3: "Thinking about that situation...Well, that is why I started psychotherapy. I need to talk it all out, all the things I have experienced and also the things I have done myself. I have other experiences of being the victim of an assault besides that one and I have also been involved in gang violence and such it is such a heavy burden and I need to get it, well not removed from my system, but to open things up."

FM: "That sounds like a good idea. Mm, I'm just thinking how I am a father and you are also a father and to think about that situation as a father it feels incomprehensible that a father would do such things to their own son."

(5)

G3: "Yeah I think it is a bit I haven't really come to terms with it all so it feels difficult."

In Extract 23 the group member talked about a situation in which he was about 15 years old and had called his father gay. The group member continued to talk about the consequences of this and how it resulted in him getting beaten up by his father. The group member mentioned how he has sought psychotherapy because of his traumatic experiences. The facilitator tried to bring forth the terribleness of the situation by positioning. The facilitator mentioned how he is a father himself and how the group member is also a father and emphasized how terrible it is that a father could do such things to his own son. After the facilitator's comment, the group member was silent for a long while but then brought the conversation back to the current moment by telling how he hasn't dealt with his painful experiences enough. The group member didn't follow the facilitator's positioning.

3.3.6. Strengthening the agency of the group member

The facilitators aim was to strengthen the agency of the group members by disclosing issues that the group members can impact, or which they have already impacted, or are impacting. Even though the group members have had traumatic experiences they can still impact their own behavior and their ways of thinking instead of following in their parents' footsteps. The group members responded to this kind of talk in two ways. One was that the group member agreed with the facilitator and another way was that the group member compared his current self to his past self.

Extract 24

(IV/37/00:56:16-)

G3: "I guess you could give yourself a break or something. The things that have happened in my life have not been the nicest. I mean there have been bad things happening for a long time. I sometimes wonder why have I been like that. Even my mother told me how as a child I used to be such a sensitive boy so I don't think I would have after all the experiences have shaped me so much the things that have happened in my life. I don't know how else I could have survived junior high. I had to be very tough. I didn't choose it. Those things were done to me and well what can you do. It has caused so much damage now and turning thing around is very difficult."

(...)

G3: *“That’s exactly how I see it. It has surprised me a little bit how difficult it is to make a change and how long it takes. Those experiences are so deeply rooted in me and I can’t just suddenly learn to hug and such or at least it’s not natural at all. Even a child can see it when I hug like a robot and such and it just doesn’t work. Or maybe even that would have been better. Maybe I would have learned that way if I just let people close to me I don’t know.”*

(...)

G3: *“I’m not lying when I say our father has probably never hugged me. He has even said that he is not the hugger type.”*

(...)

G3: *“Yeah our father doesn’t even hug his grandchildren really. He is always like that.”*

FM: *“So you have not created this chain but you have been made part of it, this thought that men don’t show emotions. And now you are trying to stop this chain from continuing and are wondering if you could do something so this kind of thinking wouldn’t get passed on to your son. Am I understanding correctly?”*

G3: *“Yes and it was a very difficult thing to grasp. I needed to watch other people and somehow I thought that’s just the way things go that it is completely normal or something and that it’s how things are supposed to be handled. It took a lot of work for me to understand that this is not good.”*

In Extract 24 above the group member has told how he had to learn to be tough because of the terrible experiences in his childhood and that his father didn't teach him closeness nor how to process his emotions. The group member also mentioned how his father doesn't even hug his grandchildren. The facilitator talked about how the group member is involuntarily made part of this chain of events and how important this deliberation his having is. The facilitator emphasized that the group member has the power and ability to stop this chain from continuing and affecting his son. This way the facilitator tried to strengthen the agency of the group member. After the facilitator's talk, the group member started to ponder his past way of thinking and compares it to the current way.

3.3.7. Bringing forth the responsibility of the group member

In their talk the facilitators emphasized how the perpetrator is always responsible for their violent behavior and violence is a choice the perpetrator has made. The purpose of this way of talking was to help the group members notice that their parents or other adults have made the choice to use violence and that this is wrong in any case. After this kind of talk, the group members gave a very brief answer, agreed with the facilitator, and came back to talk about current events, criticized their own behavior during the traumatic event, defended the behavior of their parents, or continued to talk about their traumatic experiences.

Extract 25

(I/3/00:36:18-)

G4: "He didn't strangle me so hard I would've died but he grabbed me and held me there."

FM: "Well as a child there is not much you can do in that situation."

G4: "No."

FM: "If he wanted to choke you."

G4: "Yeah."

FM: "There would have been very little you could have done."

G4: "Yes but it's a strange thing because I sometimes still saw him when he was still alive naturally and if I saw him in the street and of course he was a pretty big guy and I was thinking how I would just want to punch him in the face."

In Extract 25 above the group member has told about a situation where his stepfather has strangled them. The facilitator brought forth the helplessness of a child and the responsibility of the perpetrator which in this case was the stepfather. The group member agreed with the facilitator and then started to talk about revenge fantasies that he has had towards his stepfather.

3.3.8. Confrontation

In our data there was one instance in which the facilitators confronted the group member by questioning the suggestion made by him (G8) to another group member who was discussing

his traumatic childhood (G3). The facilitators allowed this suggestion to be made but also expressed their disagreement in the matter bringing forth the possible downside of it. The facilitators expressed their understanding that the suggestion made by the group member (G8) might work in his situation but might not be suitable for everyone. After the facilitators' response the group member (G3) continued to talk about his father.

Extract 26

(IV/37/01:01:01-)

G3: *"I think it could have been somewhat okay but then all those bad things happened and I think I would've needed that emotional support but there were no parents. They were constantly at work and I was left alone with these things."*

FF: *"Mm."*

G3: *"With my fears and stuff. I didn't really talk to my parents about these things... They were so awful, like getting beat up and getting my bike and money stolen from me and."*

FF: *"Mm."*

FM: *"You carried these things all by yourself."*

G3: *"Yeah and you had to be tough and successful, be a man. Our father didn't really talk about emotions. He didn't talk about the things you talk about here. Problems weren't discussed when children were present, but I did hear mom and dad argue. But there was no analysis of the situation or anything [they just moved on]."*

FF: *"[(- -)]."*

G3: *"And I just thought this is how things go, this is how they are handled so."*

G8: *"I'm thinking that if I were in your situation and were on good terms with my parents, like I myself am in very good terms with my own, and if your kids are with you at the same time as they are with their grandparents, what I mean is I would discuss these things with my parents and open things up with them so that some of that burden would be lifted from your shoulders. And then I would start this by first saying yeah we could hug with dad now."*

FM: *"We have mainly disagreed a bit on that matter here and I think that in your situation G8 where you are on good terms with your parents it works but the environment that G9 is describing here I think and I generally think that it is more important to focus on what we put out and forward. This deliberation you are having is very important regarding you and it is very important regarding your children and"*

this is the most important direction. It's a bit you know parents they are already old and they have had their ways."

FF: "Mm yeah and sometimes you can try to solve things with your parents but then again it won't."

FM: "[(- -)]."

FF: "Erase the things that have already happened [and then]."

FM: "[And then] if you are not heard and your parents get defensive you might end up getting hurt again."

FF: "Yeah yeah."

FM: "I have always said that in your thoughts you can discuss with your parents and if needed scold them but when addressing these things with your real parents I think there is always a risk."

FF: "Mm."

G3: "I got this weird like I got it earlier too and I don't know what you think about Donald Trump but our father is kinda like him somehow. They remind me of each other."

In Extract 26 above the group member (G3) talked about his childhood experiences and how he didn't get the support he needed from his parents when experiencing traumatic things such as abuse and stealing. The facilitators encouraged the group member (G3) to continue his talk by giving backchannel responses (FF) and repeating a part of what the group member had told them. Group member (G3) continued to tell how his father raised him to be tough. Another group member (G8) suggested that the group member would make reconciliation with his parents. The facilitators said that it's not a good idea and that he should rather focus on the current situation and the future. The facilitators also pointed out how trying to go through the past with his parents might just end up hurting him again. After this contention, the group member (G3) continued talking about his father.

3.3.9. Ignoring the trauma talk

The facilitator ignored the group members' talk about a traumatic experience and instead focused on something else the group member said leading the conversation to the current

events or other topics. One way of leading the conversation was to ask linear questions about the current topics but not about the traumatic experiences. There was also one instance in which the facilitator (in this session there was only one facilitator, FF) didn't get involved in the conversation at all and another group member joined the conversation. The facilitator didn't get involved in this conversation when it was linked to the traumatic experience, but when the topic changed she joined in. Context influenced the facilitators' decisions of which parts of the group members' talk they wanted to focus on. For example, the remaining time of the session had to be taken into account. Leading conversation to current events was one of the facilitators most used ways of talking. In most cases, the group member followed the facilitators lead and started to discuss current events or other topics. There was also one case in which the group member continued to talk about his traumatic experiences even after the facilitator tried to lead the conversation to the current topics. In two cases the group member agreed with the facilitator but didn't continue talking about the current situation or his traumatic experience. There was also one case where the group member gave a very brief answer after the facilitator's talk and once the group member agreed with the facilitator.

Extract 27

(III/16/00:03:40-)

G3: "I have a pretty violent background. I remember getting beat up for the first time when I was five years old. Pretty much ever since that it has been like that. First I got beaten outside then at school throughout elementary school. Junior high was the worst till the eighth grade. Then I had already grown to be quite big and I did sports and went to the gym and I started to give back at them. After that, I've had fights in the streets and been involved in gang violence, and was heavily using intoxicants. I'm not going to go through all the things I used but then when I was a bit over twenty I had this crisis when some of my age group and people I knew started to settle down. They had degree palaces and they wanted to live a proper life and all that. I started to feel anxious about the way I lived and decided to become a taxpayer and a proper citizen and I did get a degree place and started a family but then I noticed my old habits didn't disappear and when things got difficult I broke things and talked very rudely and acted very threatening. It was a bit you know the kids were there and I started to think it can't continue like this and that I must try and change things up. Well, my life is pretty messed up at the moment. Me and my partner have separated again and now it is just a countdown to when my partner and the kids will move to

(locality). I'm in a debt settlement and yeah but I think the situation would be a lot worse if this group didn't exist."

FF: "Mm."

G3: "I think I can handle adversities better and I don't have that anxious feeling all the time. I also go to psychotherapy and take aldazines so they probably also do their part. I think that is it in a nutshell."

FF: "Mm."

G3: "The introduction so."

FF: "Do you remember what it was like coming to the group for the first time?"

G3: "Yeah I remember feeling a bit scared to come here. I thought there would be bikers and that it could be dangerous. I remember it being way scarier telling these stories for the first time."

In Extract 27 above a new group member had just joined the group and the group member who has been in the group for the longest time was introducing himself. In this introduction, the group member talked about the violence and trauma he has experienced in his past. The group member has experienced abuse in his childhood and adolescence, street fights and gang violence, and used intoxicants. Around his twenties, the group members started to change his lifestyle. He got a degree place and started a family. In his family life, the group member has noticed how his old ways of behavior did not change and how he still acted violently. After this, the group member understood how this could not continue the way it did. The facilitators ignored this kind of trauma talk and gave no feedback to it. Instead, the facilitator responded to the talk about change with a backchannel. The group member continued to talk about how he now has a better ability to handle difficulties and how psychotherapy and psyche medicines have helped him. The facilitator gave a backchannel response and asked the group member to describe what it was like entering the group for the first time. In this context, the facilitators wanted to focus on the topic of this session which is simply an introduction and welcoming the new group member to the group. The group member answered the facilitator's question and began to describe his feelings entering the group for the first time.

3.3.10. Backchannel responses

Backchannels were short verbal feedback given to the group members during their talk. The purpose of such feedback was to signify that the facilitators were paying attention to what the group member was telling them. This was also a method used to encourage the group member to continue talking. The facilitators used backchanneling very often and most of the time, the group members continued talking about their traumatic experiences after receiving a backchannel from one or both of the facilitators. Another quite usual response to a backchannel was to change the subject from the traumatic experiences to something else. There were two cases in which the group member stopped talking after receiving a backchannel. There were also individual cases where the group member agreed with the facilitator, continued to talk about the traumatic event he had experienced but also criticized his own behavior during the traumatic event or criticized the behavior of his parents and continued to talk about his traumatic experiences after.

See Extract 14.

In Extract 14 the group member talked about a situation in which he became a victim of an aggravated assault. Both of the facilitators gave the group member backchannel responses and the group member continued to talk about the assault he had experienced and described details about this situation.

3.3.11. Humor

The facilitators also used humor in their interactions with the group members. When the facilitators used humor in their talk the group members answered in different ways. There were singular cases in which the group member defended the way his parents had behaved in his childhood, criticized his own behavior during the traumatic event, continued talking about the traumatic event he had experienced, or gave some kind of statement.

Extract 28

(I/3/00:27:33-)

G2: *“When I was younger I wouldn’t have dared to call names like that I surely would have gotten spanked or pulled by my hair. When I was a bit older I would but I thought I would fight back a little and after that, I didn’t get punished the same as before. But many questions remain and I probably could have left the name-calling out but they could also have not I don’t know maybe they had a bad day and something was already pissing them off and then I come and call them by names and I just think it’s pretty insulting if you are told not to do something and you respond back by calling them names. It’s a bit different with complete strangers than with your own parents.”*

(...)

G2: *“Yes it was a punishment. I tried to secretly eat strawberries from the field so that no one would notice but I got caught like goddamnit the biggest ones have been eaten.”*

FM: *“Why were you not allowed to eat the strawberries?”*

G2: *“My grandma had a strawberry field filled with strawberries.”*

FM: *“Why were you not allowed to eat grandma’s strawberries?”*

G2: *“They were meant for something else. For jam or something so you are not allowed to eat them. Only if there are some leftovers.”*

FM: *“Well um...Is it just me or doesn’t that sound extremely”*

G2: *“Well if you plant something and mooses come and eat all of it and you are left with nothing.”*

FM: *“\$Dammit it’s a bit different whether we are talking about grandchildren or mooses.\$”*

G2: *“For fucks sake if we plant something in order to make something out of it then it is meant for that purpose and not for someone to just go and eat it all.”*

In Extract 28 above the group member has talked about the punishment-related violence he has experienced in his childhood. The group member reflected on his own behavior and how he could have left out his parents' name-calling. The facilitator and the group member have discussed the example the group member gave about a situation in which the group member got punished for eating strawberries from the strawberry field. The facilitator asked linear questions about the situation and tried to bring forth the exorbitant of the situation. The group member responded by defending his parents' behavior. Then the facilitator used humor to

bring forth the harshness of the situation. However, the group member insisted on saying that it was wrong of him to eat the strawberries.

3.3.12. Asking questions about the support network

Facilitators asked questions trying to make sure the group members were getting the support they needed outside of the group program. In these situations, the group member either came back to talk about his current situation or made some kind of statement.

Extract 29

(IV/30/00:20:00-)

G3: "It would have been nice to understand and kinda know why have I been that way before. I haven't quite figured it out but I guess it is something I have had to go through and see and my personality. I guess I will figure it out eventually."

FF: "Do you still go to psychotherapy?"

G3: "Yeah I do [so]."

FF: "[Yeah] I was wondering if that is a place for this kind of deliberation."

G3: "Yeah we have managed to but the progress feels so slow."

In Extract 29 the group member wondered about the reasons behind his violent behaviors and how they are probably caused by all the traumatic experiences he has gone through as a child. The facilitator didn't take part in this thought process but asked the group member if he still goes to psychotherapy. The facilitator tried to make sure the group member had a place for this kind of discussion, even though it might not be this group program. The psychotherapy of this group member was ongoing and he started to talk about how he has been discussing these same topics there, but the progress feels to be very slow.

4. DISCUSSION

Most of the group members in our study had experienced traumatic events and brought these experiences up in the video recordings and in the interview. The group members had many adverse childhood experiences such as physical, emotional, and sexual violence, physical and emotional neglect, living with a family member who has alcohol addiction, living with a family member who has mental illnesses, witnessing their mother being abused, being a victim of bullying, witnessing violence outside the home, witnessing a sibling being abused, parental separation and unsafe ambiance of the home. Group members also talked about sibling abuse. In addition to the childhood experiences, we found that some group members had experienced traumatic events during their adulthood. These findings support the previous findings of traumatic experiences being associated with the perpetration of intimate partner violence (Fulu et al. 2017; Leibman, 1992; Murrell et al., 2007). They also show that the group members' trauma experiences are brought up and discussed in the program. Many IPV treatment programs don't incorporate structured and specific intervention strategies of the trauma aspect even though studies show the benefit of doing so. After noticing that the traumatic experiences were indeed discussed in the program we looked deeper into how they were discussed. We focused on the facilitator's responses to the trauma talk and what followed these responses. Our results show that the facilitators either focused on the trauma issue or ignored it. When focusing on the trauma topic the facilitators mostly used the traditional methods which can be seen in many different therapeutic interventions. These ways were reflective listening, linear and reflexive questions, psychoeducation, backchannel responses, positioning, and strengthening the agency of the group member. The facilitators also tried to make sure the group members were getting the support they needed outside of the group program by asking questions about the group members support network. Other ways to focus on the trauma issue we found were bringing forth the responsibility of the group member, confrontation, and the use of humor. Some of the responses we found were partly overlapping. For an example some of the questions were asked in a humorous way.

We found some of the same methods that have been found in previous research of the Jyväskylä Model. Presenting a new point of view and other elements of reflexive listening as well as linear and reflexive questions, psychoeducation, and confrontation were also found in a study carried out by Liikamaa and Tantarimäki (2005). We also noticed facilitators using positioning which have been previously studied by Päivinen et al. (2021), and ignoring which

have also been found in a previous study carried out by Partanen & Wahlström (2003). Newly found methods were humor and the facilitators' way of making sure the group members were getting the support they needed outside of the group program.

Reflective listening can be seen as a special type of listening in which the listener is paying respectful attention to the content and feelings expressed by the speaker (Katz & McNulty, 1994). The purpose is to let the speaker know that they are heard and understood. In this type of listening, the listener doesn't offer the other person their perspective but responds by reflecting the thoughts and feelings which can be heard in their talk. Reflective listening can help understand what the speaker is telling and make the speaker feel heard and understood. It can also help the speaker explore their feelings and clarify their thoughts. Repeating, reflecting the emotion of the statement, summarizing, rephrasing, and presenting a new point of view were the ways of reflective listening used by the facilitators in this study.

Linear questions are questions that help a therapist to orient to a client's situation. These questions give more information and are based on facts (Tomm, 1988.) In our data for example the facilitators used linear questions to get more information about group members' traumatic experiences. Neutral and approbative questions are an important part of the intervention because they cause less contradiction in perpetrators than confrontative questions (Tomm, 1993). Reflexive questions are especially known from the field of family therapy but they are also used in other contexts (Hieker & Huffington, 2006). Karl Tomm (1987) has defined reflexive questions as questions which purpose is to activate the reflexivity within individuals. This leads individuals to consider meanings within belief systems which enable individuals to develop constructive patterns of cognition and behavior. Reflexive questions may also help clients change their perspectives and open space for new possibilities (Tomm, 1987; Tomm, 1988).

Psychoeducational approaches aim to increase the patients' knowledge and understanding of their illness and the treatment and can include printed handouts and video materials (Lanktree et al., 2012; Xia, Merinder & Belgamwar, 2011). Lanktree and her colleagues (2012) suggest that psychoeducation could be an important part of trauma treatment. In this program, the facilitators used psychoeducation by bringing up how common it is for the perpetrators to have experienced domestic violence in their childhood, or by defining violence. It is good to note that the facilitators' purpose was not to normalize violent behaviors but to increase knowledge and understanding. The facilitators emphasized that not every perpetrator has traumatic experiences and that you can experience traumatic events and not become a perpetrator.

There was one session in our data where confrontation was used by the facilitators. Facilitators usually use confrontation to confront the violent behavior of the perpetrator in batterer treatment programs. It is part of the facilitators role to use traditional therapeutic interventions and confrontation flexibly (Partanen, 2008). In our data this therapeutic intervention was used differently, the facilitators confronted the group member by questioning the suggestion which he made to another group member.

Positioning theory is interested in parlances and how they are used to cause the subjectivity of people by positioning (Davies & Harré, 1990). According to this theory, local moral orderliness is created in conversations that define what rights and responsibilities each have (Harré, Moghaddam, Cairnie, Rothbart & Sabat, 2009). By talking people define these rights and responsibilities and the limits linked to themselves and others (Harré & Slocum, 2003). People can offer new positions to others and also change their positions (Harré et al., 2009). In this study, the facilitators offered positions from the child's perspective to the group members.

The facilitators also used backchannels in their interactions with the group members. Originally the term “backchannel” was coined by Victor Yngve (1970) and according to linguistics theory backchannel responses encourage clients to continue talking while the therapist takes the role of a listener (Arnold, 2012). These responses don't demand to be acknowledged, they simply signal to the speaker that they may continue talking and that the therapist is paying attention to their talk and understands what they are saying. Ferrara (1994) estimates that 19-35% of therapist's responses are some sort of backchannel responses and in this study backchannels were the most used response by the facilitators.

This study shows that the facilitators strengthen the agency of the group members. In therapy context, client-agency means clients' ability to make choices regarding their therapy (Hoener, Stiles, Luka & Gordon, 2012). Williams and Levitt (2007) found in their study that the therapists had the need to enhance clients' self-awareness and to guide them to recognize what is changeable in their lives. Enhancing clients' agency is seen as a key concept across psychotherapy traditions. In the Jyväskylä Model, central themes of conversation in the groups are the group members' responsibility, choices, regulating their own behavior, and the possibility of change (Holma et al., 2005). There is an endeavor to accomplish conversation about alternatives, imagine different alternatives to their behavior, and reflect consequences of these alternatives in group members. These mental images create an opportunity and could lead to another kind of behavior.

The facilitators also brought forth the responsibility of the group member which can be seen as a typical method when working with perpetrators. In this specific context, this method was used a bit differently. When discussing the traumatic experiences the facilitators brought forth the responsibility of the abuser who had used violence towards the group member.

Humor was also a tool used by the facilitators. In general, humor seems to be a pretty well-liked tool for therapists to use, and its benefits in psychotherapy have been recognized (Franzini, 2001). The use of humor in therapy can be intentional or spontaneous and it can be used to improve the client's self-understanding. The humorous point made by the therapists should always have relevance to the client's situation or personality to appear most helpful. It should also take into account the possible sensitivities and needs of the client (Salameh, 1987). It is good to remember that humor is not made for every situation and therapists need to be aware when the use of it might not be appropriate. In the Jyväskylä Model humor was mostly used to lighten the situation or to bring forth the harshness of the situation. The group members reacted to the use of humor in different ways. Some accepted it and joined it, laughing with the facilitator. Sometimes the group members got defensive and the facilitators' attempt to lighten the mood did not work.

In this study, the trauma talk produced by the group members was not always acknowledged and the facilitators used a couple of ways to ignore this kind of talk. Ignoring as a therapeutic discourse by facilitators is also found in a previous study (Partanen & Wahlström, 2003). In this study, the facilitators mostly ignored the trauma talk by leading the conversation to other topics. Another way of ignoring the trauma talk was to simply not respond to it at all though this happened only once in our data. Leading the conversation to other topics can be seen as a specific method used in very specific situations. It might be more commonly used in group programs in which there can be a specific topic to be discussed or worked on in a certain session or the purpose of the group program is more or less strictly defined. The way and reason the group member starts to talk about their traumatic experiences may also impact the facilitators' decision to either focus on or ignore the trauma talk. If trauma is used to justify the current violent behaviors it might be that the facilitators don't want to give space to this kind of reasoning. Context also influenced the facilitators' decisions to ignore the trauma talk. For example, if the purpose of the meeting was to introduce a new member to the group, the facilitators kept the discussion on this topic.

When looking into what followed the therapist say we found the following manners of talking from the group members: the group member continued to talk about his traumatic

experiences, gave an example of a traumatic event, gave a very brief answer, accepted a new point of view presented by the facilitator, defended the behavior of his parents, agreed with the facilitator, gave some kind of statement, compared his current self to his past self, started to notice his own agency, came back to talk about current events/other topics or didn't reply at all. When facilitators ignored the trauma talk by leading the conversation to other topics the group members usually followed the facilitators lead. More rarely did the group members continue talking about their traumatic experiences despite the facilitators attempt to change the topic though this also happened. When focusing on the trauma topic the group members usually continued talking about their traumatic experiences but sometimes changed the topic themselves.

Like many other programs, the Jyväskylä Model doesn't have incorporated, structured, and specific intervention strategies of the trauma aspect. Our results show that some group members have trauma experiences and that they bring these experiences up during the group sessions. Our study also shows that these traumatic events are discussed in the group program. In the Jyväskylä Model group members are allowed to talk about all kinds of things but at the same time, it is important to remember why the group members are in the group (Holma et al., 2005). This can be seen when looking into the trauma aspect. The group members were allowed to talk about their traumatic experiences. Sometimes the facilitators gave more room to this kind of talk and sometimes they ignored it. There could be many reasons for this. One the facilitators might react to the reason why the group members bring up their traumatic experiences. If they are brought up as a way of escaping responsibility it might be that the facilitators choose not to give room for this kind of talk and rather ignore it. If the reason the group member wants to talk about their traumatic experiences is simply the need to go through them and talk about them, the facilitators might want to give them the chance to do so. Facilitators try to lead the group members to wonder how something they have experienced before is linked to their current violent behaviours. This is how violence is discussed. The facilitators focus on the violence, come back to discuss it repeatedly, and try to link other topics to it so that no explanation that escapes responsibility would be left as dominant because of the changing topics (Holma et al., 2005). When focusing on the trauma talk the facilitators asked questions and usually gave everyone a chance to talk. From the results of this study you could notice that face-work was present when working with the group members. Face-work refers to practise in which humiliating someone or putting someone inTo the spotlight in a way that could embarrass them is avoided (Goffman, 1967).

It's notable that therapeutic intervention is a construction of an interactive process

instead of a set of different techniques (Fruggeri, 1992). The treatment could be considered an institutional situation where therapists are in a position in which they have power (Burr, 1995). The context of therapy could be considered a tool for functional societal control which purpose is to prevent the recurrence of violent behaviour (Liikamaa & Tantarimäki, 2005). As advocates of societal institutions, therapists have the right to lead a conversation but at the same time, they have responsibility for treatment progress. In the Jyväskylä Model at the beginning, the role of the facilitators is active and leading (Holma et al., 2005). After the beginning the facilitator's role becomes less active and the group works in its own way. However, a certain type of leading from the facilitators is part of their role for the whole time.

In the videos, two of the group members talked about their experiences of sibling abuse. Despite one of the group members mentioning their fights with their sister causing them the worst injuries, the facilitators ignored this kind of talk and focused more on the violence perpetrated by their parents. One of these group members also mentioned their experiences during the interview. Social context that still considers sibling aggression as normal can affect professionals as well (Begun, 1995; Finkelhor, Ormrod, Turner, & Hamby, 2005). It is often dismissed as normal or just playful behavior and in a study carried out by Hardy (2001) respondents reported that hitting a sibling is considered to be acceptable and is not seen as violent or abusive. But sibling abuse is harmful which is why it should be given more attention (Eeva, 2018).

Personal preconceptions should not alter the analysis of the research yet this is inevitable when it comes to qualitative research (Stiles, 2003). The researcher needs to be careful while making conclusions and stay loyal to their data. Personal preconceptions might alter the analysis towards the expected outcome and this should be avoided as much as possible. Our data, the video recordings, and interview questionnaires, were in Finnish. This means that the original transcripts are written in Finnish and then later on translated into English. When using conversation analysis it is important that the transcriptions are as precise as possible. This is why all of the analysis is done with the original Finnish transcriptions. The weakness of the videotaped data was that gestures, gazes, or expressions could not be observed. Most of the time the faces of the group members were not visible. Information from this level could have brought some extra to the analysis. Because our data consists of just eight group members these results cannot be generalized. They simply give us information about the traumatic experiences these group members talk about and of the discussion between them and the three facilitators in the Jyväskylä Model.

More research is needed from therapeutic interventions in the field of treating perpetrators. Treatment of domestic violence is challenging and there are elements that are special to this kind of treatment. There have been disagreements on what kind of approach the batterer intervention programs should take on perpetrators' trauma experiences. These experiences are quite common in perpetrators and previous studies have shown better results when batterer programs are focused also on perpetrators' trauma experiences (Zarling & Berta, 2017; Zarling, 2017). It would be important to study more how focusing on the trauma aspect affects the results of the treatment. Studying the function of the trauma talk of the perpetrators could increase the understanding of the purpose of the trauma talk. This study showed that the group members bring up their trauma experiences and they are discussed in the Jyväskylä Model. There could be a need for a structured and specific intervention strategie of the trauma aspect in the Jyväskylä Model. This could help the facilitators in their work and make the Models take on trauma aspect more clear.

REFERENCES

- Anda, R. F., Chapman, D. P., Felitti, V. J., Edwards, V., Williamson, D. F., Croft, J. B., & Giles, W. H. (2002). Adverse Childhood Experiences and Risk of Paternity in Teen Pregnancy. *The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, 100*(1), 37–45.
- Arnold, K. (2012). HUMMING ALONG: THE MEANING OF MM-HMM IN PSYCHOTHERAPEUTIC COMMUNICATION. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 48*(1), 100–117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00107530.2012.10746491>
- Askeland, I. R., Evang, A., & Heir, T. (2011). Association of Violence Against Partner and Former Victim Experiences: A Sample of Clients Voluntarily Attending Therapy. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(6), 1095–1110. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0886260510368152>
- Babcock, J. C., Green, C. E., & Robie, C. (2004). Does batterers' treatment work? A meta-analytic review of domestic violence treatment. *Clinical Psychology Review, 23*(8), 1023–1053. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2002.07.001>
- Begun, A. L. (1995). Sibling relationships and foster care placements for young children. *Early Child Development and Care, 106*(1), 237–250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0300443951060118>
- Briere, J. N., & Lanktree, C. B. (2011). *Treating Complex Trauma in Adolescents and Young Adults*. California: SAGE Publications.
- Burr, V. (1995) *An introduction to social constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Condino, V., Tanzilli, A., Speranza, A. M., & Lingardi, V. (2016). Therapeutic Interventions in Intimate Partner Violence: An Overview. *Research in Psychotherapy: Psychopathology, Process and Outcome, 19*(2). <https://doi.org/10.4081/ripppo.2016.241>
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 20*, 43–63.
- Delsol, C., & Margolin, G. (2004). The role of family-of-origin violence in men's marital violence perpetration. *Clinical Psychology Review 24*(1), 99–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2003.12.001>
- Dobash, R. E., Dobash, R. P., Cavanagh, K., & Lewis, R. (2000). *Changing Violent Men*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Dutton, D. G. (1997). Male abusiveness in intimate relationships. *Clinical Psychology Review, 15*(6), 567–581. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-7358\(95\)00028-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-7358(95)00028-N)
- Eeva, E. K. (2018). Sisarusten välisen väkivallan merkitykset internetkeskusteluissa. The University of Helsinki: Master's thesis.
- Eskola, J., & Suoranta, J. (1998). *Johdatus laadulliseen tutkimukseen*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., Koss, M. P., & Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of Childhood Abuse and Household Dysfunction to Many of the Leading Causes of Death in Adults: The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 14*(4), 245–258. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797\(98\)00017-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797(98)00017-8)
- Ferrara, K. (1994). *Therapeutic ways with words*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R. K., Turner, H. A., & Hamby, S. L. (2005). Measuring poly-victimization using the Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 29*(11), 1297–1312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2005.06.005>
- Finkelhor, D., Shattuck, A., Turner, H., & Hamby, S. (2013). Improving the Adverse Childhood Experiences Study Scale. *Jama Pediatr, 167*(1), 70–75. <https://doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2013.420>
- Flaherty, E. G., Thompson, R., Litrownik, A. J., Zolotor, A. J., Dubowitz, H., Runyan, D. K., English, D. J., & Everson, M. D. (2009). Adverse Childhood Exposures and Reported Child Health at Age 12. *Academic Pediatrics, 9*(3), 150–156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2008.11.003>
- FRA, European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2015). Violence against women: an EU-wide survey. Main results. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [referred 30.3.2021]. Available: https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2014-vaw-survey-main-results-apr14_en.pdf
- Franzini, L. R. (2001). Humor in Therapy: The Case for Training Therapists in its Uses and Risks. *The Journal of General Psychology, 128*(2), 170–193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221300109598906>
- Fruggeri, L. (1992). Therapeutic process as the social construction of change. In S. McNamee & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), *Therapy as social construction* (pp. 40–53). London: Sage.
- Fulu, E., Miedema, S., Roselli, T., McCook, S., Chan, K. L., Haardörfer, R., & Jewke, R. (2017). Pathways between childhood trauma, intimate partner violence, and harsh parenting: findings from the UN Multi-country Study on Men and Violence in Asia

- and the Pacific. *The Lancet Global Health*, 5(5), 512–522.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(17\)30103-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(17)30103-1)
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual. Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Hardy, M. S. (2001). Physical Aggression and Sexual Behavior Among Siblings: A Retrospective Study. *Journal of Family Violence*, 16(3), 255–268.
- Harré, R., Moghaddam, F. M., Cairnie, T. P., Rothbart, D., & Sabat, S. R. (2009). Recent Advances in Positioning Theory. *Theory & Psychology*, 19(1), 5–31.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0959354308101417>
- Harré, R., & Slocum, N. (2003). Disputes as complex social events. On the uses of positioning theory. *Common Knowledge*, 9(1), 100–118.
- Have, P. T. (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis. A Practical Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Henriksson, M., & Lönnqvist, J. (2017). Psykkiset kriisit, sopeutumishäiriöt ja stressireaktiot. In J. Lönnqvist, M. Henriksson, M. Marttunen & T. Partonen (Eds.), *Psykiatria* (pp. 357–384). Helsinki: Duodecim.
- Heritage, J. (1998). Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk: Analyzing Distinctive Turn-Taking Systems. In S. Cmejrková, J. Hoffmannová, O. Müllerová & J. Svetlá (Eds.), *Dialogue Analysis VI. Proceedings of the 6th Conference Prague 1996* (pp. 3–17). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Hieker, C., & Huffington, C. (2006). Reflexive questions in a coaching psychology context. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 1(2), 46–55.
- Hoener, C. Stiles, W. B., Luka, B. J., & Gordon, R. A. (2012). Client experiences of agency in therapy. *Person-Centered & Experiential Psychotherapies*, 11(1), 64–82.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14779757.2011.639460>
- Holma, J., Laitila, A., Wahlström, J., & Sveins, P. (2005). Miehet väkivaltahoito-ohjelmien kohteena: lähtökohtia ja toimintaperiaatteita. In J. M. Holma & J. Wahlström (Eds.), *Iskuryhmä* (pp. 24–50). Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.
- Holma, J., Partanen, T., Wahlström, J., Laitila, A., & Seikkula, J. (2006). Narratives and discourses in groups for male batterers. In M. Libshitz (Eds.), *Domestic Violence and its Reverberations* (pp. 59–83). New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Hotaling, G. T., & Sugarman, D. B. (1986). An analysis of Risk Markers in Husband to Wife violence: The Current State of Knowledge. *Violence and Victims*, 1(2), 101–124.

- Hutchby, I. (2019). Conversation analysis. In P. Atkinson, S. Delamont, A. Cernat, J. W. Sakshaug & R. A. Williams (Eds.), *SAGE Research Methods Foundations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036>
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis 2*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Karakurt, G., Koç, E., Çetinsaya, E. E., Ayluçtarhan, Z., & Bolen, S. (2019). Meta-analysis and systematic review for the treatment of perpetrators of intimate partner violence. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *105*, 220–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2019.08.006>
- Katz, N., & McNulty, K. (1994). Reflective listening. [referred 8.2.2021]. Available: <https://www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedfiles/parcc/cmc/reflective%20listening%20nk.pdf>
- Kaufman, J., & Zigler, E. (1987). Do abusive children become abusive parents? *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *57*(2), 186–192. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1987.tb03528.x>
- Keltikangas, M., & Laaksamo, S.-R. (2012). MIESTEN LÄHISUHDEVÄKIVALLAN TAUSTATEKIJÄT JA VÄKIVALLAN SIIRTYMINEN SUKUPOLVELTA TOISELLE: Jyväskylän yliopiston psykoterapian opetus- ja tutkimusklinikan Vaihtoehto väkivallalle -ohjelman alkuhaastattelu. University of Jyväskylä: Bachelor's thesis.
- Krippendorff, K. (1989). Content analysis. In E. Barnouw, G. Gerbner, W. Schramm, T. L. Worth, & L. Gross (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of communication* (pp. 403–407). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lanktree, C. B., Briere, J., Godbout, N., Hodges, M., Chen, K., Trimm, L., Adams, B., Maida, C. A., & Freed, W. (2012). Treating Multitraumatized, Socially Marginalized Children: Results of a Naturalistic Treatment Outcome Study. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *21*(8), 813–828. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2012.722588>
- Leibman, F. H. (1992). Childhood abandonment/adult rage: The root of violent criminal acts. *American Journal of Forensic Psychology*, *10*(4), 57–64.
- Liikamaa, M., & Tantarimäki, T. (2005). Terapeuttisten interventioiden rakentuminen ryhmähoidossa. In J. M. Holma & J. Wahlström (Eds.), *Iskuryhmä* (pp. 114–134). Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.

- McFall, M., Fontana, A., Raskind, M., & Rosenheck, R. (1999). Analysis of Violent Behaviour in Vietnam Combat Veteran Psychiatric Inpatient with Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 12*(3), 501–517.
- Murrell, A. R., Christoff, K. A., & Henning, K. R. (2007). Characteristics of Domestic Violence Offenders: Associations with Childhood Exposure to Violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*, 523–532. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-007-9100-4>
- Neller, D. J., Lenney, R. L., Pietz, C. A., & Thomlinson R. P. (2005). Testing the Trauma Model of Violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 20*(3), 151–159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-005-3651-z>
- Partanen, T. (2008). *Interaction and Therapeutic Interventions in Treatment Groups for Intimately Violent Men*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University Printing House.
- Partanen, T., & Wahlström, J. (2003). The dilemma of victim positioning in group therapy for male perpetrators of domestic violence. In C. Hall, K. Juhila, N. Parton, & T. Pösö (Eds.), *Constructing clienthood in social work and human services. Interaction, identities and practices* (pp. 129–144). London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Perry, B. D. (1997). Incubated in terror: Neurodevelopmental factors in the "cycle of violence". In J. D. Osofsky (Eds.), *Children in a violent society* (pp. 124–149). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Piispa, M., Heiskanen, M., Kääriäinen, J., & Siren, R. (2005). Naisiin kohdistunut väkivalta 2005. Oikeuspoliittisen tutkimuslaitoksen julkaisuja 225. Yhdistyneiden Kansakuntien yhteydessä toimiva Euroopan Kriminaalipoliitiikan Instituutti (HEUNI) Publication Series No. 51. VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN FINLAND. Helsinki. [referred 10.1.2021]. Available: https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/152455/225_Piispa_Heiskanen_Kaariainen_Siren_2006.pdf
- Pomeroy, W. (1995). A Working Model for Trauma: The Relationship Between Trauma and Violence. *Pre- and Peri-natal Psychology Journal, 10*(2), 89–101.
- Päivinen, H., & Holma, J. (2012). Positions constructed for a female therapist in male batterers' treatment group. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 24*, 52–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08952833.2012.629132>
- Päivinen, H., Siltala, H., & Holma, J. (2021). Positioning as a Tool in Work with Fathers Who Have Been Violent in the Family. In L. Gottzén, M. Bjørnholt & F. Boonzaier (Eds.), *Men, Masculinities and Intimate Partner Violence* (pp. 170–183). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429280054-12>

- Ruglass, L. M., & Kendall-Tackett, K. (2014). *Psychology of Trauma 101*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Sacks, V., Murphey, D., & Moore, K. (2014). Adverse Childhood Experiences: National and State-level Prevalence. [referred 18.1.2021]. Available: <https://nvc.dspacedirect.org/handle/20.500.11990/1143?show=full>
- Salameh, W. A. (1987). Humor in integrative short-term psychotherapy (ISTP). In W. F. Fry, Jr., & W. A. Salameh (Eds.), *Handbook of humor and psychotherapy: Advances in the clinical use of humor* (pp. 195–240). Sarasota, FL: Professional Resource Exchange.
- Shepard, M. (1992). Predicting Batterer Recidivism Five Years After Community Intervention. *Journal of Family Violence*, 7(3), 167–178.
- Shipway, L. (2004). *Domestic Violence. A Handbook for Health Care Professionals*. London: Routledge.
- Stevens, J. (2017). If you integrate ACEs science into batterer intervention programs, recidivism plummets, and men (and women) heal. PACEs Connection. [referred 15.1.2021]. Available: <https://www.pacesconnection.com/blog/if-you-integrate-aces-science-into-batterer-intervention-programs-recidivism-plummets-and-men-and-women-heal>
- Stiles, W. B. (2003). Qualitative Research: Evaluating the Process and the Product. In S. Llewelyn & P. Kennedy (Eds.). *Handbook of Clinical Health Psychology* (pp. 477–499). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Suomen virallinen tilasto (SVT). (2019). Rikos- ja pakkokeinotilasto [e-publication]. ISSN=2342-9151. Helsinki: Tilastokeskus. [referred: 9.1.2021]. Available: http://www.stat.fi/til/rpk/2019/15/rpk_2019_15_2020-06-02_tie_001_fi.html
- Tomm, K. (1987). Interventive interviewing: Part II. Reflexive questioning as a means to enable self-healing. *Family Process*, 26, 153–183.
- Tomm, K. (1988). Interventive interviewing: Part III. Intending to ask lineal, circular, reflexive and strategic questions? *Family Process*, 27, 1–15.
- Tomm, K. (1993). *Interventiivinen haastattelu*. Jyväskylä: Mannerheimin lastensuojeluliitto.
- Tuomi, J., & Sarajärvi, A. (2013). *Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi* (2. edition). Helsinki: Kustannusosakeyhtiö Tammi.
- Williams, D. C., & Levitt, H. M. (2007). Principles for facilitating agency in psychotherapy, *Psychotherapy Research*, 17(1), 66–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10503300500469098>
- Wolfe, D. A., & Jaffe, P. G. (1999). Emerging Strategies in the Prevention of Domestic Violence. *The Future of Children*, 9(3), 133–144.

- Xia, J., Merinder, L. B., & Belgamwar, M. R. (2011). Psychoeducation for schizophrenia. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*, 2011(6), CD002831.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD002831.pub2>
- Yngve, V. H. (1970). On getting a word in edgewise. Papers from the Sixth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society, 567–578.
- Zarling, A. (2017). New intervention program reduces domestic violence recidivism rates, Iowa State study finds. IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY. News Service. [referred 26.5.2021]. Available: <https://www.news.iastate.edu/news/2017/07/05/actv>.
- Zarling, A., & Berta, M. (2017). An Acceptance and Commitment Therapy Approach for Partner Aggression. *Partner Abuse*, 8(1), 89–109.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.8.1.89>

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: The questions regarding the perpetrators' childhood experiences from the interview form in english and finnish

1. Did your parents have a drinking problem?
2. Was your father violent towards your mother?
3. Were your parents violent towards you?
 - a. How often?
4. Were you sexually abused?
 - a. How old were you?
 - b. Who abused you?
 - c. Have you talked about this before?

1. Oliko vanhemmillasi alkoholiongelmia?
2. Oliko isäsi väkivaltainen äitiä kohtaan?
3. Olivatko vanhempasi väkivaltaisia sinua kohtaan?
 - a. Kuinka usein?
4. Käytettiinkö sinua seksuaalisesti hyväksi?
 - a. Minkä ikäisenä?
 - b. Kuka?
 - c. Oletko puhunut asiasta aikaisemmin?

Appendix 2: The original text extracts in Finnish

Extract 1

(I/3/00:17:00-)

FM: *“Oliks teillä käytössä tukkapöllyä tai remmiä?”*

G3: *“Oli joo ne oli käytössä. Erehdyin omaa isääni sanomaan homoks kerran ni se oli paha virhe se jäi oikei erityisesti mieleen se kurmuutus mitä siitä seuras.”*

FM: *“Mitä siitä seuras?”*

G3: *“Noh.. käytännössä turpaani siinä omalta isältä.”*

FM: *“Löiks hän ihan nyrkillä vai litsareilla?”*

G3: *“Joo kyllä. Löi hiuksista päätä tohon auton auton siihen tuota kaareen siihen mikä missä on se takaovi se kaarituki niin löi mun päätä pari kertaa siihen ja mä olin ite niinku kenossa siihen ja sitte se niinkö paino mut siihen maahan että sitte mitä se sano että on niinkö viimeinen kerta ku sä mua tuoksi nimität että se oli ehkä se semmonen kaikista rajuin. Mutta mä olinki silloin jo olinko mä 15-16-vuotias.”*

Extract 2

(III/16/00:18:30-)

G7: *“Mut mulla on myöskin niinku lapsuudesta semmosia kokemuksia, että isä on ollu aggressiivinen aina että semmonen hyvin herkästi tulistuva tyyppi ja tota mutta muistin muistelen että ei oo lyöny eikä käyny kiinni mutta on niinku hajottanu tavaroita ja ollu semmonen uhkaava ja semmonen että varmaan sieltä on jotenki niinku tullu se semmonen omakin käyttäytymismalli.”*

Extract 3

(IV/37/00:22:00-)

G3: *“Omatkaan vanhemmat ei sillaa ne on töissä ja mä olin hirveän paljon yksikseni siinä kerrostaloasunnossa, että emmä en mä niinkö koskaan oikein oppinu semmosta ja sitte mä joskus jos joku kyselee sillai mun vointia mä saatan ahistua.”*

(...)

G3: *“Ehkä se ois niinku jollain lailla mennykki, mutta sitte niitä kaikkia ikäviä juttuja tapahtu että mä oisi niinku tarvinu ehkä sitä tavallaan semmosta tukea ja sillaa mutta ei ei siellä niinku ollu semmosta henkistä tukea et ei siellä ollu niinku vanhempia ne oli*

koko ajan töissä ja mä olin niinku yksin niitten juttujen kanssa pelkojen ja semmosten kanssa. Emmää niinku oikeestaan ees puhunu niistä niinku vanhemmille monistakaan ne oli jotenki niin semmosia kamalia.”

Extract 4

(III/19/00:54:00-)

G4: “No kyllä varmaan siinä on se, että ensinnäkin ne niinku ne miespuolisten hahmojen osalta kotona ni tuota päihdeongelmaa siinä mukana öö et se on niinku vaikuttanu ja siinä on ollu heidän taholtansa sitä väkivaltasuutta ja se on niinku tietysti yks yks varmasti, mut sitten äiti äitillä ei oo sinänsä ollu päihdeongelmaa, mut sitte on ollu niitä päihdeongelmaisia kumppaneita kyllä mutta sit sitte taas jos mieltii hänen kotiaan ni hänen on ollu aika rikkinäinen, etä mummo on ollu psyykkisesti sairas ja äiti ei oo pystyny asumaan kotona, et siellä on varmaan kertautunu tämä juttu, että seki on varmasti lapsena pelänny, että mitä tapahtuu että siellä on ollu päihteitä ja psyykkistä sairautta kotona.”

FM: “Mulle kuulostaa mitä sä sanot, että se siinä on niinku pelon siinä on sellanen pelästyminen mikä tulee nopeasti ja jota ei pysty hallita. Onks siinä vähän sellanen?”

G4: “No siis.”

FM: “Mikä siinä tulee mikä sullakin tulee kun kolahtaa mikä mahdollisesti sun vanhemmillaki tuli kun kolahti?”

G4: “Kyllä varmaan joo pelko ja sit no tietysti pelko liittyy kontrollin tarpeeseen, että niinku et et jos mulla on paha olo niin mulle tulee semmosia ihmeellisiä puuskia, että niinku mua alkaa niinku vapaapäivänä alkaa niinku tympiä, että ei oo saanu mitään aikaseks ni sit mä levitän kaikki mopit ja imurit sinne ja alan hirveesti moppailemaan ja kiillotan kaikki paikat se tulee tavallaan, että korjaa sitä ahistusta sillä, että paikat pitää olla niinku näin et mun pitää tehdä jotain, että muuten tympääntyy ja turhautuu ja ahistuu siinä paikalla. Kyllhän se varmaan sit sekin että siinä lasten huoneessa kolahtaa ja näin et siinä on niinku et nyt se menee se harmonia rikki ja sit mä ite tuun sinne ja mesoan niin että ikkunat helisee et se on vähä ristiriitasta mutta tavallaan siinä on niinku joku semmonen ja meillähän oli aina ku mieltii lapsena niinku minun lapsuuttani ja kyllä varmaan äiti paikkas hyvin paljon sitä semmosta ahistusta sillä, että oli viimeksen päälle siistiä että kaks kertaa viikossa lakanat vaihetaan ja tämmöstä jo vähä neuroottista oli se että en en oo ihan semmonen, mutta se puskee silloin ku on itellä paha olla tai tulee semmonen hankala tilanne.”

Extract 5

(III/19/00:54:00-)

G4: "No kyllä varmaan siinä on se että ensinnäkin meillä on ollu miespuolisten hahmojen osalta kotona ni on päihdeongelmaa siinä mukana et se on niinku vaikuttanu ja siellä on sitte heidän taholta sitä väkivaltaisuutta."

Extract 6

(I/6/00:30:00-)

G1: "No just siitä, että ku kyllä se varmaan molemmilla on se lapsuus mitä me nähtiin sitä jotenki isähän niinku sitä se oli alkoholisti ja se pieksi sitä äitiä sitte. Ni ollaanhan me molemmat nähty sitä tietenki että."

Extract 7

(IV/37/00:51:00-)

G3: "Emmää ninku oikeestaan ees puhunu niistä niinku vanhemmille monistakaan ne oli jotenki niin semmosia kamalia juttuja niinku piekse, pieksejäiset, ryöstettiin rahat ja pyörä."

Extract 8

(III/16/00:03:40-)

G3: "Sen jälkeen mulla oli katutappelua ja semmosta jengiväkivaltaa, päihteiden käyttöä kovaa."

Extract 9

(I/3/00:39:00-)

G1: "Siis mua itteeni kohtaan ei ollu, ainakin toista isoveljee on ollu, isä kuoli kun olin mä olin 5-vuotias kun isä kuoli ei ollu itellä mut tota isoveljee kohtaan ainakin toista on sillei että tyyltiin oli tais olla 15-vuotias sitten kävi justiin se et oli vieny sen viinapullon tai tämmönen oli löytyny loppupeleissä sitten samasta paikasta mihin oli se ukko sen jättänykin nii sit lyömään mun veljee ja sit ja sit mun pikku se mun pikku tai mm meillä on pikkuserkkuja niin niitten äiti huutaa mun isälle että että ihan samalla lailla mejänkin pojalle joka ei oo tehny yhtään mitään."

Extract 10

(I/3/00:27:00-)

G4: *“Oma isähän ei kyllä oo, en muista omasta isästä ei oo muistikuvia silleen kasvattajana tai vanhempana.”*

FM: *“Eiks hän ollu paikalla vai kuoliks hän?”*

G4: *“Ei niille tuli ero kun mä olin kaksvuotias.”*

Extract 11

(III/19/00:54:00-)

G3: *“Pelko siellä kotonakin, sit on niin turvaton turvaton olo sillä tavalla koko ajan ni sitten jotenki sitte jossai vaiheessa sillai tietoseks et mä pystyn sillai vaikuttaa ympäristöön sillai et mä en halua kokea sitä turvattomuutta enää et mä pistän asiat ojennukseen.”*

Extract 12

(IV/35/00:33:10-)

G8: *“Että tota. Sanotaanko että enimmäkseen vauriot ehkä on tullu pienenä poikana siskon tappelujen kanssa. [hehe]”*

FM: *“[Jaha].”*

G8: *“Ne on ollu ne mitä on siskon kanssa ollu erimielisyyksiä.”*

G9: *“Mulla on kanssa veljen kanssa tappelut ollu semmonen enemmänkin semmonen.”*

G8: *“Joo.”*

G9: *“Hmh.”*

FF: *“Mm.”*

G8: *“Kyllä.”*

FM: *“Se on vaan jotenkin mä aattelen mä just tänään päivällä puhuin siitä et miten me kaikki ollaan tavallisesta perheestä että ne mitkä on ne oman perheen mallit ne pitkään näyttäytyy tavallisen perheen malleina (...)”*

Extract 13

(II/7/1:19:41-)

G5: *“Noista vielä semmosen tarinan jos kertoisin se mikä vieläkin ottaa tosi koville jollain tavalla se oli hyvä työkaveri ja ystävä kymmenkunta vuotta ja nelkykkäks vuotias*

(nimi) ja minun pojan ikänen (nimi) kanssa samassa joukkueessa pelasvat kaks talvee semmonen (nimi)-poika niin tuota (paikkakunta) onnettomuudessa kuolivat molemmat sillon juhannusaattona siellä et. Just oli (nimi) kanssa muutama päivä aikasemmin juteltu siinä ja aina nähtiin että ja niitten hautajaiset sitten oli ja töissä oli silleen raskasta et tavallaan kun vieläkin näkkee niin on aika...”

FF: “Mm.”

FM: “Kyllä.”

G5: “Silleen et se tuli aika. Aika shokkina et siinä kotona ei hirveesti tullu tukea et me oltiin (nimi) kanssa ehkä viikoittain tai kahen viikon välein soiteltiin ja muuta niin kotona sitten tuli et ei se sinun niin hyvä ystävä ollu.”

Extract 14

(III/14/00:24:10-)

G5: “Ja ja no jouluaattona oli sitte, tuli väkivallasta mieleen et ite jouduin väkivallan uhriksi töissä että.”

FM: “Aijaa.”

FF: “Mm.”

G5: “Asiakas hyökkäs kimppuun löi kaks kertaa et mulla lohkes kaks hammasta alhaalta ja löi takaraivoon yritti kuristaa tuota puolen minuutin ajan semmonen treenattu jätkä että en ois päässy siitä kuristusotteesta pois jos sen omaiset ei ois tullu auttaa. Sitten pääsin siitä käen alta niinku karkuun ja työpari ku se oli naispuoleinen lähetään tuota ulos ja sit kaks poliisipartioo pyyettiin sinne ja päästiin sitte siitä.”

(...)

G5: “Et kyllä se vähän sitte se oli jouluaatto ku kämpille menin ni kyllä se vähän oli silleen tärinä sit mä rupesin miettii et ei hitsi siinä ois oikeesti voinu aika huonosti käydä.”

FM: “Voinu käydä aika huonosti.”

G5: “Nii ja onneks ei ollu mittää kättä pidempää sitte et se oli siinä mielentilassa et jos ois ollu.”

Extract 15

(I/3/00:42:11-)

G1: “...sit on ollu itellä se oma koulun ala-asteelta ollu sit et jahdannu puukko kädessä luokkakavereita takaa ja.”

(...)

FM: *“Minkä ikänen sä olit?”*

G1: *“Yhdeksän vuotias kolmannella luokalla.”*

FM: *“Okei aika rajulta kuulostaa.”*

G1: *“Joo se oli silleen se koulukiusaamista et mua kiusataan ja oon mä kiusannu takasinki sitten ja sitte se kiusaaminen loppuki kyllä siihen myöhemmin miettiny et aika radikaali ratkaisu oli.”*

Extract 16

(III/19/01:03:24-)

G3: *“Sitä oli niin se-semmonen turvaton olo olo siellä koko ajan. Jotenki sitteku tuli sillai jossain kohti tietoseks että mä niinku pystyn vaikuttaa ympäristöön sitte sillai mä en niinku halua kokea semmosta turvattomuutta enää et mä niinku pistän asiat ojennukseen ympärilläni. Tai sillai mä vähä niinku oon kokenu ja aatellu sillai ne vähän niinku johtuis siitä.”*

FM: *“Mm.”*

G3: *“Just semmosista kaikista semmosista niinku arvaamattomista käännteistä ja semmosista ni semmosista niinkö hirveen helposti hermostuu ei siedä niinkö semmosia.”*

FM: *“Ne tunteet mitkä siellä herää niistä arvaamattomista jutuista on pelko ja sitten tällanen turvattomuus ja.”*

G3: *“Niin kyllä.”*

FM: *“Jotain sen tyyppistä.”*

G3: *“Tai joskus aikasemmin sitä ei pystyny sillai myöntää, että ne johtu niinku niistä et se ja muutenki sitä oli semmosessa niinku semmonen arvo- ja asennemaailma et se pelko on semmosta heikkoutta että ei saa pelätä niinkö että se on häpeällistä jos pelkää ja vähän niinku sitä meidän poikaakin sillai just niinku hirveetä henkistä vahinkoa sillekki varmaan tehny tai niinku sitäki yritin kasvattaa just semmoseks niinkö kovaksi.”*

Extract 17

(I/3/00:33:13-)

G4: *“En en noin rajua rajua tuommosta fyysistä väkivaltaa oo mitä kuvailit äsken ni en oo kokenu mutta mietin vaan sitä miten katkeraks ite jäi siitä mitä koki niitä juttuja.”*

FM: *“Sä oot huomannu niitä jälkiä myöhemmin.”*

G4: *“Joo joo ja mä silloin puhuin tässä et juuri tämä kyseinen henkilö joka harrasti sitä väkivaltaa ni kuoli.”*

Extract 18

(III/19/00:54:01-)

G4: *“Että se on ollu semmonen hyvin hyökkäävä ja niinku edelleenki niinku jollai tavalla niinku vois vääntääkin että se että sieltä tulee sellanen tietty malli toimia tietyissä tilanteissa mutta.”*

FM: *“Niin se voi olla malli tai sitte mä aattelen että pelästyitsä silloin niissä tilanteissa silloin lapsena? Kun tuli se reaktio sun vanhemmilta ja muuta?”*

G4: *“Siis pelästyin.”*

FM: *“Ja sama pelästyminen tapahtuu tässä se on enemmän reaktiivinen ku tämmönen malli et jota sä haluaisit toistaa sillai jotakin mitä sun vanhemmat teki.”*

G4: *“Nii no kyllä joo et kyllä se on semmonen automaattinen et siinä tavallaan ei niinku tapahdu sulle vielä mitään kun se reaktio jo tulee et.”*

Extract 19

(I/3/00:20:32-)

G3: *“Joo ei ei voi ihan sillai hoitaa niinku isä isä hoiti että”*

FM: *“Se oli lyhyt ja nopee tie.”*

G3: *“Joo. Muistan ku.”*

FM: *“(- -) tukkapölly tai remmi?”*

G3: *“Oli joo ne oli käytössä. Erehyin omaa isääni sanomaan homoks kerran niin se oli se oli paha virhe se jäi kyllä oikein erityisesti mieleen kurmootus mitä siitä seuras.”*

FM: *“Mitä siitä seuras?”*

G3: *“No mä sain käytännössä turpaan siinä omalta isältäni että.”*

FM: *“Löiks hän ihan nyrkillä vai litsareilla?”*

G3: *“Joo kyllä niinku löi hiuksista päätä tohon auton auton siihen tota kaareen se siihen mikä missä on se takaovi ja se tota se kaarituki niin se löi mun päätä pari kertaa siihen tai siihen sillai et mä olin niinku ite kenossa siinä sitte ja paino mut siihe maahan että mitä se sano et tuo on viimeinen kerta kun sä sä mua tuoksi nimität että se oli ehkä se semmonen kaikista rajuin mutta mä olinki silloin jo olinko mä viistoista kuustoista vuotias.”*

Extract 20

(I/3/00:35:10-)

G4: *“Niin no se on joo semmosta että se ei koskaan lyöny mutta otti kiinni ja puristi ja siirti ja yhen kerran kävi pilliin kiinni ku se oli tämmönen perunakellarishow mun piti mulle tuli käsky että hae perunoita kellarista ja mä pistin sitte pikkusiskon hakemaan niitä.”*

(...)

G4: *“Se kävi pilliin kiinni.”*

FM: *“Onks pilliin kiinni sama kuin kuristaminen?”*

G4: *“Kyllä joo siis tuli kurkkuun kiinni mut sillon ku äiti (- -) joo mut enemmänki mä näin sit et kohistu mun äitiin ei niinkään sitten minuun niin usein että mutta on se.”*

FM: *“Mitä sää aattelet tänä päivänä oman lapsen kuristamisesta?”*

G4: *“No en missään nimessä niinku hyväksy sitä.”*

FM: *“\$Entä lapsipuolen.\$”*

G4: *“Mitä?”*

FM: *“\$Entä lapsipuolen oisko se hyväksyttävämpää.\$”*

G4: *“\$No ei ei varmasti.\$”*

Extract 21

(IV/34/00:30:30-)

G8: *“Että pääosin puhumalla mutta muistan että joskus oon oisko saanu piiskaa joskus tukistettu on kotona ja mutta ei sen kummempata ja kyllä sen yhen kerran piiskan jälkehen melkeempä ties ettei halunnu toiste et sit muistan semmosenki tilanteen että ite hain pihakoivusta oksan tuota pianon päälle ja se ootti siellä sitte jos oli ollu tuhma että ei tarvinnu ku kahtoo et se on siellä ni ties että mitä tehdä ja mitä ei tehdä mutta ei siellä.”*

(...)

G8: *“Ei ikänään aikasemmin ja ite en tekis missään nimessä sitä ni että laittas oksan sinne pelotteeks.”*

FM: *“Mm.”*

FF: *“Mm se oli pelote.”*

FM: *“Toi on hyvin tuttu toi mitä sä kerroit. Tutuista asioista puhut mä oon kuullu monta kertaa tuon tuon mitä sanoit. Tuttu toimintatapa.”*

G8: *“Että tota. Sanotaanko että enimmäkseen vauriot ehkä on tullu pienenä poikana siskon tappelujen kanssa. [hehe]”*

Extract 22

(IV/34/00:30:30-)

G8: *“Että pääosin puhumalla mutta muistan että joskus oon oisko saanu piiskaa joskus tukistettu on kotona ja mutta ei sen kummempata ja kyllä sen yhen kerran piiskan jälkeksi melkeempä ties ettei halunnu toiste et sit muistan semmosenki tilanteen että ite hain pihakoivusta oksan tuota pianon päälle ja se ootti siellä sitte jos oli ollu tuhma että ei tarvinnu ku kahtoo et se on siellä ni ties että mitä tehdä ja mitä ei tehdä mutta ei siellä.”*

(...)

FM: *“Jotenki tuo mitä R8 kuvasit että pitää hakea koivunoksa pelotteeksi tuntuu ihan hirveeltä se ajatus.”*

G9: *“Vaikka se on ollu vaan pelotteena mut jotenki se semmonen pelolla kasvattaminen.”*

(...)

FM: *“Väkivallalla uhkaaminen riittää sehän on väkivallan päämäärä.”*

G9: *“Nii.”*

FM: *“Et pelkkä uhkaaminen riittää.”*

Extract 23

(I/3/00:21:28-)

G3: *“Joo kyllä niinku löi hiuksista päätä tohon auton auton siihen tota kaareen se siihen mikä missä on se takaovi ja se tota se kaarituki niin se löi mun päätä pari kertaa siihen tai siihen sillai et mä olin niinku ite kenossa siinä sitte ja paino mut siihe maahan että mitä se sano et tuo on viimeinen kerta kun sä sä mua tuoksi nimität että se oli ehkä se semmonen kaikista rajuin mutta mä olinki silloin jo olinko mä viistoista kuustoista vuotias.”*

(...)

G3: *“(...) Aatella sitä tilannetta no sikshän mä sinne psykoterapiaan meninkin et pitää niinku purkaa niitä kaikkee mitä oon kokenu ja mitä mä oon sitten ite ite tehny. Mulla on semmosia muitakin pahoinpitelykokemuksia ja sitte niitä kaikkia joukkotappeluja ja*

semmosia ne on kuitenkin sen verta iso semmonen taakka jotenkin et mun täytyy saaha jotenkin sillai systeemistä no ei pois mutta sillai niinku auki.”

FM: “Kuulostaa hyvältä ajatukselta tuo millä. Mm mä niinku mietin e et jotenki et jos niinku et sä oot isä ja mä oon isä ja mieltä isänä tota tilannetta ni jotenkin niinku aivan käsittämätön tilanne et isänä tekis lapselle tekis jotain tollasta.”

(5)

G3: “Joo on siinä ehkä vähän semmonen että mä en oikein sillai oo sinut sen kaiken kanssa vielä et sitä on vaikee sillai.”

Extract 24

(IV/37/00/56/16-)

G3: “Ehkä siinäki vois sitte tavallaan antaa vähän itellensä niinku armoa tai sillaa että ei niinkö ei sitä ihan mitää mukaviakaan asioita oo elämässä tapahtunu tai sellasia inhottavia aisoita ollu pitkään elämässä vähä semmosta niinkö mä oon just välillä miettiny miks mä oon ollu semmonen. Et mää meidän äitiki puhu että silloin pienenä sä olit niin semmonen herkkä poika ja näin ni ei se ei sitä varmaan ois kyllä ne varmaan kuitenkin ne kokemukset on muokannu niin paljon mitä on niinkö elämässä tapahtunu että vähän emmä oikeen tiä miten siitä ois muuten voinu siitä yläasteesta ees niinkö ees selvitä niinkö että tavallaan kovettaa ittensä ihan täysin että. Että en mää sitä niinkö valinnu sitä niinkö että et mulle niinkö tehtiin niitä asioita silloin että ei minkäs sille voi. Nyt se on vaa hirvee niinkö vahinko mitä silloin on tapahtunu et se on tosi vaikee kääntää se ja.”

(...)

G3: “Kyllä näin näin mää sen juuri juurikin ajattelen että se ehkä vähä yllättäny kuinka vaikee se on sitte kuinka pitkä homma niinku se semmonen kääntäminen sitte että ne on niin syvällä ne jotenki semmoset jutut että ei sitä yhtäkkiä vaan opi semmoseks että hirveesti jotain niinku halailis ja niinkö tai sitte se ei oo semmosta yhtään luontevaa että sen kyllä lapsikin näkee että semmosena ihan robottina halaat ja näin ei se toimi sillaakaan, että. Tai ehkä sekin ois ollu parempi sitte ehkä siinä ois niinku oppinu siinä sitte ku ois tarpeeks vaa niinkö päästäny lähelle ja en tiä.”

(...)

G3: “No se meidän isä ei niinku se ei kyllä valehtelematta varmaan koskaan oo halannu mua. Se on sanonukki että mä en oo mikään halailija että.”

(...)

G3: *“Joo ei siis tota ei meidän isä oikeestaan halua ees omia lap-lapsenlapsiaan se on niinkö aina semmonen.”*

FM: *“Eli sä et oo keksiny tätä ketjua vaan sä sut on liitetty tähän ketjuun miehet ei ilmase tunteita ja nyt sä oot itte katkasemassa sitä sun omassa elämässä ja mietit että voisko poikaan vaikuttaa niin, että se ei periytyis myöskään hänelle ymmärräkö oikein?”*

G3: *“Joo kyllä, että niinku se sitä oli hirveen vaikea niinku tajutakkaan sitte sitä asiaa että sitä piti niinku seurata muita ihmisiä ja niinku sillai ku jotenki aatteli että sillai niinku toimitaan, että se on niinku iha normaalia tai jotai semmosta, että niin kuuluu toimia. Et sitä ei ei niinku se oli niinku hirveen työn takana tajuta se että tää ei oo oikeen hyvä juttu tämmönen.”*

Extract 25

(I/3/00:36:18-)

G4: *“Nii ei se ollu silleen niinku semmonen kuristus että mulla ois varmaan henki siinä lähteny mutta se kävi ja piti kiinni siitä että.”*

FM: *“Eipä siinä niinku poikana paljon myöskään tee siinä tilanteessa.”*

G4: *“Niin no ei.”*

FM: *“Jos se ois halunnu kuristaa ni.”*

G4: *“Nii.”*

FM: *“Ois ollu keinot vähissä.”*

G4: *“Kyllä, mut se on jännä mietin sitä kun sitä tuli nähtyä vielä luonnollisesti kun se hengissä oli ni sitä saatto nähä niin jos sitä kylilläki näki sitä miestä ni tietysti silleen aika isokokonen ukko ja mä niinku mielessäni aina mietin sitä et tekis mieli vetää turpaan.”*

Extract 26

(IV/37/01:01:01-)

G3: *“Ja ehkä se ois niinku jollai lailla mennykin, mutta sitte ku niitä kaikkee muutaki ikäviä juttuja tapahtu, et mä oisin niinku tarvinu ehkä sitte siellä kotona semmosta niinkö tukea ja sillai mutta ei siellä niinku ollu semmosta henkistä tukea että ei siellä ollu niinku vanhempia oikeastaan ne oli aina töissä ja mä olin niinku yksin niitten juttujen kanssa sillon.”*

FF: *”Mm.”*

G3: "Pelkojeni ja semmosten kanssa en mää oikeestaan ees puhunu niistä niinku vanhemmille monistakaan ne oli niinku niin semmosia kamalia juttuja ne pieksä pieke pieksemiset ja multa ryöstettiin rahat ja pyörä ja."

FF: "Mm."

FM: "Sä kannoit ne kaikki itsekses."

G3: "Niin ja sitte oli vähän isällä oli kans semmonen että pitää olla semmonen kova ja pitää niinkö menestyä ja olla mies ja ei ei meidän isä oikeestaan puhuu semmosista tunteista ei se niinku puhunu mitään niinkö vaikka sinä puhut niinkö tämmösiä täällä tai ei semmosista ongelmista ei niinkö lasten kuulten mä kuulin kyllä ku isä ja äiti riiteli, mutta niinkö ei ei mitää semmosta niinkö analyysiä eikä semmosta [sitä vaan porskutettiin]."

FF: "[(- -)]."

G3: "Eteenpäin. Ja sitte mä niinkö aattelin että näin se menee näin ne hommat hoidetaan että."

G8: "Mulle tuli tuosta mieleen, että ite jos oisin sinun tilanteessa ja mulla ois välit vanhempiin kunnossa niin kuin minulla itselläni on erittäin hyvät välit niin tuota jos nyt kummiskin nämä lapset on sinun kanssa yhtä aikaa, kun ne ois isovanhempien kanssa ni lähinnä niinku sitä että minä sinuna keskustelisin näitten omien vanhempieni kanssa näistä asioista ja aukasisin sitä ni sieltä häviäis joku paino omasta taakasta pois. Ja sitte vaikka alottais sitä justiin sitä kautta että no voiaanhan myö nyt vaikka halata isän kanssa tähä."

FM: "Me ollaan G8 pääsääntöisesti oltu noista asioista vähän eri mieltä et mä aattelen et varmaan sun tilanteessa jos siellä on avoimet välit sun ja sun vanhempien välillä niin sehän toimii, mutta toi niinkun mitä G3 kuvaat tuota ympäristöä ja muuta niin mä aattelen et tai mä muutenkin aattelen, että merkittävämpää on se mitä me laitetaan sit eteenpäin. Tää sun pohdinta on sun ittes kannalta ihan hiton tärkeätä ja tää on sun lasten kannalta hirveen tärkeätä ja se on niinku se merkittävin suunta ja sitten se on vähä se vanhemma nyt on jo vanhoja ja mennyt tolla reseptillä et."

FF: "Mm niin joskushan niidenkin kanssa voi tehdä jonkinlaista semmosta niinku vähän niinku tilikäyntiä, mutta sitte [toisaalta ei sekään]."

FM: "[(- -)]."

FF: "Poista sitä mikä on jo tapahtunut et jotenki just se että sitten et tulee [niinkun]."

FM: "[Ja sitte] se jos siinä ei tuukkaan kuulluksi vaan ne menee puolustuskannalle niin siinä uusiutuu se tavallaan se loukkaantuminen [mikä on jo kerran tullu että]."

FF: “[Niimpä niimpä].”

FM: “Että sisäisten mä oon aina vähä sanonukki että sisäisten vanhempien kanssa kannattaa keskustella ja tarvittaessa pistää kuriin ja nuhteeseen, mutta että niitten todellisten vanhempien kanssa keskustelu ni siinä on aina riskinsä.”

FF: “Mm.”

G3: “Tuli vähä semmonen omituinen on tullu jo aikasemminki, mutta en tiä mitä tästä Donald Trumpista ootte mieltä, mutta meidän isi isä on vähä niinku jollain lailla semmonen jotenki niistä tulee vähä niinku sama.”

Extract 27

(III/16/00:03:40-)

G3: “Mul on sillai aika semmonen väkivaltanen tausta sillai että mä muistan niinku ensimmäiset pieksäjäiset että mä oon ite ollu piestynä viisvuotiaana. Et oikeestaan niinku siitä lähtien sitte jatkunu siinä mut ensin piestiin pihalla ja sitte koulussa oikeestaan koko ala-aste yläaste oli se kaikista pahin oikeestaan siihen kasiluokkaan asti että sitte mä kasvoin sen verta isoks ja harrastin kuitenkin urheilua ja salilla käyntiä ja sitte mä rupesin vähän niinku takasin päinki antamaan ja si tuota sen jälkeen mulla olin sitte semmosta niinkun katutappelua semmosta jengiväkivaltaa oli siinä sitte päihden käyttöä kovaa ja rupee tässä sitte sen kummemmin erittelemään mitä oon käyttäny mutta tota ni ni mulla tuli sitte joskus vähä reilu parikymppisenä semmonen kriisi sillä lailla että mä näin että osa osa niinku mun ikäluokasta ja tuttavapiiristä alko sillai niinku vähä niinku asettua niillä oli opiskelupaikat ja semmosta niinku kunniallista elämää halusvat viettää ja muaki rupes sitte ahistamaan se se se tota silloinen elämäntyöli että mä päätin sitte sillä lailla et alan niinku veronmaksajaks ja semmoseks kunnon ihmiseks ja mä pääsinki sitte opiskelemaan ja näin ja tota perustin perheen ja mut sitte tota mä niinku huomasin että siinä jotenkin ne semmoset ne vanhat toimintamallit ja semmoset ettei ne niinku häviä sillä lailla että semmosissa tiukoissa paikoissa sitä sitte tosiaan niinku äity väkivaltaseks sitte pisti paikkoja palasiks ja oli tosi paha suustaan ja semmonen uhkaava ja se oli sitte vähä ku siinä on niitä lapsiakin ja näin ni se tuli semmonen ettei tää voi tälleen jatkua et mun on niinku pakko yrittää jotaki muutosta tähän että nii nii nyt on kyllä elämä aika sekasin tällä hetkellä. Taas asumuserossa, nyt se on lähinnä vaan semmonen lähtölaskenta että puoliso ja lapset läh muuttaa (paikkakunta), oon semmosessa

velkajärjestelyssä tällä hetkellä et mutta varmaan ois paljon huonompi se tilanne jossei tätä ryhmää ei olis sitte.”

FF: “Mm.”

G3: “Vastoinkäymiset niinku osaa ehkä käsitellä paremmin paremmin että tuota eikä mulla oo enää tuota semmosta ahistusta koko ajan päällä ja mä käyn myös psykoterapiassa ja syön psykykenlääkkeitä että nekin varmaan tekee oman osuutensa tähän. Siinä se varmaan pähkinäkuoressa oli tämä.”

FF: “Mm.”

G3: “Esittely sitte että.”

FF: “Muistaksää minkälaista oli tulla ryhmään silloin ekoja kertoja?”

G3: “Joo silloin mua vähän niinku pelotti tulla että mä aattelin et täällä on jotai semmosia motoristeja tai täällä on tosi vaarallista ja vähän niinku sitte jotenki muistan kun mä kerroin nämä tarinat ekaa kertaa ni se sillai jännitti paljon enemmän et.”

Extract 28

(I/3/00:27:33-)

G2: “Mä en kyllä nuorempana oikeen uskaltanu tuolleen nimitellä ois varmaan tullu remmiä tai tukkapöllyä et vähän sitte vanhemapana kyllä tuli ilmeisesti mä arvelen et mä pistän vähä hanttiin ni ei enää sillä lailla tullu korville et mutta monta kysymystä jäi et ois voinu itekki jättää nimittelemättä mutta ois voinu toinenki sitte jättää sattuko huono päivä et vitutti jo joku muu asia ja sitte vielä joku nimittelee tossa kyllä mä aattelen ite että aika loukkaavaa se on jos jos jostaki asiasta vähän kielletään ja sitte rupee ite nimittelemään takasin se on vähän semmonen eri juttu ku jossakin tuolla ventovieraiden kesken.”

(...)

G2: “Kyllä se oli rangaistus. Mansikoita pellostä kävin vaikka mä koitin silleen käydä syömässä sieltä että niit ei huomais ja jäin kiinni perkele isoimmat on syöty täältä. hehe”

FM: “Miksei mansikoita saanut syödä.”

G2: “Mummolassa oli pellolla mansikoita ni.”

FM: “Miksei mummon mansikoita saanut syödä.”

G2: “Noku ne oli tarkotettu johonkin muualle että niistä tehään hilloo tai jotaki muuta nii niit ei saa syyä vasta sitte ku on korjattu ja sitte jos jää ni.”

FM: "No öö. Kuulostaaks tuo vaan minusta niin valtavan kuulostaaks."

G2: "No se jos viljellään mitä tahansa jos hirvet syö sieltä naamaansa ni eihän niitä saa ite viljaa millää lailla."

FM: "\$No onhan se hitto viekoon eri juttu hirvet tai lapsenlapset.\$"

G2: "Perkele viljellään sitä varten et niistä tehään jotakin ni nehän on tarkotettu silloin siihen eikä syyään suoraan napaan että."

Extract 29

(IV/30/00:20:00-)

G3: "Se ois kyllä ihan kiva oikeestaan ymmärtääkki sillai niinku tietää että miks miks mä oon sitte ollu semmonen ennen. Mut en mä oikeen päässy siihen ihan täysin kai se sitte aina johtuu jostain mitä on kokenu ja nähny jostain omasta luonteesta. Mistä nyt sitten milloinkin, mutta no ehkä se joskus selviää sitten."

FF: "Jatkuuko sulla vielä se psykoterapia?"

G3: "Joo jatkuu, [että]."

FF: "[Joo] Mietin et onko se semmonen paikka missä voi tutkiskella sitä myöskin sitte."

G3: "Joo kyllä se niinku ollaan vähän niinku jollain lailla päästykin, mut sit tavallaan tuntuu että hirveen hitaasti jotenki etenee sillee."