**Focus group 2 transcript (1/2/24, 9.30-10.30)**

RY: So welcome everyone, thanks again so much for coming along today. I think we might start just by introducing ourselves to, to the group, so I'll start. I'm using my real name today, I'm not using a pseudonym. I'm Becky - and we will share our pronouns as well, so I go by she/her. So we can we start, going this way?

Nicki: I'm Nicki and I go by she/her.

Poppy: I’m Poppy, I go by she/her.

Cardi: I'm Cardi, I go by she/her.

Keira: I’m Keira, I go by she/her.

Amy: I’m Amy. I go by she/her.

Sarah: I’m Sarah, I go by she.

Jon: I'm Jon, I go by he/they.

Unicorn: I’m Unicorn. I go by any pronouns.

Pomni: I'm Pomni, I go by he/they.

RY: Great. Thank you everybody. So what we're going to do in terms of the structure of today is start by thinking specifically about Shakespeare and then move on to content warnings more generally in terms of how you think those are used. I think it would be good just to start by finding out what Shakespeare plays people have read or - read in your own time or studied at either school or college before, just to get a sense of what base of plays we're talking about. So again, can we maybe go around and just share which Shakespeare plays we've studied already?

Nicki: Yes, I've studied *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*, and that's it.

Poppy: I've studied *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*, but I've read *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Merchant of Venice* on my own time.

Cardi: I’ve studied *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet*, but I've also read *Macbeth*.

Keira: *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*, I’ve studied. That’s it.

Amy: I’ve studied *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *Romeo and Juliet*.

Sarah: I’ve studied *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *Romeo and Juliet*, but I’ve also read *Othello* and *King Lear*.

Jon: I’ve studied *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* but I’ve read *Romeo and Juliet* on my own time.

Unicorn: I’ve studied *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* and then read *Romeo and Juliet.*

Pomni: I’ve studied *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, *Romeo and Juliet* and I briefly went over *The Tempest* in my own time.

RY: Right. Great. So, *Hamlet*, *Macbeth* and *Romeo and Juliet* are obviously the ones that keep coming up, but if you have read any of the others and want to bring those in as examples - because obviously different themes turn up in different plays - you know, if something else seems relevant to a question, then obviously do bring that in please. In terms of where I want to start by thinking about Shakespeare and violence: something that came up when I was looking through the questionnaire answers that you all filled out a few months ago - and it's quite interesting - some people said ‘Shakespeare's violence doesn't upset me because I don't think it's graphic’ and some people said that, ‘Actually, I think the violence in these plays *is* quite graphic.’ And that struck me as an interesting difference between responses. I just wondered, therefore, as a place to start, perhaps something to think about: what do you think of as ‘graphic violence’? Would you say Shakespeare was graphic? What do you think that term means? Anyone want to jump in with a first thought?

Poppy: I think a lot of the plays that like I've studied, like *Macbeth*, a lot of the violence is sort of off the stage, like the murder of King Duncan is referenced to, but it's not something that's really on stage. Then later on, it's like the murder of Macduff's children *is*. So I think he has like a share of non-graphic and graphic violence throughout the plays?

RY: Yeah. I mean, so I suppose when you're reading it, all of it is kind of in your head, so if it's off stage… Or how much difference it makes if it’s off stage or, or presented on stage. What do other people think about that? Do you think it makes a difference, on stage versus off?

Pomni: From what I know, like even if it is shown on stage, the worst I’ve encountered is just like the mention of blood and I think that's quite commonplace. So to me that's not really graphic per se.

RY: So you're saying that the mention of blood would be fine with you? Is that what you're saying? Yes. Yes, I suppose there are different ways of thinking about the graphicness, you know: Is it shown? Is it off stage? Is it talked about in detail versus is it not, are there general mentions of blood or specific talking about methods of killing somebody? Are there any other thoughts from other people about the violence in the plays that you've read or studied, would you describe them as graphic in their violence or not?

Unicorn: I would say, I guess it depends on the age you read or study it. I read *Romeo and Juliet* when I was younger, and I find that I found it quite unsettling because I was young and I didn't really know much of the world. But reading *Hamlet* in school, I didn't really have a problem with it, and that was recent.

RY: When you say you found it unsettling and you didn't know much about the world, could you just expand on what aspects of *Romeo and Juliet* you found unsettling?

Unicorn: I guess the, the death aspect, the concept of death. The… I don't really know how to explain it, just I wasn't familiar with the concept of death at the time. Fully.

RY: Right, yeah. Jon, you look like you wanted to come in before… Sorry, it is Jon, isn’t it? Yes.

Jon: Yeah. I think in *Romeo and Juliet*, again, I did read it when I was quite young and of course there’s been like adaptations made of it, movies about it and things, but the concept of these two people who are kind of portrayed to be juvenile kind of our age at the time to go through a lot of this torment and having to murder people and this kind of overarcing theme of abuse and then suicide at the end, to be showing us this kind of undying love. It's quite, it's quite a lot to have when you're quite young, you know, in year six, year seven-ish. And then for other aspects, when I studied *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*, of course the violence was a lot of the time more referenced than shown or described, but the after effects of them, with Shakespeare's writing, can be quite graphic, seeing these characters that we've kind of known break down, which is what Shakespeare aimed to do. But I think having some kind of warning or kind of preemptive talk about what's going to be shown can generally help anyone.

RY: That's a really interesting point. The idea of - it's not necessarily just the act of violence itself, but also perhaps the aftermath, the trauma, how that's something that, at least potentially, could be something that could be emotionally affecting for the reader. It’d be interesting to get a sense of some of the other people in the room, their views on the graphicness… Did other people find Shakespeare upsetting? Have any of the rest of you been upset by any of the violence in Shakespeare or did you all find it fine? What do people think?

Sarah: Yeah, I do think it like goes with how old you are really. When you’re younger, you do really need… You’re not sort of used to reading that sort of thing specifically. Like in *Romeo and Juliet*, like with the death and suicide and things like that. Like, you’re not used to that when you’re younger. But I think as you get older and… I’d compare like *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* as more graphic than *Romeo and Juliet* really. Because of all the brutality that’s in there and how that adds to the plot. But because we’ve read that as we were older, I don’t think I had that much of an issue with that content.

RY: Yeah, and I suppose also one of the differences that strikes me between something like *Romeo and Juliet* and, and something like, say, *Macbeth* is, is some of the violence in *Macbeth*… He's a professional soldier. *Romeo and Juliet* - these are teenagers; in some ways people closer to you. So, do people think that makes a difference in terms of - *who* you're reading about, what kind of world it is, whether you feel the characters are like you or whether you identify with the characters? Does that make a difference to your responses?

Nicki: I mean, yeah, if it's like a soldier, then I suppose a child is, like, more open to the idea that, you know, he's going to fulfil his profession and probably kill people. It's probably… like a child is probably more desensitised to that, like probably playing with toys or like seeing like cartoons and stuff. But I mean, if it's like themes of like suicide in like *Romeo and Juliet* for example, then it's probably going to be something a lot more shocking if, like, a child's going to read it.

RY: Yeah, that's interesting. Anyone else have any thoughts on that issue? The question of who the characters are, what kinds of acts of violence there are?

Jon: I think there's an element of how these plays are seen as kind of the general kind of English public. *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* have been described as being kind of for mature audiences. They’re known to have this graphic nature to them and that's how they're described to people kind of casually. But *Romeo and Juliet* is described as being a love story and we see all these… and is classed as a romance, in some cases. Which it is, there is this kind of ‘undying soulmate’ kind of love between them. But it is, it's tragic, and it's got a lot of these kind of graphic elements. Again, suicide described as being an act of love, when you're very young, is, it's harming.

RY: That's a really interesting point. Perhaps that leads on to the next question I want to ask, which is: When you first did these plays, when you first studied some of them at school, do you remember what your teachers said about the acts of violence? Did they give content warnings and if so, at what point did they give content warnings and how detailed were the content warnings? But also, did you talk about things like, you know, ‘This is a violent scene, let's kind of talk through the violence itself.’ Because I think you can just kind of go, ‘Well, this is just the plot. This is just what happens. We're thinking about theme. We're thinking about language.’ But you could directly talk about violence. Basically, do you have any memories of how these plays were taught to you, what your experiences were of being in the classroom, studying them?

Sarah: No, I don’t think I was given any sort of warning about the violence that was gonna happen. We were just told to treat it like any sort of book we were reading, except for the scene would be shown. And any of the scenes that we learnt about didn’t put any sort of, ‘Oh we’re going to learn about violence and we’re going to go in depth about why this violence is happening.’ It was just treated as any of the scenes in any other play would have been.

RY: Yeah. How about other people? What were your experiences?

Amy: We focused on more like how it impacts the play as a whole rather than just the violent acts of the play.

RY: Yeah, so I suppose here, just taking an example of *Romeo and Juliet*: the suicide of the lovers rounds off the play, it ends the feud, it's significant from that point of view. From a plot point of view, you can say it's kind of a positive thing because it brings the families together, but obviously it is suicide. So I suppose that those are two different ways of thinking about it, as plot elements versus ‘Let's talk about suicide, or let's talk about domestic violence or other things that come up in the plays.’

Poppy: When I was in high school and studied *Romeo and Juliet* briefly, we only looked at the first couple of acts, sort of very nonchalant scenes where it's like the balcony scene where there's no real violence or like interactions with Juliet and the nurse. And then when we were doing *Macbeth* as an actual GCSE – so we had to learn the entire play – we learned about violence simply as like a theme. So like, we didn't do in-depth discussions about like violence or like any of the damage or the brutality. We were more just like, ‘Within *Macbeth*, the theme is violence, here are the examples of the violence’. So it was never like warned or like really gone into a discussion. It was more, ‘This is something in *Macbeth*, find examples.’

RY: Yeah, that's interesting. Anyone else want to share their experiences?

Jon: I don't have a lot of memories of studying *Romeo and Juliet*, but I know the comparison between how I was taught about Lady Macbeth’s death versus Romeo and Juliet. Lady Macbeth’s suicide was seen as her final fault of her character succumbing to these hallucinations and falling from her kind of grace and it's just kinda seen as this kind of sad sudden ending. While the deaths of Romeo and Juliet are seen as beautiful and romantic and kind of something that you could strive to have that devotion for another person. Because we were so young when we learned about it and… I don't know… Just kind of the negativity that we’ve seen of Lady Macbeth, in both of these Shakespeare plays about how they both talk about the suicide, depending on how old we were.

RY: Yeah, it's interesting that when you were younger, it was treated as less problematic in some ways, more of a desirable thing.

Unicorn: To add on to what Jon said. I feel like with Lady Macbeth’s suicide, it was treated almost as if she deserved it. So, I guess I felt less empathy for her. It didn't impact me as much. But with like tragic suicides like Ophelia in *Hamlet* or Juliet, I felt more upset about them.

RY: Yeah, and that goes back to the question of how you feel about the characters. I mean… Do you find it more upsetting when it's people you care about in a play or people who you feel they're supposed to be sympathetic characters?

Poppy: I mean, like the death of Polonius in *Hamlet*, I don't think anyone was bothered by. I think everyone… Because Polonius is purposefully, like, quite an irritating, idiotic character, a loud fool. When he died, everyone was sort of like, ‘Yeah, I'm quite glad.’ But then obviously when other figures like Ophelia go and die, everyone was more affected by it because we're meant to be sympathetic to her and we've seen her be likeable. Whereas with Polonius, no one cared.

RY: Poor Polonius! I always feel bad for Polonius to be honest.

Poppy: I feel dead bad for him.

RY: Because he's a bit of a busy body. But he's this old guy. He doesn't know there's been a murder.

Poppy: I feel bad for him. I feel bad for him. But I don't care that he gets killed. [laughs]

RY: Ok, fair enough.. It’s really interesting though that you can have similar acts where you have such different responses to them, depending on how you identify with the character and how you feel about the characters or who the characters are.

Pomni: Based on what other people have said, that like spoke about like Ophelia and Lady Macbeth and all that… With their like suicides, I find that some of the suicides in Shakespeare’s plays, I find the mental anguish and build up beforehand a bit more distressing than the actual act of suicide, because when the suicide comes about, it's somewhat expected after you've been through this character and seen them kind of spiral into that state. So I kind of find that a little more distressing than the actual act of suicide itself, because especially considering a lot of – not a lot of but like there’s quite a handful of suicides that are handled off set, and you only encounter, again, that mental anguish beforehand.

RY: Yeah, that ties in perhaps interestingly with the comments about the aftermath and the trauma that we see sometimes with characters, the… It's not just the violence itself, it’s what we see before and after, that are all relevant parts of it.

Jon: Building on Pomni’s point, the death of King Duncan is completely shown off screen, sometimes on screen in some adaptations, but it's completely off screen. We only see, you know, Macbeth later covered in blood. But it's his anguish afterwards that builds such effect to it, how his entire character completely falls and there’s this massive downfall in character but he falls because of it, mostly blamed on Lady Macbeth’s influence. But it's his aftermath that brings impact to it, which brings us kind of an emotional side to it as you see someone's, just some man’s reaction to murdering someone so close to him. And that's what gives it the effect, not the actual gore or the graphic nature of it. And I think that's what should be warned about: this breakdown of a human, of another being, is kind of mental. It's hard to read about, especially if you're younger.

RY: Yeah. Because I suppose some of the things that have been coming up, there’s that sense of, it gets more complicated the more you think about it. Because it's not just the act of violence. It's the psychology that surrounds it. It's the effect it has on people's lives building up to and coming away from it – that’s the sense I'm getting from some of the responses that we've had. And I suppose that leads me on to the next question, which is: All right, put yourself in a teacher’s shoes. If you're teaching these plays, how do you teach them? How do you think teachers should address the acts of violence? Would it be good to directly kind of talk about particular acts? What would you do?

Sarah: I feel like we should give a warning because of the mental like deterioration across… It’s like Lady Macbeth, for example, the scenes where she’s like coming in with blood on her hands, things like that, that’s really distressing to read, especially for a younger audience that are being taught about it. I think it should be less emphasised that… I think when I was taught it at like lower levels, it was more like: ‘This is a key for you to pass your exams,’ rather than, ‘This is us having a, like a moral discussion of whether violence is okay in these ways.’ So I think there should be more emphasis on it, rather than ‘You should learn this because you need to get good grades.’ We should have a discussion over this because of the issues that are shown in the play.

RY: Yeah, so rethinking the content warning… I think when we think of content warnings also, we could discuss why we're doing this play, what you could get out of this play. Yeah, that's interesting.

Unicorn: I would personally have appreciated a warning, *but* I feel like Shakespeare's intent when he wrote these plays was for it to be shocking. So if you went act by act before teaching this and said, like, ‘Ophelia’s gonna die in this scene.’ I feel like it's almost spoiling it in a way. It takes away from, like, the joy of reading it yourself. But then I'm conflicted because I feel like warnings would be appreciated by a lot of people.

RY: That's something that came up in the questionnaires a lot, actually, that sense of tension between on the one hand, people saying ‘Warnings are good, warnings can help people who've particularly suffered trauma of their own and I think they can be helpful.’ But at the same time, yes, that element of surprise gets lost, that shock factor, and whether that's actually an important part of reading the play. So it is difficult.

Poppy: I feel like it should be treated the same way a lot of like films treat it. You know, like before you start a film, there’ll be like content warning: sexual violence, violence, and it'll be like, ‘Rated 15 because of these reasons.’ I feel like they should just be a general, vague, like: ‘Oh, this play has murder. This play has suicide.’ Just to sort of like prepare with the themes that are going to be apparent, maybe not so much specific like, ‘Ophelia is going to commit suicide. Macbeth's gonna commit murder.’ Just sort of like a general content warning of what will be in the play as a whole.

RY: Yeah, 'cause also that question of: if you provide warnings, *when* do you provide them is interesting… How specific do you get? And we might come back to that, when we talk about content warnings more broadly in a little while. But yeah, there’s a question of should you just put in a blanket ‘This is the kind of content that will be in there’?

Jon: I think in secondary school upwards, it should always be, yeah, content warnings, ‘There's going to be like, you know, character death and suicide and murder and this kind of psychological element to it.’ I also believe that it should be kind of an open classroom, so you should be able to leave or remove yourself from the situation if you feel that the content that is being talked about is a little bit too much for you. There shouldn't be a shame element around that. But I think, anywhere before secondary, if you're learning about suicide or murder and all these kind of graphic elements… So, again, you are, you know, 12 and below, you're a child. I think letters should be sent out to parents being like: ‘Would you like this subject to be taught to your child in this way, or this way, or this way?’ Because then at least you have this kind of third party who knows what situation the child's been in, how to… if they want to put their child in that situation to learn about these things at this age. It should be the parents’ choice and there should be some kind of third option for these children who don't want to learn about this kind of stuff to learn about a different material in a different classroom. Yeah, it will be a little bit more effort for these children but learning about suicide as a devotion of love when you're 13 will impact you.

RY: Yeah. That’s one of the things this project is thinking about doing, it's working with teachers also, thinking about how they teach these plays, and are there ways of making potentially sensitive material easier for them to talk about? Because I think teachers are obviously people. Teachers are… sometimes they don't quite know how to deal with these sensitive issues or may find it difficult and they don't want to upset people and all that kind of thing.

Unicorn: I feel like that was a really good point to make because I remember in primary school, there were letters sent out to parents saying: ‘Do you want your child to learn about periods and menstruation?’ And a lot of people said, No, and a lot of people were sectioned away from that talk. But when we studied *Romeo and Juliet*, that was never an option. Everyone in the class had to study it. Well, not study per se, but we, we like went through it, went through the themes of suicide and death and poison and I feel like that's such a strange comparison.

RY: Do you want to jump in at this point? You had your hand up around here.

Pomni: I kind of feel like how people have mentioned before, how it's to do with the age you learn it at. Because I feel like a lot of people here have been taught *Romeo and Juliet* or heard about *Romeo and Juliet* at quite early on. So when it comes to that, I think it's more a problem with the education system in the sense that they'll teach something to people so young rather than later, at a time where, say, where people learned about *Macbeth* and were a little bit more accustomed to graphic scenery…

RY: I think that's a very good point, the fact that this is clearly quite a sensitive play being brought in at quite an early age. *Romeo and Juliet* is a tricky one, I think.

Cardi: I feel like it depends on… Well, in… When you’re in middle school and like high school, you don’t really have a choice. You’ve kind of got to do English because it’s the main subject that you’re doing. And I feel like some younger students, like immature boys or immature girls, they don't really get that the violence can be damaging to some people, so they make immature comments and stuff surrounding that. So, I feel like if there was a warning surrounding that and teachers were more sensitive about the subject then they could protect students that found violence a bit more damaging.

RY: Yes, I suppose there's the option of warning in advance. There is also, though, you know, the option of focusing on the violence *as* violence within the plays and saying, ‘This is a difficult topic. And we're going to spend a session to actually… Rather than talk about themes or language or things like that, we're going to actually talk about murder as a thing in the world as well as a thing in literature.’ I don't know how people feel about that as a way of approaching these plays, whether you think teachers should do that, if you would do that, if you were teaching?

Jon: Like kind of letters in primary school, because, of course there were… Again, I also had the issue that Unicorn had with periods, again, learning about them, and sex, was very optional in the primary school. You could just completely avoid it. But children are naturally very curious, that they wanna explore these new ideas that are put in front of them and, you know, play it out with their friends in like the playground after, during break and lunch and things. And the idea with the letter is that there is this third party of parents. It would give parents an opportunity to think about how *they* would teach their children about violence and murder and suicide at home because a lot of parents aren't… At 13, a lot of parents aren't prepared to go into those kinds of subjects with their children. There is this alternate third party that we need to be taking into some form of consideration. Because you know you can have the sex talk with your child as you know, kind of a fundamental thing. But talking to a child about why suicide shouldn't be seen as an act of devotion and love is a lot more difficult and something that needs preparation for.

RY: I suppose that's the thing. So on the one hand, you were earlier, I think, saying it would be good to send out those letters to parents, but I suppose you're putting a lot of work on the parents in that case and they might perhaps need to have those conversations, if it's not something ever happening in schools. So… Yes?

Sarah: About that thing with letters. I had those letters sent out when we watched specific films and things like that, that were particularly graphic. So, I think I’ve mentioned it as well about, we should really use these tactics that are catered towards violence in films, like warnings, very like vague warnings and things like that. And letters of, like, preparation should also be applied to books cause they’re both forms of content in a way. So we’re both watching them and they can both include violence in a certain way. So why shouldn’t they be warned about this? Anyway, just needed to be treated in a similar way.

RY: Parents will need to be kept in the loop about what their child is learning at what stage. And I suppose, going back to the question I asked before, assuming, say, whether or not a parent has been told - maybe, if a parent has been told, they've consented: ‘Yes, I'm happy for my child to study this play.’ Once you're in the classroom, though, and you're teaching a play with a scene of suicide or a scene of domestic violence, a scene of murder. Again, what do you think the teacher should do in that situation? Do you think it's good to focus in on it, to talk directly about that subject or is it better to not make a big deal of it, just talk about it as part of the plot?

Nicki: I think that it's one thing for the parent to say that, ‘Oh, no, my child's…’, like if they say like, ‘Oh, my child can go like ahead and read this book, it's fine.’ It's one thing for the parent to say that, but that parent might have, like, no knowledge of, like, actual… what's actually in Shakespeare, like, say, if they're looking at *Romeo and Juliet*, that parent might actually not know what's in *Romeo and Juliet* that well. Like, they… In, like, the letter may say, ‘Oh, there's violence and graphic’, and they may think that their child's OK with it. But what if the child's not OK with it? So I think even in the classroom then, even if the letters go out, the child should still be allowed to, like, take a moment, leave the classroom. Like the teacher should make that clear.

RY: You know, it's the second time I think that the idea of being allowed to leave the classroom has come up. Just in terms of what's allowed now: if you were covering in class something that was violent, or sensitive in other ways with - I don’t know - misogyny or racism or something like that, would it generally be acceptable to just put your hand up, ask if you can step outside the room for a minute? Is that the kind of thing that ever happens? Is that the kind of thing that you'd feel comfortable doing?

Jon: In college, in a lot of my creative subjects, it's very normal to just like, even if the teacher was talking, to stand up and like leave or go to the toilet or get a drink from somewhere, just like casually… In my English, it's a little bit more complicated 'cause of how the seating’s set out and everything, so you need to request to leave. But I think it's a very fundamental point. In secondary school, you were allowed to ask for like break cards, which are cards you could put on your desk and then leave for 15 minutes or 10 to 15 minutes and then come back. As long as that little card was still on your desk, it meant that you had permission to leave. And I think just those for anyone having that conversation is, you know, it's important and there will be those kind of, you know, the children that won't take it seriously, that will leave the piece of paper on the desk and they will leave for 20 minutes to go and mess around. But I think it's better to take that chance than to have someone who is vulnerable knowing about these subjects, who are being taught these subjects, to have to sit in silence.

Keira: Going on with Jon’s point, with like these children that need to take breaks and stuff.   
Obviously, as you’re growing up, your mind’s very vulnerable. So, having that opportunity and chance to go and take a break from like a vulnerable subject, like suicide for example, it kind of gives them the chance to kind of think and be like, ‘Oh, is this…? Do I want to read this? Do I need to do this right now?’ It depends how… I don't know, it just depends how they’re feeling, I guess, if that makes sense.

Jon: And from a teaching perspective, I think if these kind of cards are a little bit too much for everyone to have, because I can understand that, just having breaks in the actual classroom environment where after they've gone over one of these very harsh subjects to just take a 5 to 10 minute break to, you know, allow a bit of classroom chatter or to just take an exhale after all these subjects, is a really good step forward, just as a room to all process what's been said.

Sarah: I feel like, if you did put your hand up in a lesson and you did say, ‘Oh, can I please excuse myself?’, that would be accepted and you would be allowed to leave. But it’s not really emphasised as an option that students do have. Like there’s no form of: ‘If you want to leave in this lesson, then you definitely can.’ So I feel like if that was emphasised more then more students would take up that opportunity and realise that they do have the option to leave if they’re a bit overwhelmed.

RY: Again, I suppose you get that kind of tension between the two things, because on the one hand, you don’t want the entire class taking the opportunity to take a break, if it's not because they're really upset or bothered, it's because they just want some time out of class. So yes, it is another tricky one, with the students who *are* affected and the students who perhaps are less so.

Poppy: When I was in secondary school, it was pretty much an expectation to not leave the classroom unless you had, like, specific, like, causes, like if you had issues with anxiety, that would allow you to have like a time out card. So we weren't really allowed if, like, a lesson got quite heavy in topic… Like especially in English because it's a mandatory subject back in high school. There was never really the option to like: ‘This is quite… Can I please leave?’ Whereas in college, I would say that based on just the difference of teacher, the teacher is more accepting. Like, ‘Oh yeah, you can step out for 5 minutes, that's completely fine.’ So I do think it's sort of something that, teacher by teacher, it's different. But I think as you get older, it's treated with more like respect that sometimes you do want to leave and stand outside, especially because I think at college people are less likely to take it as sort of like a given that they want to go mess out, around for 20 minutes because it's not a mandatory subject when you get to college, you've chosen to sort of be here. So I feel like that's a difference as well.

RY: I mean, again, it brings back that problem, perhaps particularly with the younger year groups… Because, ok, when you're treated a bit more as adults, you're probably more capable of coping with the material in the first place, but also kind of trusted more by the teachers. And in some ways, the younger students, 12, 13, 14 perhaps, who are studying these plays, not trusted to step out on their own, might find them more disturbing than you might at a later age.

Jon: Building on Poppy’s point, in secondary school, there was like a pressure where if you were in a lesson after like a break or lunch, you couldn't even go to the bathroom, like you weren't allowed to leave the classroom to go to the bathroom. So you couldn't even use that as an excuse to take a 5 minute break. There is such a pressure to stay sit and still for an hour, maybe more, depending on your lesson time. Learning about these harsh subjects without a break and then immediately, you know: 10 minute break, go your next lesson. It's very hard and you don't have that time to process it and teachers don't have the time to give you a 10 minute break so you can process it. So, there needs to be a fundamental change to allow children to take a break after learning about kind of graphic mental breakdowns or suicide or murder.

Pomni: I was going to say that it was kind of a thing that happened to me personally as well.  
Where it was very much a thing where you couldn't leave the classroom. Like, at any given point, if it was lesson time, you weren't allowed to go to the toilet unless you had gone to like, the main office at the beginning of the day to confirm that you could go to the toilet at one specific moment or something. And then, even at break time, certain toilets were locked off to prevent students from, like, coming inside. With me, when it came to say *Romeo and Juliet*, for example, when I was a bit younger when it happened. When the sensitive topics came up, at the time, I was quite disoriented by it because I was, I was very aware of death and suicide, but it was still quite a disorienting subject for me, and I would have appreciated to step outside. But I know at that moment I was too terrified to say anything, especially in a classroom where even if I could have done that, I would have been the odd one out, walking outside, being upset.

RY: Yeah, when you step outside, you’re obviously drawing attention to yourself. It is quite a visible way of… You can see people not wanting to, perhaps even if they are allowed.

Poppy: I feel like it should be a thing sort of like what John said, where teachers give discussion time after something has been seen, to let like the students discuss it. Because obviously, you can't… You can watch something graphic and think things in your head, but if you don't have the opportunity to verbalise it, you just sort of stay thinking about it. I think allowing especially younger students who, like you say, maybe aren't trusted by teachers to leave and not trusted to, like, not abuse time outs. I feel like discussion time where you break down what's happened, whether it's domestic violence, racism, sexism, suicide, anything like that, anything that would typically come with content warning in film or whatever, I feel like that is something that teachers should break down, discuss and allow students to discuss amongst themselves with people their age to know sort of how everyone else feels about it, not just how the teacher expects them to feel about it.

RY: Which comes back to that early question I asked about: do you think actually acknowledging that there's a sensitive issue, or rather glossing over it would be a good idea? And are there any different ways of addressing the content warning? At present, the content warning comes up front and you get told, ‘This is what's going to happen.’ And then it happens - you read or you watch or whatever it is. But alternatively, maybe you could have more of an after session, once you've read something that is potentially disturbing, to actually have a chance to think about your own reactions. ‘How did you find that? How did other people find that?’

Nicki: I think that even if, like worst case scenario, like, these changes don't happen, like, you know, you're not allowed to leave the classroom and content warnings aren't given, I think teachers, like, as well as having like a responsibility to teach, like, material and, you know, make sure they get good grades, I think they also have a responsibility of knowing their students, and if they notice abnormal behaviour… And I think this will also, like, reduce, like, the chance of them looking weird if they like, if someone wants to – like ‘weird’ in quotation marks – if they want to like, leave the classroom for a bit because they've been affected by material that's been taught, I think that teachers should know, like, what the students are like. And if they notice someone that's not acting like they usually do, and they look a bit upset, I think they should, like, probably be like, ‘Hey, do you want to, like, take a step out?’ Like, go to them personally or something. And so obviously not announcing it to the class, like going to them quietly or something like that.

RY: Yeah?

Keira: I’ve noticed when it comes to quite like, like news stories and stuff like that, things that happen in real life, like… Throughout high school, when we’re like having one of those talks where there’s something like bad happening in the world, there’s usually that kind of, ‘If you need to, when like we’re learning about it, if you need to, you can step out and stuff like that, if you find it uncomfortable.’ But when it comes to, like, like literature and stuff, you never really got that option. Obviously, like, it's kind of seen as like, like everyone was saying, like a theme and stuff. Like, there isn’t an option, if that makes any sense. There isn’t an option. Whereas, when it becomes real-life subjects, there is. Like, it's treated differently in a sense.

RY: Yeah. I think we need to move on to the next question - Pomni, maybe just quickly, if you’ve got… You've had your hand up for a while so I don’t want to leave you out.

Pomni: I was gonna say, I feel as though the way suicide is approached as well in subjects or mental health in general, outside of literature as well, especially in like high school and - more specifically in high school - isn't treated as well as it should. Because, not only are you dealing with, like, younger students who are just coming into this, like, awareness of suicide and death and everything like that. But, like, with the way it was treated in my classroom, it wasn't treated as, like, an emotional topic or anything like that. It was kind of just treated as like, ‘Oh, well, you have to learn about it. It doesn't matter how you feel about it, you have to otherwise you're not going to hit those grades.’ It's kind of just treated… Suicide and people's mental health is kind of just treated as just something to earn a good grade rather than a sensitive topic or an emotional topic, that's a very real thing.

RY: Yeah, thank you. I think there are lots of things for our team to think about here about how teachers deal with these situations in the classroom. Let me just go back to the content warning for a minute. Again, just asking about your kind of own experiences in the past with these. When teachers have given content warnings, *when* do they give them? Is it like: ‘Today we're doing *Romeo and Juliet’*? Maybe sometimes they don't give them at all, but if, if they have given them, is it on the day: ‘We're starting a new text, here is the content warning’? Do you get more advanced notice, or is it then before each scene or each act that you read?

Poppy: When I was studying *Hamlet*, I think the teacher did give a general debrief of like, ‘Oh, it's like it's a Gothic-y text, it's got murder and it's suicide…’ This isn't a Shakespeare example, but the other day we were doing another play, and the teacher gave warning about, as the scene was about to start, like, not specific, but just sort of warning: ‘This is a very like aggressive, angry sort of scene and it's quite heavy.’ So, just as the scene’s about to open rather than a while in advance, at the very beginning of the play.

RY: Right. So yeah, just immediately before you actually saw or read that bit. Yes?

Cardi: I feel like it depends on what school you’re in. Because in college, they do give you a warning because obviously you’ve taken the subject voluntarily so they tell you about all themes and obviously we’re doing more violent texts most of the time, especially with Gothic. But in middle school and high school, they didn’t warn us about the violence in our Shakespeare texts. The only thing they warned us about was the racism in other books like *Of Mice and Men*. We didn't learn about, we didn’t get warned about, like, the death and the suicide in any of the other texts. It was just something towards racism, we didn’t get anything else.

RY: And did you miss that? Did you did you want those warnings, do you think?

Cardi: Yeah.

RY: Yeah, right.

Jon: In college, of course, we do get warnings with kind of all my teachers before we go into a very harsh subject, they'll give a general warning of: ‘This is the kind of emotions that are in the scene. This is like going to be a very sexual scene. This is going to be kind of portraying domestic violence.’ In secondary school, with my memory, I don't think I ever got a warning for any Gothic texts. The only kind of warning that we got was when we read *To Kill a Mockingbird* and it was our teacher just saying, ‘Hey, this text contains the N word, and I'm gonna say it throughout this text.’ Like a very white teacher. [laughs] And it was… If you, as a student, when we would do popcorn reading, if you also wanted to say it. And that was, that was the only content warning that I got through any text in secondary school.

RY: Yeah. I mean, certainly in general, that kind of racism is something that teachers perhaps more reliably give content warnings for. I suppose the problem with violence is there's often the assumption that people have encountered violence in other forms, are kind of familiar with certain types. There's a lot of violence on television, so there’s a question of whether people still need warning... Because, you know, there can also be kind of overkill with content warnings. Arguably, there’s a whole list of things that could potentially trigger somebody and it could be endless, for every text - and in some ways that perhaps becomes less effective. If you're listing 40 different things, you never know what are going to be the more upsetting ones and what are the ones that probably everyone's going to be fine with.

Poppy: Yeah, it was just sort of a continuation of Cardi and Jon, where it's essentially racism - when I was studying *Of Mice and Men* in year eight, or year seven, that was like, ‘This is a theme explored through the text because it's contextual within, like, the 1930s when it was written.’ We went into like an exploration of, like, the societal context of, like, when the book was written, whereas when we were studying *Macbeth* or *Romeo and Juliet*, it was just sort of like, ‘Yeah, it's a violent text. Shakespeare wrote it to be violent and there's suicide.’ But we never really broke down, like, any context or why it was written like that or really any explanation into, like, violence as a subject like we'd had with racism. Which is completely valid, I agree with having the content warning for racism. It's just I think it would also be useful to have it applicable with, you know, quite brutal violence or suicide in, like, *Macbeth*.

RY: Yeah. What do other people feel about that? Maybe teachers are doing different things. Did anyone have a different experience where the teachers did acknowledge the violence, talk about the violence in the plays they've studied?

Sarah: I think, we did have a very, very, very brief, like, overview of, like, what was gonna be included perhaps before we started it. It was like a couple of days beforehand and they were like: ‘Oh, just so you know, like next week, we’re starting *Romeo and Juliet* and it will contain these things.’ But it wasn’t… I think it would have been useful to do it in like specific scenes. Like any acts that, like, involve suicide, like, primarily. It would have been nice to have that sort of reminder: ‘Oh, this is going to include suicide and it’s gonna be a very big theme at the end.’

RY: Yes?

Amy: We were given more content warnings for the poetry side rather than the Shakespeare. But I think that it should have been carried through, like, all the way through GCSEs.

RY: Was that violent poetry? It was things like war poetry, was it?

Amy: Yeah, conflict, yeah.

RY: Yeah, so you were told about in one context, but not so much in the other. Yes?

Cardi: Similar to Amy’s point, we were studying another text, *An Inspector Calls*, and that obviously has suicide in it. And they gave a much more graphic warning about the suicide of Sheila Berlin in that and then just kind of skipped over the suicide in Shakespeare. And I think my English teacher personally was so used to teaching the Shakespeare violence that she just didn’t, she just forgot to talk about it, and she didn’t see it as that violent and aggressive. Like, even though it was *Romeo and Juliet*, it still was damaging to some students because of how it was portrayed. And I feel like she didn’t put a warning on that and more focused on the suicide of another book.

RY: That's interesting. That comes up quite a lot if you read the media coverage of content warnings and sometimes people say, you know, ‘Well, Shakespeare plays are violent. If you go into a Shakespeare tragedy, it's going to have violence, it's going to have suicide, it's going to have murder. These are just kind of characteristics of Shakespeare.’ It's kind of assumed that everybody knows that. And yeah, perhaps there is that sense that people *don't* necessarily know that. *Romeo and Juliet* was that interesting earlier example of that, when it's sold as a love story and you might be less aware of how very violent it is all the way through.

Sarah: I was just gonna say, I think it’s an issue like with just specifically Shakespeare. Other texts that other people have studied, they obviously get, like, a warning for content and that. So I think it might be to do with the more established stories. Like most people know what happens in *Romeo and Juliet*, if not every detail but very briefly. So that’s why there’s not that sort of reminder what content warning there is in there because people are expected to already know it, sort of.

Keira: To carry on with Sarah’s point, there’s kind of a stigma around Shakespeare. Like, if you think of a tragedy play of Shakespeare, a tragic kind of story of Shakespeare’s, it’s kind of… Like, there’s kind of gonna be violence, there’s kind of an expectation of violence because it *is* a tragedy, kind of… If that makes… Yeah, there’s kind of a stigma around it. So it's kind of treated as… Cause obviously, he’s a very well-known author, it’s kind of expected to have that knowledge of the tragedy side of his work.

Poppy: I also feel like it's an issue of Shakespeare's so *old* that maybe some, certain teachers feel like it doesn't have the relatability to sort of shock or upset. Whereas texts like, *Of Mice and Men*, *To Kill a Mockingbird*, while they're like technically still, like, older books, they're still, they're classics, they're like fresher stories whereas Shakespeare's, like, well-established, super old. People maybe don't think it has the potential to shock or upset, but when you're like 12-13, maybe not necessarily our age, going into these stories, you *won't* know them. You don't know the content that they have, because when you're 12-13, you maybe haven’t explored Shakespeare as a general idea. So you don't know the themes of *Romeo and Juliet,* like maybe a 20-30 year old would. Because you're a child, you haven't studied or learned about Shakespeare.

RY: Yeah. Interesting.

Pomni: I'm kind of wondering if it comes down to a matter of understanding, because the whole thing about Shakespeare being older and then other books that are given a graphic warning that are still old but a bit more modern. With Shakespeare, when I was learning about it, they gave us like the older texts, so it had the language in it that at the time a lot of people didn't quite get a grasp on when we were learning about it and I feel like then, it kind of becomes… like you’re mildly aware of what's happening, but it then comes down more to the teacher and how *they* describe what's happening in the text as well. And like with the more… like, *An Inspector Calls*, I wasn't given a warning for that, but it was more…  
easier to read in comparison to Shakespeare, and so when it came to the actual topic of the suicide, it was approached a little bit more sensitively than Shakespeare's suicides were, even though we weren't still given a warning about it. It was still treated a bit more sensitively.

RY: Hmm yeah, it really matters how the teacher frames it, when it's a play where people might not immediately understand even what's being talked about at particular moments. You know: famously Hamlet’s ‘to be or not to be’ speech, which is talking about suicide, is quite a dense speech. It's actually quite difficult to work out what he's actually saying in the speech.

Nicki: Adding to what Pomni said, I think that it's because… I think that because of like the nature of Shakespeare, a lot of it needs to be annotated to be able to be fully understood. I'm not saying like it's not all explicit, some of it probably is, but I think to understand probably some of the violent bits it might need to be annotated. So I do think it comes down to how far the teacher goes in annotating, like, parts of, like, Shakespeare that are gory and violent.

RY: And perhaps this goes back to John's earlier point about, you know, do you present the suicide moment of Juliet’s as this romantic gesture of love? Because I think you can read it that way, but you could also, the alternative explanation is: this is a tragic waste, there were other things they could have done with their lives and they didn't have to take this route, this is not necessarily the best choice. So yeah, the way in which teachers present different interpretations and framings seems to matter.

Unicorn: Add-on to Jon’s, I think first point. I was just thinking about it and *Romeo and Juliet* is widely known as almost something to strive for? I think people, often couples, compare themselves like, ‘Oh, we're Romeo and Juliet. It's so cute. It's, like, we're in love.’ But I think that glamorisation of such a violent play is quite harmful on, like, a wider scope, you know?

RY: That's interesting.

Poppy: I think with just sort of general application of content warnings, I think it's something that I personally never really needed because I've always been more into, like, even as a child, I was, like, reading Stephen King. And I was always more interested in sort of like more macabre things. Particularly as a little girl. But I think it's just something that, like, I knew other people around me maybe would have appreciated, who maybe might have struggled with the themes more so than I would. So I think it maybe isn’t something that every student would need or every student would find useful. But I think for those that would, that would appreciate it, it's something that should be implemented because it doesn't matter whether it's the entire class of 30 or whether it's just one out of the 30. I think it's still something that generally if one of the 30 could use it, why would you not want to implement it?

RY: Though I suppose that we come back to the point that Unicorn made earlier on about the sense of surprise or shock quality. That’s one thing that has come up in quite a few of the questionnaires, as some people were saying, ‘I don't really want a content warning’ or ‘I don't want to know that so-and-so dies because I want to be surprised by it.’ And from that point of view, I was wondering: how would you guys feel about, say, content warnings where you had the option to look at them or not? So, say if they were provided in some form - I don’t know -like a website you could go to and it would give a content warning about the texts you were studying. You've got the choice: do I want to look at the content warnings? Do I not? 'Cause then - you know yourself, you know: Am I the kind of person who's been reading Stephen King since I was seven and I'm probably not going to be bothered by violence, or am I someone who knows that I like to have that kind of forewarning? What do people think? Yes, Jon?

Jon: I think that a lot of people do think that they can, if they look at a sheet of paper and it says ‘this play has a graphic murder in it.’ You can say, ‘Objectively I think if I, you know, if I saw that, you know, being played out by two actors on a stage or two people being written about, I could deal with that pretty well.’ But then again, actually seeing the fallout afterwards, this breakdown of character, which is not just this kind of graphic element, is damaging. And I think content warnings should be given before lessons every single time and a content warning on the actual breakdown of these characters should also be given. Just as like a soundproofing for going into these lessons about this very kind of graphic subject. I think it's just like the bare minimum, just helpful for everyone. Even if you don't think you're gonna be affected by that.

RY: Hmm. So, so rather than just saying ‘this contains suicide’, you say ‘this contains suicide and the mental breakdown leading up to suicide,’ that kind of thing? Is that what you're thinking of? Yeah. Because I suppose again, with Lady Macbeth, the difference between Lady Macbeth and Romeo and Juliet - different kind of contexts surrounding the suicides there.

Unicorn: I feel like with optional content warnings, it comes down to how well the individual knows themself. So if you look at a younger audience being given the option to study *Romeo and Juliet* and it says: ‘This is going to contain suicide.’ Does a 12-year-old know what suicide is? Do they understand the complications of suicide? I guess it calls onto the question: should younger teenagers and children be studying these texts at all?

RY: Yeah, there's the question of what age is it suitable to introduce the text. But also I suppose how they are taught - so if you're going to study suicide, if it is something that young people of that age have perhaps never really thought about, do you need to address it directly? Do you need to spend class time talking about it as an issue?

Jon: I think the major important part of teaching is of course yes the content warnings and knowing who you’re talking to. But if you do go over suicide or murder or, like, graphic descent into madness, going over the context of why Shakespeare wrote it like that is *so* important, about why he showed Lady Macbeth’s death as kind of fault of character but Romeo and Juliet’s as this kind of eternal love and who he was portraying his audience to and what was going on in that in England at that time. It's so we don't have to put it to our current society and kind of see ourselves as Romeo and Juliet. That kind of societal context is one of the main teaching points that should be taught instead of just being like, ‘Oh yeah, Romeo and Juliet, they kiss and they die. OK, next one.’ It's so important.

RY: Yeah, contextualising the violence and not just glossing over it, assuming people can kind of draw their own conclusions about what it means.

Sarah: Yeah, like what Jon said, I think it’s really important to contextualise like, I think the general… What we believe Shakespeare is, like, the general overview of like Romeo and Juliet is that they are this, like, romantic couple essentially. And going into the context would really get rid of that. And then really get rid of the… like prepare more people for like the graphic nature of it, if you know what I mean. Like, in *Hamlet*, the ‘to be or not to be’ speech, that line itself is just seen as, like, a famous quote. It’s not really… The context behind it is: this is a guy who’s debating whether or not he should kill himself. It needs to be put in more detail what these quotes actually mean, rather than like the big stereotype that's been created of them in society.

Poppy: Sort of touching on Unicorn’s point, I think there does need to be an [inaudible] on the way that Shakespeare is handled in younger secondary school versus college because I feel like with content warnings, maybe a younger audience, it should be: ‘Yeah, this scene is about to come up. This is what comes into this scene. This scene is about to come up. This is what’s going to come into the scene.’ And then I feel like it should be like a given, every time, when you are younger. Just because young children, it doesn't really matter, I feel like it should just be a given that they get told quite explicitly what is in the scene, what's going to be handled. Because I feel at this age, sort of year 1, year 2 college and university studying as well, I feel like it should be more individual, like, ‘Oh well, this is maybe like the general themes of the play. But if you want to learn more, you know, like there is this resource for you to find out more specifics.’ So I feel like at this age it should be more of a personal choice on whether you want content warnings, whether you want to seek them out. But I feel like as a young child studying *Romeo and Juliet*, or any other text, I feel like it should just be: the teacher gives it without, you know, choice.

RY: Some people have been a little bit quiet in this session. It would be nice to hear a bit more of your voices before we come to an end. What do you guys think about optional content warnings, versus teachers who just say to everybody: ‘This is what happens, these are the big issues’?

Amy: I feel like it gives children more control over what they want to learn, like, if they want to go into more detail on the violence. It just opens up that choice for them rather than ‘you must learn this’ or a parent deciding ‘you’re not learning this’ or… I just think it gives that element of choice of what they want to do.

RY: So I suppose that brings us to the question of… - I don't know if you're suggesting that the child could decide, ‘I don't actually want to study this,’ if they get the warning.

Amy: Yeah, or just avoid like the more violent elements. I just feel like you need more option of, if you want to go into the detail, into the violence, or if you don’t.

RY: Yes, it's tricky, particularly with the younger years, that question of does the teacher just pick the bits that aren't so violent, we talked earlier about maybe just doing the first few scenes of or first few acts of *Romeo and Juliet*, not doing the second half of the play, which is much more the violent one. And whether the teacher makes that choice, or whether… At what age do young people start making those choices for themselves?

Pomni: I kind of feel like there should be a certain age where, like, say, for the younger audiences learning about this, that content warnings should be a given because they're quite young. But I also feel like the problem, there's also a problem that lies in how mental health in general is treated, especially in secondary school, because I know with me approaching mental health in school at any given point, you were told like, ‘Oh, you can talk.’ But when you did talk to anyone, it was kind of just treated as, like, something that could be pushed aside or easily fixed or anything like that when it's not at all treated like that. And so, it's kind of, I don't think that we should, like, delve into like mental health at a young age, if we're still giving like content warnings. But I do feel like it should be something that should be a little more open and more well known about, especially in secondary school where these problems will start to arise naturally anyway, rather than pushed aside as something like, ‘Oh, it's just child problems or teenage problems, or always just something like that.’

RY: So, in some sense you're suggesting it’d be good if you could build mental health discussion into literary studies, as part of the way we approach these things?

Pomni: In a way, yes. Because there was also a point someone made earlier about how people wouldn't quite understand or have a grasp on suicide and its extent because obviously suicide delves into other problems like depression and other serious mental health issues, but more commonly depression. So it's kind of more based around, like, I guess a person's knowledge of it. If they're more aware of it, then it's more likely that they'll be a bit more able to approach the subject, but obviously again at the age I studied *Romeo and Juliet*, I feel like it should be a given that content warning’s given anyway, but mental health should also be more covered in regards to the topic as well.

RY: Yeah and I suppose that fits our discussion of *Hamlet* as well, because of course Hamlet, you could see him in modern terms as somebody who is depressed in various ways and whether it's a good idea to talk about mental health problems when you're talking about Hamlet. He's also got a very messy personal life so that doesn't help. But the grief at the death of his father, you can clearly see that being part of the bigger problem that faces him. Yeah. And I think this might have to be the last comment because I think we do need to finish up.

Unicorn: I think regarding structure… I was given an opportunity in year 6 to study ‘The Highwayman’, the poem, as an extracurricular, because it was like a selected group of mature students who were quite interested in literature, who are then able to go and study this… Because the poem is quite graphic in a sense. It's, like, kidnapping. I don't know if you've read it.

RY: I read it at school but that's a while ago now.

Unicorn: Yeah, but I was eleven reading this.

RY: Right, yeah.

Unicorn: I was able to process it because it was a smaller group. It was with a teacher that selected me personally. I feel like that could potentially be an option.

RY: It’s like that earlier thing about, you know, ideally – and sometimes it's not possible – ideally, teachers, knowing their students, knowing who might have problems with things, knowing what subjects are going to be sensitive with any particular group, they can address these things with individuals. It’s certainly something that would be an ideal, if we could get that. As I said, I think we are now out of time. So we should end there. But thank you so much everybody for your participation today. Just a couple of things before we finish up. Hopefully you’ve enjoyed this conversation, you’ve found it interesting and you're happy with how everything went today. If you have any kind of complaints though, you can obviously let me know as you file out of the room if there was anything you're unhappy with. You can also get in touch with me by e-mail. You've got my e-mail on the information sheet. If you feel upset about anything we discussed today, please speak to a trusted adult, so that obviously might be an adult at home or it might be a teacher at the college, and there's also of course ChildLine that you can call. That number is 0800 11111 and you can find that online. There are those resources if you want to talk about any of these issues. As I said, everything that's been recorded today, we will make into a transcript, all kept anonymous, all personal stuff removed if there is anything. And again, please don't talk about any of this as you go back to the rest of your day and with other people in the college. There is still the option, even though you've just done the focus group, there is still the option to opt out of the focus group if you want. If you want us to remove any of your contributions from today, what you need to do, just then contact me at the e-mail address on the information sheet and we can try to remove your contributions from the transcript if you decide that there are things you said that you'd rather not have put into the record. OK. Again, as I say, thanks. Thanks so much for your participation. It's going to be massively helpful to us.