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Dynamic assessment represents an opportunity for educational psychologists to utilise a play-based approach for assessing the functional behaviour of children who struggle to perform in formal testing situations (Tzuriel, 2000; Hill, 2015). A systematic literature review aims to evaluate available empirical research on the use of dynamic assessment approaches within the early years to provide a clearer view of the evidence for their use and to support educational psychologists’ development of such approaches within their professional practice. The review of this evidence indicated mixed results for the usefulness of dynamic assessment in the early years phase and warranted closer inspection of the use of dynamic assessment by educational psychologists.

In the empirical project, a purposive convenience sample was used. Two practising educational psychologists were interviewed using semi structured interview schedules and observed delivering dynamic assessment in the Early Years Foundation Stage. Interviews were analysed using thematic analysis and a content analysis was used to analyse the videoed observations.

The findings of this empirical project highlight the type and level of mediation required for dynamic assessment of children in the Early Years Foundation Stage; how educational psychologists evaluate the usefulness of dynamic assessment for assessing and identifying the needs of children in the Early Years Foundation Stage; and the implications of dynamic assessment for intervention for children in the Early Years Foundation Stage.
Stage. Implications are discussed for promoting the use of dynamic assessment among educational psychologists as a useful tool for assessment of children in the early years age phase.
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Thesis Introduction

The aim of the present study was twofold. Firstly, Paper one aimed to highlight the evidence of the usefulness of dynamic assessment in the early years age phase. Secondly, Paper two subsequently aimed to evaluate the evidence for the usefulness of dynamic assessment in the early years phase and, in turn, to support educational psychologists’ (EPs) development of such approaches within their professional practice. Paper three aimed to evaluate ways to effectively disseminate the research findings of both Papers one and two, to the appropriate fields of social and professional activity, over and above publications aimed at academic dissemination.

The author’s interest grew further in the area of assessment of young children when developing her “tool kit” as a trainee educational psychologist. Standardised assessment seemed unhelpful for children in the early years because such tests follow standardised procedures and cannot accommodate the positive demonstration of knowledge, skills and learning strategies of young children with some degree of learning compromise (Boyle & Fisher, 2007). This is not a criticism of standardised assessment as their purpose is specifically to measure performance within standard and non-flexible conditions which is useful to provide norms (Losardo & Syverson, 2011). However they prove less useful when informing teaching and intervention and arguably learning potential (Waters & Stringer, 1997). Due to the proposed limitations of standardised tests, the context of play based assessment has been suggested as a viable setting for collecting assessment data for children in the Early Years Foundation Stage (Groth-Marnot, 2009). Lorsado and Syverson (2011), stress that play based assessment is particularly useful for assessing functional behaviour of a young child who cannot perform in a formal testing situation. The context of play allows a comprehensive and integrated view of a child’s interactions with people and objects in a meaningful environment. Dynamic assessment represents an approach that seeks to overcome many of the above difficulties associated with standardised testing (Yeomans, 2007). The Early
Years Foundation Stage has an element of dynamic assessment embedded within it as it can be delivered using a play based approach.

Having responsibility for a few early years settings in a specific allocated area, the researcher was continuously faced by this prospect. Consequently it was decided to explore dynamic assessment and see what fellow EPs were doing in this field. The researcher’s pilot research project highlighted that EPs value dynamic assessment yet it didn’t feature as part of their practice for various reasons such as time constraints. Whilst exploring this area by conducting a systematic literature review, it became apparent that dynamic assessment not only has a limited evidence base but a mixed evidence base. Only a small number of studies explored the usefulness of dynamic assessment in the early years. Out of the five studies, three supported the specific or additional utility of dynamic assessment within the early years’ age phase, whilst two studies did not provide such support. Despite the emphasis on early years work in educational psychology services, it would seem there is still a lack of emphasis on dynamic assessment (Bagnato & Neisworth, 1994). Significantly, none of the found studies were conducted by EPs or used play based assessment procedures. Findings from paper one informed the research questions for paper two.

**Figure 1.** Overarching diagram to illustrate the link between different components in the researcher’s research paradigm.
The diagram above is a representation of the researcher’s thinking around the research paradigm. The components connect into a circle starting at ontology and have an influence on the component to the right. The knowledge is already in existence but has to be captured using the chosen research methodology. As the participants are the real contributors to the knowledge, they have a voice which has to be elicited through the methods chosen. Hence the research being exploratory in nature aiming to gain an understanding of underlying reasons and opinions ethically without causing any harm to those involved. Semi-structured interviews were chosen as they are flexible enough to facilitate the emergence of new and unanticipated categories on meaning and experience (Willig, 2008), yet aim to be systematic, valid and reliable (Forshaw, Upton & Jones, 2012).

The researcher explored components above in relation to the following research questions:
• What type and level of mediation is required to support children in the Early Years Foundation Stage?

• How do EPs evaluate the usefulness of dynamic assessment for assessing and identifying the needs of children in the Early Years Foundation Stage?

• What implications does dynamic assessment have for intervention for children in the Early Years Foundation Stage?

**Ontological stance**

Ontology is the study of existence and belief in the nature of reality, in other words what is believed to be real in the world (Scotland, 2012). In this case it is highlighting the existence of dynamic assessment among EPs and bringing it to the forefront. The ontological stance influences the epistemological position and the selection of the methodology. Epistemology refers to thinking about the reality (Carter & Little, 2007). When talking about research methodology, one questions how to use the thinking to gain more knowledge about reality. In this study, the researcher was trying to capture abstract concepts, such as showing EPs’ use of dynamic assessment practices in the early years, by collecting data and classifying their existence, providing meaning and ultimately contributing to knowledge. Hence an inductive-deductive reasoning approach was used when analysing the data in order to move from the generalisations to a specific conclusion about the data. In this case, knowledge is socially developed among groups such as EPs who create it. Gibbons, Camille, Helga, Schwartzman, Scott and Trow (1994) identify two forms/modes of knowledge. Mode one refers to abstract forms of knowing, whilst mode two refers to practical knowledge. Practical based knowledge is relevant to everyday lives. The value of mode two is inspirational to professional doctorate courses like Educational and Child Psychology where professional development is linked to practice based knowledge production. There is a
need for practitioners to build an evidence base to show the validity of what they are doing as competent researchers (McNiff, 2013).

**Epistemological stance**

The epistemological position of the current study is Critical Realist. Critical realism guides and facilitates highly reasoned reflective and coherent actions in bringing about positive change. The author, as an action researcher will contribute (critically) to the creation of truth and solid knowledge (Nielsen & Nielsen, 2006) and this position allows to connect imaginative processes to practical social change and to theory of societal development. As a critical realist, it is believed that there is one reality which is fluid and dependent upon various factors which influence this reality. How one thinks about the reality is context dependent and therefore thinking about reality affects one’s practice as an educational psychologist (Wilson, 2001). The methodology hence reflects the ontology of a fluid reality; as reality is fluid it is dynamic and can be changed. The methodology will therefore be working towards social change. This epistemological position would allow the author to make generalisations from the research to other similar contexts. The qualitative research will be focusing on a real life problem reflecting the world as it actually is (Banister, Bunn, Burman & Daniels, 2011). This reality will be critically examined from a practical stance (Scotland, 2012). The author aims to understand individual case studies in their particularity (Willig, 2008), hoping that it will benefit EPs and those they work with (Scotland, 2012) by having a suitable assessment approach in place which will help to inform suitable intervention.

Darlstan-Jones (2007) claimed that reality is socially constructed by and between the persons who experience it (Gergen, 1999). It is a consequence of the context in which the action occurs and is shaped by the cultural, historical and social norms that operate within that context and time. Thus reality can be different for each person based on their unique understandings of the world and experience of it (Berger & Luckman, 1966). Reality in this
case is completely subjective and need not be something that can be shared by anyone else but at the same time it is independent of the person living it. This epistemological position and design of the study allows the participants to be active contributors to the research (Carter & Little, 2007). Within their speech are meanings and perceptions that construct reality (Cameron, 2001). As seen in the interactions both children learnt new skills in a classic pre and post-test situation, which is dynamic rather than static. What is especially helpful with more dynamic approaches to assessment, is the emergence of a greater range of information about a child’s skills, knowledge and acquisition of both rather than simply did he/she identify the “shape” or not?

**Axiological stance**

Axiology deals with the nature of value, more specifically it is concerned with assessment of the role of the researchers own value on all stages of the research process (Scotland, 2012). As a researcher it is important to be clear about one’s beliefs that guide the research process and hence adopting a research paradigm helps to establish a set of practices that guide the acquisition of knowledge. Axiology also makes reference to ethics. Research has to do something beneficial in the world (Wilson, 2001). It is about empowering individuals to be able to make changes and develop good practice. In terms of the axiology, it is up to the researcher to make things better for EPs and improve current reality of dynamic assessment through understanding (Wilson, 2001). The author’s previous work and role as trainee EP involved helping children and young people as well as those that work with them. Hence the interest in dynamic assessment as a method of assessment that is an alternative to standardised methods. Furthermore, the research provides learning for EPs, promoting the use of dynamic assessment through case studies and case based research and an opportunity to engage EPs in that endeavour.

The researcher has developed as a reflective practitioner over the duration of the course, which has been influential in the choice of research and methods
selected. It is felt that reflection is part of the learning process and it is important to be able to examine one’s practice, perspectives, attributes, experiences and actions/interactions, with the aim of learning and identifying something in order to achieve a better understanding. Participants also had the opportunity to reflect upon their experiences in the second interview. Reflection was an important part of research because it provided an explicit way of allowing participants to think about their effectiveness in the activities that they carry out as part of their role. One participant felt that it was a “powerful” experience for her. Ethical guidelines were adhered to and efforts were made to keep all participants safe as highlighted to the ethics committee.

An inductive -deductive reasoning approach was used by the researcher as it was felt that she started with a premise moving from generalised principles that are known to be true towards a specific conclusion. Thematic analysis allowed for this to happen reaching a logical true conclusion. The thematic analysis process was a lonely process although Braun and Clarke’s (2006) guidance was strictly followed during the analysis process. According to Braun and Clarke (2006), it is relatively easy to conduct a good thematic analysis on qualitative data, even when you are still learning qualitative techniques analysis. Guba and Lincoln (1994) claim that in an actual world that can be known, requires the researcher to adopt a position of objective detachment in order to ascertain how things really are. Therefore there is a presumption that the researcher and the known are separate and independent entities that do not influence one another. As the researcher was the one responsible for giving the interaction meaning, at times the researcher found it difficult to detach from the data and step back. However regular meetings and supervision with her supervisor allowed for problem solving; possible pitfalls were avoided with thematic analysis such as vague codes, incoherent themes and vague definitions (Alhojailan, 2012).
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Paper One

Exploring Educational Psychologists’ Use of Dynamic Assessment with Children in the Early Years Foundation Stage: A review of the literature.

Background: Assessment of individual children remains a major focus of professional activity for educational psychologists (EPs) (Ashton & Roberts 2006, Freeman & Miller, 2001). In England, the Early Years Foundation Stage curriculum (ages 0-5) emphasises the use of a play-based approach, focusing on the needs, interests and developmental stages of children. Dynamic assessment represents an opportunity for EPs (Hill, 2015) to utilise a play-based approach for assessing the functional behaviour of young children who find it difficult to engage with formal and static testing situations (Tzuriel, 2000).

Aim: Dynamic assessment is one of the least utilised methods in EP practice (Hill, 2015). This systematic literature review aims to evaluate available empirical research on the use of dynamic assessment approaches within the early years to provide a clearer view of the evidence for their use and to support EPs’ development of such approaches within their professional practice.

Rationale/Approach: Using systematic literature review methodology and applying research quality assessment frameworks, this paper examines the evidence of the usefulness of dynamic assessment with children in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

Findings/conclusion: Included studies investigated the use of dynamic assessment with Early Years Foundation Stage children with varied demographic characteristics. The studies used dynamic assessment such as the Application of Cognitive Functions Scale and the British Picture Vocabulary Scale to elucidate areas of literacy such as reading and phonological awareness. The review indicated mixed results for the
usefulness of dynamic assessment. Dynamic assessment added value to the static assessments for cognitive and linguistic functioning, reduced the risk of biased assessment in preschool assessment and contributed predictive information about later independence. However dynamic assessment of phonological awareness in two studies offered little advantage over static forms of assessment. Future research should explore EPs’ use of dynamic assessment in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

Keywords: EARLY YEARS FOUNDATION STAGE, DA, EPs, school psychologists.
**Introduction**

**Early Years Foundation Stage**

In 2008, the Early Years Foundation Stage was introduced to provide a framework outlining standards for the learning and development of children from birth to five years (Palaiologou, 2016), through to the end of the reception year in all types of early years provision, for example nursery care, childminders and reception class in schools. The Early Years Foundation Stage was paralleled with the Early Years Foundation Stage profile, which is a summative assessment at the end of the foundation stage 2 (just before children start KS1). The purpose being to collect evidence over the 2 years to compile the profile using observation, analysis and planning (Nutbrown & Carter, 2009). The Early Years Foundation Stage is organised around seven areas of learning: communication and language, physical development, personal, social and emotional development, literacy, maths, understanding the world and expressive arts and design (Wood, 2009). The Early Years Foundation Stage was designed to raise standards and improve access to positive experiences for all children (Nutbrown & Carter, 2009).

In an independent review of the Early Years Foundation Stage by Tickell (2011), there is clear evidence that outcomes for young children are improving. However, it also highlighted that almost half of the children (44%) are still not considered to have reached a good level of development by the time they are five. Tickell (2011) highlights that early identification of need followed by appropriate support is the most effective approach to helping children overcome specific obstacles to learning. Furthermore, all practitioners working in the Early Years Foundation Stage, including teachers, key workers, teaching assistants and EPs have a responsibility to identify needs and intervene with appropriate support as early as possible (Rose & Rogers, 2012; Tickell, 2011). They need to understand the different ways in which children learn, in order to provide effective support.
and hence emphasis is placed on how children learn rather than what they learn (Tickell, 2011).

**Educational psychologists early years assessment**

Assessment of individual children and young people has remained a major focus of professional activity for EPs (Ashton & Roberts 2006; Freeman & Miller, 2001). Elliot, Lauchlan and Stringer (1996) believe that “Psychological assessment should involve a creative investigation of a broad range of hypotheses that build on research from all areas of Psychology” (p. 152). The Currie Report (Scottish Executive, 2002) explained that EPs assess needs, using a range of methods and approaches. Psychological assessment techniques need to be sensitive to the social and emotional development of children, as well as their cultural and linguistic backgrounds and comply with the Disability Discrimination Act (1995) and Special Educational Needs and Disability Act (2001). The profile of special needs in the early years has risen recently as a consequence of the Special Educational Needs and Disability Code of Practice: 0-25 years (SENTCoP); DfE/DoH, 2014), placing an emphasis on increased provision in the early years (Wolfendale, 2013). The DfE/DoH (2014) places importance on the work of EPs (through Local Authorities) to be collaborative, accessible, comprehensive, up to date and transparent. At the moment, however, there is no clear guidance in the UK on which assessments EPs must undertake as their fundamental assessments and which are complementary. Annan (2013) outlines the importance of utilising problem solving frameworks to guide EP decision-making and practice. By doing this, EPs are supported in becoming transparent, methodical, analytical and accountable in the work they do and the thinking that they engage in.

The aim of psychological assessment is to produce understanding of what is happening, who is concerned, why there is a problem and what can be done to make a difference (Woods, 2012). EP assessment can serve two purposes: first, to identify difficulties and needs and second, to inform intervention
To this end, EP assessment involves testing hypotheses (Groth-Marnot, 2009) and planning interventions based on the analysis of information gathered, with the key to effective assessment being to match the strategy for gathering information to the questions being asked (Boyle & Fisher, 2007). Reliable and valid psychological assessment is crucial to the appropriate provision of special services (Shepard, 1994).

Rees, Farrell and Rees (2003) claimed that there is considerable variation in the assessment and intervention practices of individual EPs. Similarly, research by Woods and Farrell (2006) using a questionnaire survey of 142 EPs in England and Wales highlighted their approaches to assessment of children with learning and behavioral problems. They were asked about the frequency with which they used a variety of approaches to assessment and their usefulness, including observations, standardised tests, criterion referenced approaches and dynamic assessment. The findings revealed that partial psychometric assessments of ability feature most prominently in the EP assessments of children with learning difficulties with 46% of EPs using them. Approaches based on dynamic assessment were not used frequently, as only 11% of EPs used dynamic assessment. Dynamic assessment was ranked in 14th position in terms of its usefulness.

**Early years’ assessment approaches**

**Standardised assessment**

Standardised assessments are designed to identify strengths and difficulties (Boyle & Fisher, 2007). Standardised tests provide information about how a child is developing in relation to a larger group of children of the same chronological age (Losardo & Syverson, 2011). Kelly-Vance, Needelman, Troia and Ryalls (1999) point out that, standardised tests require the use of standardised procedures. These include issues such as the use of an unfamiliar environment and examiner, instructions regarding how to complete tasks and a question and answer format with which the child may have minimal experience or ability (Macy, Bagnato, Lehman & Salaway,
For purposes of standardisation, however, examiners cannot deviate from the administration procedures dictated in the test manual (Groth-Marnot, 2009). Waters and Stringer (1997) stated that although standardised tests are used in determining eligibility, they were not developed to define intervention needs.

Alfonso and Flanagan (1999) suggest that difficulties arise when using standardised assessment measures with younger children because such tests do not match the developmental characteristics of pre-school children. Thus, they cannot accommodate the potentially differing needs of children with difficulties (Macy et al., 2007). Children in the early years with communication or physical impairments may not be sufficiently assessed for other strengths they possess therefore incomprehensive information may be obtained about the child (Kelly-Vance et al., 1999). Bagnato and Neisworth (1994) highlighted in a survey of 186 American psychologists working with the early years’ age group that 43% of the time standardised assessment failed to be an acceptable tool and recommended play based assessment as an alternative. Due to the proposed limitations of standardised tests (Groth-Marnot, 2009), the context of play based assessment has been suggested as a viable setting for collecting assessment data for children (Kelly-Vance & Ryalls, 2005) in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

**Play based assessment**

Play is one of the many ways children learn new skills, knowledge, adapt to their environment, solve problems, build their sense of identity (Wood, 2009) and it is central to the Early Years Foundation Stage. Lorsado and Syverson (2011), stress that play based assessment is particularly useful for assessing functional behaviour of a young child who cannot perform in a formal testing situation. According to Wolfendale (2013), the most detailed and comprehensive assessment information can be gained though observation and participation. Their model of play based assessment combines observation and adult participation to help determine strengths and weaknesses. As an assessment tool it is accessible to both parents and
professionals in a range of contexts (Lorsado & Syverson, 2011). According to Whitebread and Coltman (2015), during play children set their own level of challenge, which is developmentally appropriate, more so than tasks set by adults. Furthermore, play is often initiated by children themselves, making them in control of interactions in a learning, teaching or assessment setting. Hernan (2007) highlighted that the context of play allows a comprehensive and integrated view of a child’s interactions with people and objects in a meaningful environment. Also, the unstructured nature allows room for expansion of the assessment incorporating the child’s ability to organise emotions, sensations and self-regulatory behaviours. Capabilities such as exploration diversity, persistence and engagement can be identified which may not be recognised in a standardised assessment (Lorsado & Syverson, 2011).

Segal and Webber (1996), identified 2 observations of play, structured and non-structured. In non-structured play, observations allow the observation of a child in spontaneous play with an adult without any restrictions in the environment, toys or timing. Structured play observations allow the assessment of play behaviours. They involve the use of checklists or rating scales and involve predefined procedural directions that specify the environment, toys, and strategies to use for eliciting behaviours. The authors stress that this requires planning, time, the lack of a standardised procedure, a good knowledge of child development and what the targeted behaviour/focus of the observation is. It is the observer’s responsibility to develop tailored activities and data collection tools. A shared understanding needs to be created before the assessment regarding the observational criteria. Practitioners must be able to observe and record behaviours across multiple domains of development (Losardo & Syverson, 2011) such as cognitive, affective and psycho-motor (Drifte, 2002).

**Dynamic assessment**

The Early Years Foundation Stage places emphasis on the concept of using a play-based approach, which has led to an improved focus on the needs,
interests and developmental stages of each child, enabling an active approach to guiding and supporting their development (Robertson, 2009). The Early Years Foundation Stage currently includes a requirement for the areas of learning to be delivered through planned, purposeful play with a balance of adult-led and child-initiated activities (Tickell, 2011). Dynamic assessment represents an approach that seeks to overcome many of the above difficulties associated with standardised testing (Vulic, Altaras & Jolic, 2014). Dynamic assessment has been argued to represent an opportunity for EPs to utilise a play based approach, which is seen to have psychological validity and particular relevance to early years’ developmental stage (Hill, 2015). The Early Years Foundation Stage has an element of dynamic assessment embedded within it, as there is a requirement for practitioners to observe the things that children can do and to respond to these to help children progress to their next level of development (Tickell, 2011).

Seminal theorists and researchers in the field of dynamic assessment include: Vygotsky (1978) (social cultural approach and Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)); Feuerstein and Hoffman (1979) (Mediated Learning Experience (MLE)); Tzuriel (1987) (Learning Potential Assessment Device (LPAD)); Lidz (2000) (Application of Cognitive Functions Scale (ACFS)); Waters and Stringer (1997) (The Bunny Bag). According to Poehner (2005), dynamic assessment requires the examiner to mediate the examinee’s performance during the assessment itself through the use of prompts, hints, and questions. In this way, the focus of the assessment shifts from examinees’ success or failure at completing a given task to an analysis of the amount and kinds of assistance they required as well as the extent to which they reciprocated the examiner’s interactive moves.

Glaspey and Stoel-Gammon (2007) note that dynamic assessment evaluates a child's skills when given support, whereas static assessments evaluate skills without support. Yeomans (2007) considers dynamic assessment to examine the process rather than the product of learning by identifying strengths and weaknesses in the cognitive functions of the child. Dynamic
assessment looks at assessment of need, taking into account what the child can do with support and capitalising on these strengths. According to Lidz (2000), dynamic assessment links the results from assessment to the child's learning in the classroom.

Deutsch and Reynolds (2000) explored EPs use of dynamic assessment. They investigated how effective 119 EPs perceived the training to be, to what extent they subsequently used dynamic assessment in their professional practice and what they saw as the advantages and limitations of dynamic assessment in the UK. The survey highlighted that 74% of the 88 responses received, suggest awareness of dynamic assessment as a model of cognitive assessment and positive attitudes but with low levels of implementation, attributed to insufficient training in dynamic assessment and to lack of time due to other assessment priorities. The study by Vulic et al. (2014) looked at whether dynamic assessment contributes to the usefulness of assessment reports by school psychologists. The authors wanted to determine whether additional data collected using dynamic assessment actually contributes usefulness of test reports from the point of view of teachers. Two groups of teachers assessed the usefulness of psychological reports prepared on the basis of static and dynamic evaluation of the capability of the three children. The results indicate a significant positive effect on the dynamic evaluation of the teaching assessment, especially when it comes to how the child accepts and uses the incentives. Dynamic assessment had a significant positive effect on informing reports particularly regarding the child’s reaction to adult scaffolding. These findings provide empirical confirmation of the supposed benefits of dynamic assessment, encouraging its use.

According to Poehner and Lantolf (2005) summative dynamic assessment involves a pre and post-test procedure and reports on the outcomes of learning, whereas formative dynamic assessment is intended to feed back into the teaching and learning process and is a guide for future learning. Dynamic assessment has been criticised on the grounds that it is time consuming and requires a high level of expertise and experience. It takes a
long time to administer (Guthke, Beckmann & Dobat, 1997) due to the interactive nature of the procedure. Furthermore, according to Losardo and Syverson (2011), practitioners must engage in ongoing hypothesis formulation and decision making process, be aware of child development and balance observation with the recording.

Shannon and Posada (2007) highlight that a debate has emerged surrounding the use of psychometric assessment in the early years, proposing that alternative forms of assessment such as dynamic assessment may be considered as being more appropriate for this age group. The authors aimed to provide exploratory research evidence of current models of service delivery and EP attitudes. The main purpose of their research was to obtain a snapshot of the current role of the EP and models of service delivery in relation to early years. Data was gathered from 32 EPs, who completed questionnaires. Further interviews were conducted with 3 EPs. The authors found that there was an increasing emphasis on early years work within the EP services, however there was dissatisfaction with current working models related to high levels of individual casework.

**Summary**

Under the new SEN code of practice (DfE/DoH, 2014), EPs are now more likely to receive referrals concerning children in early years settings. Dynamic assessment represents an opportunity for EPs (Hill, 2015) to utilise a play based approach for assessing the functional behaviour of young children who cannot perform in formal testing situations (Tzuriel, 2000). Haywood and Tzuriel (1992), claim that dynamic assessment focuses on the learning process of young children and is of value in determining factors that may impede learning and informing intervention. Dynamic assessment is appropriate for the early years because it can be delivered in the context of play and is particularly useful for assessing functional behaviour of a young child who cannot perform in a formal testing situation. EPs need to be aware of suitable approaches to assessment of need when standardised
assessment is not an option, ultimately contributing to the assess plan do
review cycle as stated in the SENDCoP (DfE/DoH, 2014).

There is a lack of research showing EPs’ use of dynamic assessment
practices in the early years. Therefore, the purpose of this review is to
evaluate the evidence for the usefulness of dynamic assessment in the early
years phase and in turn, to support EPs’ development of such approaches
within their professional practice.

**Systematic Literature Review Question**

What is the usefulness of dynamic assessment for practitioners in the Early
Years Foundation stage?

**Method**

Drawing on systematic literature review methodology and using study
quality assessment frameworks the paper explores EPs’ use of dynamic
assessment with children in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

**Ethical considerations**

The review went through a process of ethical clearance at an English
University confirming that the research only involved secondary data
synthesis. The study only utilised studies in the public domain.

**Data Sources and Literature Search Strategy**

Electronic databases (University of Manchester; Psych info, ERIC, Web of
Science ASSIA and Google Scholar) were searched for journal articles.
Web searching was also conducted using Google and Google scholar.
General search terms, aimed to find all available published research relevant
to the literature review question, were: dynamic assessment AND early
years (OR educational psychologists OR educational psychology OR kindergarten OR preschool) AND (usefulness).

Literature searches were completed between November 2015 and January 2016. Reference harvesting of included papers was also used to extend the scope of the search. Pertinent journal editions and article reference lists were manually searched. Within the search period, a manual search of one of the leading psychology journals in the UK (Educational Psychology in Practice) was carried out. The review report adheres to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff & Altman, 2009; see Appendix 3).

**Inclusion criteria**

Studies were screened against the following inclusion criteria:

- Study is accessible in English via abstract.
- Study published in any country.
- Study is conducted with preschool children in the Early Years Foundation Stage (age 0-5) or equivalent.
- Study is primary empirical research which uses either/or qualitative and quantitative research methods.
- Study involves the use of dynamic assessment and its findings.
- Subjected to peer review in an academic journal.
- The study has relevance to implications for practice in the early years.

The aim of the enquiry was to look at the utility of research therefore having a closer relevance to practice. The inclusion criteria were distinctive and wide-ranging in order to capture any dynamic assessment activity by EPs.

**Details of included and excluded studies**
Electronic searches of the title and abstract generated 757 hits in total across the databases. After strict application of the inclusion criteria, a further 751 studies were excluded leaving six studies, all of which were quantitative investigations. After translation of the study by Vulic et al. (2014), it highlighted that children in the sample were aged between 6:2 – 7:0 and attended preschool education in kindergarten, which meant that the study did not in fact meet the inclusion criteria and had to be excluded.

**Study quality assessment**

To enhance the robustness of the review, a framework for evaluation of methodological quality was applied. As the studies considered in this SLR were investigative quantitative studies, a purpose-designed University of Manchester framework for quantitative investigative studies was used; the framework draws on relevant criteria from several methodological sources (Choi, 1998; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007; Geneady, Lemasters, Lockey, Succop, Deddens, Sobeih & Dunning, 2007; Wallace & Wray, 2011). The framework collected both descriptive and evaluative information about each included study. It consists of a checklist of 15 study features falling into the category of data gathering, data analysis and data interpretation. Each research study was scored either 1 or 0 for each of the framework criterion, yielding a maximum possible study quality score of 15 (see Appendix 4 for a completed example). Studies scoring between 11-15, were considered to be of high quality, those scoring between 6-10 medium quality and 0-5 low quality (Gough, 2007). Post discussion inter-rater reliability stood at 0.77and 0.8.

**Data extraction and synthesis**

For all included studies, key data were extracted and summarised. Key data included: the aim of the study, the study design and content, the sample size, demographic sample characteristics, pre and post intervention measures, outcomes, ethical considerations, research findings and implications considered.
Results

Appraisal of studies

Quality assessment of the six reported studies showed that two of the five studies were of high quality and three studies were of medium quality. The table shows the study quality score for each study included in the review along with a brief description of their main characteristics.

Table 1: The main characteristics and findings of the studies included in the review are shown below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, type of practitioner and study quality score</th>
<th>Study design and sample</th>
<th>Aim of the study</th>
<th>Methodology employed and measures used</th>
<th>Findings of the study</th>
<th>Researchers’ conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wiedl, Mata, Waldorf and Calero (2014) 10/15</td>
<td>226 pre-schoolers living in either Germany or Spain</td>
<td>Investigation of dynamic assessment reducing the risk of biased assessment of children with an immigrant background.</td>
<td>Pre and post-test using the Application of Cognitive Functions Scale (ACFS)</td>
<td>Revealed differences between native and migrant children in levels (P&lt;0.5: $\eta^2$ .02-.12) but not in progression of performance, except for auditory memory ($\eta^2$ .06).</td>
<td>ACFS can be used as a measure of cognitive functioning that is more independent of the migratory status of pre-schoolers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantor, Wagner, Torgeson and Rashotte (2011) 10/15</td>
<td>123 preschool children. South Eastern city – USA.</td>
<td>Comparison of two forms of dynamic assessment and standard assessment of preschool children’s phonological awareness.</td>
<td>Random assignment of participants to 1 of 3 test administration groups. Assessment based on scaffolding, on instruction and traditional assessment of phonological awareness.</td>
<td>Results indicate that phonological awareness of preschool children can be reliably and validly assessed using standard assessment procedures (p&lt;.05). Dynamic assessment does not improve reliability or validity of phonological awareness assessments when preschool children are given tasks that they can perform using standard administration procedures.</td>
<td>The use of dynamic assessment to speed up the response to intervention process might work better in first grade than it does in preschool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, Engelhardt, Maxwell and Bolig (1997)</td>
<td>84 children aged between 4-5; from 3 USA Midwestern cities.</td>
<td>Investigating whether dynamic measures improve the predictive use of static measures on both fluid and crystallised ability tasks in preschool children. Dynamic measures of learning and transfer are relatively consistent across different task domains.</td>
<td>Participants took pre-tests, training and post-tests. Subtests from the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) – block design and similarities. Training produced statistically significant pre-post-test improvement in performance (similarities p&lt;.001, block design p&lt;.001). Dynamic assessment of ability contributed predictive information about later independent post-test performance.</td>
<td>Authors question whether learning ease is stable across time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilleri and Law (2014)</td>
<td>40 pre-school children from the UK. Speech and language was a cause for concern.</td>
<td>Dynamic assessment enhances the predictive capacity of a static measure of receptive vocabulary in pre-school children. Pre-test phase, dynamic phase and post-test phase. British Picture Vocabulary Scale (BPVS) and British Ability Scales (BAS) Significant predictive capacity of static measure (p&lt;.05) enhanced by dynamic assessment element (p&lt;.01).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dynamic assessment can add clarity to the decision making of speech and language pathologists. Valid for practitioners to discuss with teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry, Byrne, Olson, Corley and Samuelsson (2011)</td>
<td>1,988 preschool children. 992 MZ twins, 996 DZ twins from USA. The genetic and environmental overlap between static and dynamic measures of phonological awareness tasks. Longitudinal study.</td>
<td>Unable to distinguish between static and dynamic preschool assessment of phonological awareness in terms of underlying</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is little advantage in electing to use dynamic assessment. However dynamic assessment may still serve as a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers interested in early reading development and behaviour genetics.</td>
<td>Australia, Sweden and Norway.</td>
<td>preschool phonological awareness and their relation to preschool letter knowledge and kindergarten reading.</td>
<td>genetics (non-significant loading of .01 Eta² values for LK, static phonological awareness and dynamic phonological awareness in predicting reading were .28, .06 and 0.1 respectively in predicting reading). Dynamic assessment adds minimally to variance explained in later reading (1%).</td>
<td>valuable technique for children from disadvantaged backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study characteristics

The studies selected were published within the last twenty years. Of the five studies, one was conducted in the UK, three in the USA, one in the USA as well as Australia, Sweden and Norway. One study was a randomised control trial and one was a longitudinal study. All studies used a pre-post study design. Dynamic assessment in the studies was conducted by professionals other than EPs such as speech and language therapists.

Sample characteristics

Sample sizes ranged between 40 and 1988 preschool children. Children were aged under five years who were in an educational setting.

Use of dynamic assessment

All the studies used some form of dynamic assessment with participants and looked at its usefulness. The study by Wiedl et al. (2014) examined whether dynamic assessment reduced bias, the study by Kantor et al. (2011) compared two forms of dynamic assessment, the studies by Day et al. (1997) and Camilleri and Law (2014) looked at whether dynamic assessment enhanced the predictive capacity of a static measure, the study by Coventry et al. (2011) looked at the overlap between static and dynamic assessment measures.

Measures used and analysis

The study by Wiedl et al. (2014) used the Application of Cognitive Functions Scale (ACFS) in a pre and post-test format, the study by Kantor et al. (2011) used dynamic assessment based on a pre and post-test format using scaffolding, instruction and traditional assessment of phonological awareness, the study by Coventry et al. (2011) used dynamic phonological awareness tasks based on four stages of instruction with built in assessment in a pre and post-test format, the study by Day et al. (1997) used subtests
from the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC); block design and similarities in a dynamic pre and post-test format and finally the study by Camilleri and Law (2014) also used dynamic assessment in a pre and post-test format along with the British Picture Vocabulary Scale (BPVS) used as a baseline measure and the British Ability Scales (BAS) to represent non-verbal cognitive ability.

Findings

As stated in the DfE/DoH (2014), children’s needs are generally thought of in the following four broad areas of need and support: communication and interaction, cognition and learning, social, emotional and mental health and sensory and/or physical needs. These also reflect the areas highlighted in the Early Years Foundation Stage profile (Nutbrown & Carter, 2009). The Early Years Foundation Stage is organised around seven areas of learning: communication and language, physical development, personal, social and emotional development, literacy, maths, understanding the world and expressive arts and design (Wood, 2009). However the emphasis of dynamic assessment in the studies focused on either language or cognition. All of the studies use adaptations of cognitive assessment and there is no evidence of any play based assessment being used with young children in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

In the study by Wiedl et al. (2014) dynamic assessment showed differences between children in levels of cognition, in the study by Kantor et al. (2011), dynamic assessment did not appear to improve reliability or validity of phonological awareness assessments, in the study by Day et al. (1997), dynamic assessment of ability contributed to predictive information, in the study by Camilleri and Law (2014) dynamic assessment enhanced the value of the information provided and proved to be valid for practitioner discussion with the teacher, in the study by Coventry et al. (2011) dynamic assessment was unable to distinguish between static and dynamic preschool assessment.
Evidence for the use of dynamic assessment in the early years is limited but somewhat promising. When analysing the papers, it became apparent that the authors were using dynamic assessment tools that are relevant and useful to educational psychologists. In all of the studies selected, the authors highlighted the relevance to implications for practice in the early years. The evidence base is looking mainly at the areas of cognition and language. However it is limited and not entirely positive therefore firm conclusions cannot be drawn regarding its usefulness.

**Dynamic assessment for language assessment**

**Camilleri and Law (2014) – dynamic assessment of word learning skills – UK**

The aim of this study was to determine whether dynamic assessment has the potential to enhance the predictive capacity of a static measure of receptive vocabulary in pre-school children. In this study dynamic assessment was used to enhance assessment of pre-school children with primary language impairment. 40 preschool age children were randomly selected from among children referred to an inner-city speech language pathology service. The children were 41-60 months when first assessed using a combination of static and dynamic measures. The authors used the static British Picture Vocabulary Scale (BPVS), a dynamic assessment of word learning potential and an assessment of non-verbal cognitive ability using the British Ability Scale (BAS). 37 children were followed up after a 6 month waiting period and were reassessed using the BPVS. Results indicated that although the predictive capacity of the BPVS was found to be substantial, the dynamic assessment increased this significantly especially for children with static scores below the 25th centile. It is concluded that dynamic assessment of word learning has the potential to add value to the static assessment of children with low language skills, to predict subsequent receptive vocabulary skills and to increase the chance of identifying children in need of support and providing early intervention. Furthermore, it has been
described as a brief intervention which has the effect of contributing to a diagnosis.

It is worth highlighting that the 6 month lag between pre- and post-test, the child’s performance at time 2 may have been influenced by their experience at time 1, both of BPVS and dynamic assessment component of the assessment. The extent to which the activities incorporated in the dynamic assessment component of the assessment have a direct influence on children’s growth in receptive vocabulary would need to be explored by carrying out a separate controlled study.

Coventry, Byrne, Olson, Corley and Samuelsson (2011) – dynamic and static assessment of phonological awareness - USA, Australia, Sweden and Norway

The aim of this study was to examine the genetic and environmental overlap between static and dynamic assessment measures of preschool phonological awareness and their relation to preschool letter knowledge and kindergarten reading using 1988 monozygotic and dizygotic twin children. A total of 5 static phonological awareness tasks were employed followed by 4 sessions of dynamic phonological awareness assessment. Each session consisted of 4 stages of instruction followed by built in assessment. Results indicated that when dynamic assessment of phonological awareness is used in preschool to predict kindergarten reading, it adds variance to explain later reading but the addition is small at 1%. Therefore the authors conclude that dynamic assessment of phonological awareness in pre-schoolers offers little advantage over static forms. However they acknowledge its potential in cases of preschool educational disadvantage. More generality of the conclusions of this study and other types of phonological awareness and its assessment is needed.

Kantor, Wagner, Torgeson and Rashotte (2011) – comparison of two forms of dynamic assessment - USA
The aim of this study was to compare two forms of dynamic assessment and standard assessment of preschool children’s phonological awareness. 123 preschool children were compared on two forms of dynamic assessment. One based on scaffolding and the other based on instruction and traditional assessment of phonological awareness. The authors wanted to determine whether either form of dynamic assessment improved the reliability and validity of assessments of phonological awareness relative to standard static administration. The authors found no advantage in reliability or validity for either dynamic assessment condition relative to the standard static assessment condition. Dynamic assessment does not appear to improve reliability or validity of phonological awareness assessments when preschool children are given tasks that they can perform using standard administration procedures.

There are issues limiting the generalisability of the results. The children were from middle and higher socioeconomic groups. The short duration of the study may not have allowed time for group differences to emerge. Lastly the use of multiple test administrations in a short period may limit the generalisability to instances when using the tasks at a single time.

**Dynamic assessment for cognitive assessment**

**Day, Engelhardt, Maxwell and Bolig (1997) – comparison of static and dynamic assessment procedures - USA**

The aim of this study was to see whether dynamic measures might improve the predictive use of static measures on both fluid and crystallised ability tasks in a group of preschool children. 84 preschool children were given pre-tests and post-tests on block design and similarities tasks to assess relationships between pre-training skills, ease of learning and later post-test performance in both spatial (block design) and verbal (similarities) task domains. The findings are consistent with previous research on the instruction of cognitive skills in that training produced significant pre to post-test improvement in performance. Dynamic assessments of ability
contribute predictive information about later independent post-test performance.

The results must be interpreted with caution because of the small sample size. The question remains to be answered: is learning ease stable across time? The authors do not provide clarification as to how the dynamic measures relate to school learning.

**Wiedl, Mata, Waldorf and Calero (2014) – dynamic testing using the ACFS – Germany and Spain**

The aim of the study was to show the reduced risk of biased assessment of children with an immigrant background. This effect was shown in 226 preschool children using the Application of Cognitive Functions Scale (ACFS), which is a dynamic test based on the test-mediation-test format. Dynamic testing reduced the risk of biased assessment of children with an immigrant background. Dynamic testing using the ACFS showed differences in native and migrant levels of performance but not progression. It is considered as a useful test for assessing children with a migratory background.

The study lacked a control group and therefore the question whether the progress of performance that was observed should be attributed to specific intervention or mere practice remains to be answered.

**Summary of findings**

Out of the five studies, three supported the use of dynamic assessment and two did not. Three of the studies used dynamic assessment for literacy assessment, looking at word learning, reading predictability and phonological awareness. Two of the studies compared dynamic assessment and static measures; the study by Kantor et al. (2011) compared two forms of dynamic assessment. Dynamic assessment is good for adding value to the static assessments of cognitive and linguistic functioning, reduces the risk of
biased assessment in preschool assessment and contributes predictive information about later independence. However dynamic assessment of phonological awareness in two of the studies offered little advantage over static forms of assessment.

**Discussion**

In England, early years education services and the children who attend them are increasingly the subject of assessment. While these assessments offer a number of benefits in terms of tracking child development, they also impose restrictions to practice, limits to understandings of children and fail to engage with the wider social context of the child (Campbell-Barr, Lavelle & Wickett, 2012). Therefore, we argue the need to look at alternative modes of assessment to enhance the data already being collected. There is scope to explore the use of more qualitative methods of assessment in the early years.

Only a small number of studies have explored the usefulness of dynamic assessment in the early years and none focus upon the work of EPs. A total of five studies met the inclusion criteria and examined the use of dynamic assessment in the early years. Despite there being emphasis on early years work in the EP services (Shanon & Posada, 2007), it would seem there is still a lack of emphasis on dynamic assessment. Why is it that despite recommending play based assessment as an alternative approach (Bagnato & Neisworth, 1994) it did not feature as part of this review?

Dynamic assessment fulfils the Division of Educational and Child Psychology (2002) criteria for assessment by EPs (Hill, 2015) as it is well suited to teaching and links assessment to intervention. The studies in this review used dynamic assessment in the areas of language and cognition. Both language and cognition have importance for EPs when assessing children in the Early Years Foundation Stage. They form part of a detailed and comprehensive understanding of the child’s strengths and needs. The Tickell Review (2011) acknowledged the importance of language and communication and cognition as vital skills that contribute to children’s
success in school. The context in which children learn in the early years is critical for the transition into the education system and inclusion (Hill, 2015). Furthermore, Hill (2015) highlights that information from dynamic assessment can help EPs understand and estimate the language and cognitive abilities and predict how a child will function in a school context. This knowledge helps to generate suitable recommendations and interventions for teachers, parents and other professionals and support the crucial transition process from the Early Years Foundation Stage into primary school.

Since the completion of the current review no articles have been published, to the best of the author’s knowledge, which would have been likely to have met the inclusion criteria in the current review.

**Limitations of the review**

Although the evidence from the current review is generally supportive of dynamic assessment, the studies included in the review have significant methodological limitations such as small sample sizes; lack of control groups; short duration of studies, generalisability and lack of long-term follow up. Furthermore, the present review was limited to published studies, which were subjected to peer review in an academic journal. Therefore there may have been a number of noteworthy studies that have been omitted from the review, such as book chapters, masters level dissertations and doctoral theses. Moreover, the potential expansion of search terms particularly related to the term “usefulness” could have been considered. The quantitative investigative studies were evaluated for methodological quality using the framework developed by the researchers at the university, while some of the small scale study research articles scored highly on methodological quality this should be considered objectively against the fact that the RCT design is commonly considered to be the “gold standard” in research quality terms, this potentially raises some questions about the criteria used and whether these should have been weighted differently to
Conclusions and recommendations for future research

This review has not only highlighted a limited evidence base but a mixed evidence base. In addition to the need for more rigorous research, there is also a need for research that seeks to address gaps. As encouraged by the findings from the Vulic et al. (2014) study, dynamic assessment can be used in assessing school readiness and urge school psychologists to regularly inform teachers on their observations from both static and dynamic cognitive assessment.

What is disappointing yet significant is that none of the studies were conducted by EPs or used play based assessment procedures. It would be useful to investigate EP’s use of dynamic assessment in the Early Years Foundation Stage. All early years practitioners need to understand the different ways in which children learn in order to provide effective support (Tickell, 2011). Special educational provision for a child should be based on an understanding of their particular strengths and needs and should seek to address them all, using evidenced based interventions targeted at areas of difficulty where necessary. This will help to overcome barriers to learning and participation (DfE/DoH, 2014). Furthermore, reviewing the effectiveness of interventions in enabling children to make progress can itself be part of the assessment of need, informing the next steps to be taken as part of a graduated approach to support. The focus on next steps in teaching and learning takes practitioners into the ZPD because as argued by Vygotsky (1978) “assessment does not end with a description of a pupil’s present state of knowing but rather begins there” (p. 85). Effective assessment shapes the vision for high quality play-based early learning that will allow children to reach their full potential (Nutbrown & Carter, 2009).
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Paper two

The use of dynamic assessment by educational psychologists in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

Abstract

Dynamic assessment is an interactive assessment that encompasses planned mediational teaching and assessment of the effects of that teaching on subsequent performance (Haywood & Tzuriel, 2002). Its historical roots can be traced to Vygotsky (1978) and Feuerstein (1979). According to Tzuriel (2000), dynamic assessment has been motivated by the inadequacy of conventional static tests to provide accurate information about the individual's learning ability, specific deficient functions, change processes, and mediational strategies. This paper highlights the nature and potential of dynamic assessment when used in the Early Years Foundation Stage by educational psychologists (EPs). The dynamic assessment approach has been successfully utilised to assist EPs and setting staff in devising classroom-based educational interventions. Two practising EPs were interviewed using semi structured interview schedules and observed delivering dynamic assessment to children in the Early Years Foundation Stage. Interviews were analysed using thematic analysis and a content analysis was used to analyse the videoed observations. The dynamic assessment approach was found useful in assessing “learning how to learn” skills (Tzuriel, 2000). The research has provided promising evidence regarding the utility of EPs’ play-based dynamic assessment approach with children in the Early Years Foundation Stage to elicit positive information about their skills, knowledge, learning potential and possible intervention strategies. The paper concludes by calling for further studies that examine the utility of dynamic approaches with children of different ages (Elliot, 2003). Crucial issues regarding training, reliability and generalisation are also discussed.
Introduction

Early years’ foundation stage

In 2008, the Early Years Foundation Stage was introduced to provide a framework outlining standards for the learning and development of children from birth to five years (Tickell, 2011). Early identification of need followed by appropriate support is the most effective approach to helping children overcome specific obstacles to learning. All early years practitioners, including EPs, have a responsibility to identify needs and intervene with appropriate support as early as possible (DfE/DoH, 2014; Tickell, 2011).

EPs and assessment

Freeman and Miller (2001) identify that assessment of individual children and young people has remained a major focus of professional activity for EPs. Elliot, Lauchlan and Stringer (1996) believe that: “Psychological assessment should involve a creative investigation of a broad range of hypotheses that build on research from all areas of Psychology” (p 152). Educational psychology assessment involves testing hypotheses (Groth-Marnot, 2009) and planning interventions based on the analysis of information gathered. The key to effective assessment is to match the strategy for gathering information to the questions being asked (Boyle & Fisher, 2007). For example, if the purpose is diagnosis, then it can have serious implications for individuals. Failure to be identified could mean the denial of needed services, but being identified as in need of special services may also mean removal from classroom and a potentially stigmatising label.

2 This paper has been prepared in accordance with author guidelines that can be seen in Appendix 2 (Retrieved May 05, 2017, from http://www.tandfonline.com/action/authorSubmission?show=instructions&journalCode=cepp20#Preparing_your_paper). This project was funded through England’s Department for Education (DfE) National College for Teaching and Learning (NCTL) ITEP award 2012-2015.
Therefore the assessment method used must have a high degree of reliability, validity and utility (Shepard, 1994).

**Standardised assessment**

Storeygard, Hamm and Fosnot (2010) use the term static assessment to refer to a standardized testing procedure in which an examiner presents items to an examinee without any attempt to intervene to change, guide, or improve the child's performance. Standardised assessment is believed to increase objectivity. Factors that obscure the ability being assessed are controlled for (Poehner, 2008). Furthermore, scores for individuals on standardized tests can be compared to others easily (Poehner, 2008). However, standardised assessment does not identify information about learning processes, deficient cognitive functions that are responsible for learning difficulties and mediational strategies that facilitate learning (Storygard et al., 2010). Standardised assessment methods measure only the products of prior learning (Burns, 1985). As highlighted by Groth-Marnot (2009) standardised assessment is unable to accommodate the potentially differing needs of children with difficulties.

As a result of the limitations associated with standardised assessment, dynamic assessment is an alternative approach that overcomes many of these difficulties, especially because it is based on the assumption that the type and level of instruction provided during testing is important when examining children's zones of proximal development (ZPD); Burns, 1985). Haywood and Tzuriel (1992) also reported that dynamic assessment is appropriate for the early years because it can be delivered in the context of play and is particularly useful for assessing functional behaviour of a young child who cannot perform in a formal testing situation. The Early Years Foundation Stage has an element of dynamic assessment embedded within it, as there is a requirement for practitioners to observe the things that children can do and to respond to these to help children progress to their next level of development (Tickell, 2011), directly linking the results from assessment to the child's learning in the classroom (Lidz, 1996). The study
by Benjamin and Lomofsky (2002) compared the effect of the observation of dynamic and static assessment approaches on teachers' perceptions in two schools. They concluded that the teachers in the experimental group (who had observed a dynamic assessment), developed a more optimistic stance towards the children than the teachers in the comparison group (who had observed the static assessment). The outcome of the study provides further support for the use of dynamic assessment approaches and reinforces the limitations of using static testing approaches with children from low ability groups.

**Dynamic assessment**

Dynamic assessment is based on Vygotsky’s (1987) proposal of the ZPD, which underscores the developmental importance of providing appropriate support to learners to help them stretch beyond their independent performance (Lantolf & Poehner, 2011). Burns (1985) describes that this is done when the examiner sets up a learning environment in the testing situation and takes measures on changes from pre- to post-training performance and on the amount of instruction that was required from the examiner for the child to obtain the post-test performance level. According to Lantolf and Poehner (2004) dynamic assessment distinguishes itself from other approaches to assessment, as it encompasses a range of mediation during the assessment procedure which is crucial in understanding the child’s abilities, and for promoting development in the Early Years Foundation Stage; it can be delivered using a play based approach. Dynamic assessment has been found to be more accurate in reflecting children’s learning potential than standard assessment methods (Tzuriel, 1997).

Dynamic assessment is conceived as an efficient approach to identify learning processes and to provide accurate information about the individual’s learning ability, specific deficient cognitive functions and mediational strategies that are responsible for cognitive modifiability (Tzuriel, 1997). In a report by Burns (1985), it was highlighted that children aged between 4 and 6 years of age, who received a mediational assessment
method, (examiners intentionally and directly taught the strategies needed for task completion) performed better on a cognitive task independently than children receiving static assessment. Furthermore, Spector (1992) found that dynamic assessment supported the hypotheses that it enhances the predictive utility of a phonemic awareness measure. Performance on dynamic phoneme segmentation was the best predictor of end-of-year reading scores and of growth in phonemic awareness for children. Haywood and Tzuriel (1992) claim that due to its relevance to the classroom and ability to examine the learning process, carrying out dynamic assessment with young children can be valuable in not only determining factors but also informing intervention.

Dynamic assessment has been criticised on the grounds that it is time consuming and requires a high level of expertise and experience. It takes a long time to administer (Guthke, Beckmann & Dobat, 1997) due to the interactive nature of the procedure. Furthermore, according to Losardo and Syverson (2011), practitioners must engage in ongoing hypothesis formulation and decision making process, be aware of child development and balance observation with the recording.

**Rationale for current study**

There is a lack of evidence in the literature that looks at dynamic assessment used by EPs in the early years. A systematic literature review by Hussain, Woods and Burke-Williams (*submitted*), examined the evidence for the usefulness of dynamic assessment with children in the Early Years Foundation Stage. The review highlighted a limited and mixed evidence base on the utility of dynamic assessment in the early years. Significantly, none of the found studies were conducted by EPs or used play based assessment procedures. Studies focused upon assessment of children’s language development and cognitive functioning by practitioners, none of whom were EPs. All of the studies use adaptations of cognitive assessment and the authors found no published evidence of play based assessment being used and evaluated with young children in the Early Years Foundation
Stage. Dynamic assessment has been shown to add value to static assessments of receptive vocabulary, to reduce the risk of assessment bias and to contribute predictive information about later independence.

Dynamic assessment has been argued to represent an opportunity for EPs to utilise a play based approach, which is seen to have psychological validity and particular relevance to early years’ developmental stage (Hill, 2015). Consequently the present study investigated EPs’ use of dynamic assessment in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

Aims and objectives

The current study aimed to highlight the reflections of EPs using dynamic assessment as an assessment tool with children in the Early Years Foundation Stage, through the following research questions.

1. What type and level of mediation do EPs use within dynamic assessment within the Early Years Foundation Stage
2. How do EPs evaluate the usefulness of dynamic assessment for assessing and identifying the needs of children in the Early Years Foundation Stage?
3. What implications does dynamic assessment have for intervention for children in the Early Years Foundation Stage?

Method

Design of the study

The present study was a qualitative exploration of two cases of EP’s use of dynamic assessment with children in the Early Years Foundation Stage using a variety of data gathering sources (Baxter & Jack, 2008). The case in each case study was an EP’s use of a dynamic assessment approach; although the child was their casework, the EP’s perspective was the focus of the analysis (Yin, 2010). EP1 used dynamic assessment for a referral
concerning developmental delay and poor concentration. EP2 used dynamic assessment for a referral concerning physical difficulties.

As this was a process of enquiry into the effectiveness of an assessment method (Coats, 2005), the EPs were initially interviewed using semi-structured interviews (Goodwin, 2010; Roberts & Ilardi, 2003; Willig, 2008), followed by a video recorded observation of their interaction with the child using dynamic assessment. The EPs were given the opportunity to watch the video recording of their dynamic assessment interaction and comment upon it further. They were interviewed again and their reflections were captured regarding the dynamic assessment employed.

**Sampling and participant recruitment**

For the purpose of this research, a purposive sample was used via contacts through regional university training programs (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). Ethical approval for the study was sought from the ethics committee at the university. Two EPs were selected on the basis that they used dynamic assessment in their practice (see Appendix 5 for pen portraits of the EPs), adopting a self-selected sample who met the general requirements of the study (Goodwin, 2010).

**Ethics**

For this research, relevant ethical protocol of the University of Manchester was adhered to and ethical approval was granted in November 2015 (see Appendix 6 for ethical approval correspondence and Appendix 7 for research application documents). Both EPs were emailed consent forms and participant sheets four weeks prior to the research being carried out. They were given the opportunity to think about issues such as the potential harm that could be caused by exposing their practice to scrutiny. They then emailed parents a copy of the consent form and information sheet two weeks before the interview and observation took place (see Appendix 8 for participant consent forms and information sheets). EPs obtained formal
written consent from parents. Parents had two weeks to think about allowing their child to participate in the research. Assent was obtained from the child on the day of the video observation.

Data gathering methods

Table 2: shows the data gathering methods for each research question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Data gathering method</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What type and level of mediation is required to assess children in the Early Years Foundation Stage?</td>
<td>First audio recorded semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>Thematic Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation of video-recorded EP dynamic assessment with child</td>
<td>Content analysis Mediation framework – Application of Cognitive Functions Scale (Haywood &amp; Lidz, 2006; Lidz, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second audio recorded semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>Thematic Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do EPs evaluate the usefulness of dynamic assessment for assessing and identifying the needs of children in the Early Years Foundation Stage?</td>
<td>Second audio recorded semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>Thematic Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation of video-recorded EP dynamic assessment with child</td>
<td>Content Analysis Mediation framework – Application of Cognitive Functions Scale (Haywood &amp; Lidz, 2006; Lidz, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What implications does dynamic assessment have for intervention for</td>
<td>Second audio recorded semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>Thematic Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semi-structured interviews

Each participant was interviewed twice and the interviews lasted between 30 to 45 minutes and were recorded for transcription (see Appendix 9 for interview schedule 1 and Appendix 10 for interview schedule 2). The interview was piloted with an EP and a trainee EP, which led to the use of additional prompts in respect of interview question two, and the restructure of interview question number one. The interviews took place at the assessment setting or the EP’s office. The first interview aimed to elicit the EP’s intentions in using dynamic assessment in the Early Years Foundation Stage. They were asked generally about dynamic assessment. The second interview captured reflections of a specific process of dynamic assessment and also examined the extent to which EPs had been able to fulfil the intended assessment plan.

Video recorded EP dynamic assessment

The video recording of the EP’s use of dynamic assessment was used as a data gathering tool to support their responses in interview. Jewitt (2012) suggests that video elicitation can be a useful way of validating and cross checking interpretations and Lofthouse (2010) highlights its potential to enhance the reflective component of investigative research. Each EP used formative dynamic assessment with one child in the Early Years Foundation Stage. The interaction was video-recorded in the assessment setting to preserve some of the context in its original form for analysis; the recording was downloaded onto a password protected computer and deleted after use.

Data analysis methods

Braun and Clarke’s (1996) thematic analysis was used to analyse the transcribed interview data. Thematic analysis was conducted separately for
each participant before a cross-case comparative analysis took place. This allowed the researcher to identify, analyse and report themes within the data that linked to the research questions. Themes generated were analysed at the semantic level, adhering to explicit and not latent meanings. With a semantic approach, the themes were identified within the explicit or surface meanings of the data, not looking for anything beyond what the EPs reported (see Braun & Clarke, 2006; Appendix 11). An inductive approach was used to identify themes strongly linked to the data, rather than a pre-existing coding frame. Due to the subjective nature of the researcher deciding which data pertain to which codes, and which codes constitute a theme, the reliability of data analysis using thematic analysis can be variable. In order to mitigate against this, the researcher elicited the assistance of two educational psychology doctoral research assistants in an inter-coder validation exercise using 20% of the transcripts. Following the exercise, 8 out of 159 codes were clarified for EP1 transcripts, and no clarifications were required for EP2 transcripts. Therefore credibility of the thematic analysis undertaken in this research was judged to be good (see Appendix 12 for a data trail that illustrates the TA process).

A rich thematic description of the entire data set was created using the transcripts. Codes were generated which led to themes which were then arranged into the thematic maps (see Appendix 13 for thematic maps for EP1 and Appendix 14 for thematic maps for EP2). Each participant was given further control over how their views were represented through an invitation to check the thematic map analysis of their interview, for accuracy and meaning. There were no queries from this process.

**Content analysis of video recorded EP dynamic assessment**

The aim of the content analysis was to look for specific elements of dynamic assessment that the EPs said they would be employing during their interaction with the child (Stigler, Gonzales, Kawanaka, Knoll & Serrano, 1999). The researcher used a largely directed approach to content analysis as highlighted by Hsieh and Shannon (2005).
From initial interview, EP1 chose to use the Application of Cognitive Functions Scale (six subscales: Classification, Perspective Taking, Short Term Auditory Memory, Visual Sequential Memory, Verbal Planning and Sequential Pattern Completion; Haywood & Lidz, 2006). EP1 wanted to gain an insight into affective elements in terms of the child’s approach to learning. There was an interest in cognitive functions and the language element relating to sequence, order and pattern. From initial interview, EP2 chose to use a planning sheet based on Lidz’s (2003) Response to Mediation Scale (what is the task? How will you mediate meaning?). EP2 wanted to gain an insight to the physical area of child development, fine motor, attention control and listening skills. There was an interest in making the task clear, giving it meaning and focusing attention on the task.

Content Analysis frameworks were modified by detailed observations of the dynamic assessment videos. For EP1, this exercise was initially conducted by the TEP who watched the observation independently. EP1 later confirmed the findings after engaging in a similar exercise of evaluation. For EP1, 2 additional categories were created; creating curiosity/suspense and praise (see Appendix 15). For EP2, both the EP and the TEP engaged in the content analysis exercise. For EP2, 17 categories were created, for example; creating curiosity, focusing attention on the task (physical nature of task) and making it clear – giving the task meaning – being specific in task (see Appendix 16).

The EPs was able to highlight and point out where they felt that mediation was successful. This was based on whether the child was able to complete the task independently after mediation was offered. EPs were then given the opportunity to review and validate the content analysis. Both EPs agreed in totality with the researcher’s content analysis and did not identify any errors or omissions in the coding.
Results

Having outlined a range of perspectives in the thematic analysis for both EPs, the cross-case comparative analysis focused primarily on the similarities among themes. Not all the themes identified were explained within the confines of this paper. Following cross-case comparative analysis, findings are presented by research question, with exemplification of each relevant organising theme. Some organising themes were significant in their own right, did not contain sub-themes and so were constituted directly from the coded data. See Appendix 17 for thematic maps for RQ1, RQ2 and RQ3 for EP1 and EP2.

**RQ1 - What type and level of mediation is required to support children in the Early Years Foundation Stage?**

According to EP1: *there is not much around in terms of frameworks for dynamic assessment.* EP1 intended to use the Application of Cognitive Functions Scale in a less formal play based way, looking for things like sequencing and sorting linked to the curriculum demands. EP2 intended to use the Response to Mediation Scale by Lidz (2003), which looks at persistence and self-regulation: *it is a good planning tool but I will need to be clear about my objective.* Both EP1 and EP2 informed that they would spend half an hour planning the dynamic assessment, this would include looking through the file and reading the referral notes. EP1 wanted to observe the child first and get a feel of the learning environment. EP2 also wanted to get to know the child through a general play based assessment before looking at specific things in the follow-up dynamic assessment session. She felt that this took an extra level of planning. EP1 shared that she would be using compare bears, threading beads and shapes in order to explore sequence and sorting. Resources were chosen on the basis for exploration. EP2 shared that she would be looking at fine motor skills and therefore would be using scissors, containers and dried materials such as rice. Resources were chosen due to the area of need: *the child doesn’t get success with them.*
In the first interview EP1 reported that the level of mediation to be used would be dependent on the child and mediation would only be offered once it was established what the child could do spontaneously: *the first principle of mediation is to offer no more assistance than is required for successful task completion.* EP1 made a strong link to non-intellective factors (behaviours that affect learning) because they can get in the way of actual cognitive processes such as impulsivity and persistence. Trial and error, attention and concentration were also highlighted as key areas. According to EP1, the form of mediation can be very verbal or non-verbal and showed an interest in the joint participation element of mediation. EP2 reported that mediation is about identifying the conditions the child best responds to. She would be mediating to teach the child how to complete the task: *It’s about what you say and do in order to guide completion. Also identifying conditions in the environment needed to complete the task such as reducing the task demand, making the task simple and supporting the child’s feelings.*

EP2 was clear that most of the mediation will be verbal with some physical prompts: *some hand on hand mediation with a bit of visual attention – cuing in.*

In the second interview EP1 reflected that she had used a *high level of mediation in terms of modelling, vocalisation and imitation* but no hand over hand mediation. There was evidence of mediation around pattern and the child’s understanding of pattern. Once EP1 had modelled to the child, the child was able to complete the pattern independently. The child went on to make more complex patterns. There was evidence in the video that the EP1 often moved things closer to the child. Focusing mediation was used as the child often needed bringing back to task. EP2 used *a high and varied level of mediation to focus the child, make things clear, make the task specific, and manage feelings of competence.* Visual prompts, verbal prompts and a few physical prompts were used due to the nature of the task and child’s difficulties: *Level of mediation was high for things that child found particularly hard to do.* This was evident in the video as a lot of attention was given to the direction of visual prompts and instructions.
In terms of successful mediation used EP1 reflected that mediating the pattern element was successful, getting the child to produce more systematic patterns. From the video, it was evident that when the child received modelling and repetition, the child produced a pattern: *child picked up on mediation and produced something systematic.* EP2 reflected that giving specific direction and repeating worked well and telling the child where to put their eyes worked the best: *Questioning the child to see if they remembered it, getting the child to think about it and reminding them it’s going to work.* EP1 reported that the narrative drifted a little: *I was trying to make one link too many between knowledge and thinking skills.* EP2 reported that the general gross motor stuff did not provide much information.

**RQ2 - How do EPs evaluate the usefulness of dynamic assessment for assessing and identifying the needs of children in the Early Years Foundation Stage?**

In terms of the purpose of dynamic assessment, EP1 reported that it has more of a link to the early years’ curriculum: *It fits in with the Early Years Foundation Stage and is about learning to learn skills.* The purpose is to provide a framework to talk about the child’s learning and also provide a holistic picture. According to EP2 dynamic assessment is good at asking what it takes for a child to do something better with mediation: *the main purpose of dynamic assessment is that it provides a deeper understanding of what works for the child when staff are saying that nothing works, it provides rich information about how the child operates.* EP1 found it to be a useful exercise because: *if given a framework and structure, the child can complete the task.* EP2 reported that this enabled her to look at the actual EP’s interaction, naming it and making it explicit: *It’s been useful to evaluate in terms of EP skills and not the child skills. I can carry it forward now.* Both EPs report that dynamic assessment has informed them regarding the child’s needs. EP1 reported: *It provided an understanding about why staff think the child is out of place and next steps for the child.* EP2 reported that the experimental nature of dynamic assessment provided her with
clarity on her hypotheses: *ruled out attention because once you focused the child’s eyes, the child was great.*

Dynamic assessment provided useful information for EP1 regarding the need for structure for the child: *clarity regarding the task, be clear about first and next and concept of order.* EP1 reported that dynamic assessment provided insight into affective elements and the cognition (thinking skills): *I have an idea about how the child’s behaviour is affecting their concentration. This has implications for moving to year 1.* EP2 also obtained useful information about the approach to managing the child: *I obtained useful information about how staff need to speak to and encourage the child. For EP2 dynamic assessment answered the question about what the child finds difficult: I can describe what the child is not doing, how to rectify it and what isn’t wrong with the child’s development. It has provided information about the child’s physical movement, child’s limitations, specific direction, frustration management and normalising mistakes.* Both EPs reported that they received positive responses from the children they worked with. EP1 reported that: *there was flexibility in the child’s thought, once I started in a particular way of sorting and showed the child, it was carried through.* For EP2: *the child was engaged and motivated and was able to learn from instruction.*

According to EP1 there is no formal way of evaluating the usefulness of dynamic assessment: *it is about how meaningful it is to school staff in terms of what the EP ends up suggesting, feeding back to the setting about the things that work.* EP2 reported that EPs don’t formally evaluate usefulness of any approach: *we don’t evaluate the usefulness of cognitive assessment. It’s done subjectively in terms of your own planning and what key people have said about how useful the information is to them.* EP1 highlighted that all went well, however having alternative materials could have improved the delivery of dynamic assessment: *having more choice and starting with materials the child has chosen.* EP2 wouldn’t do a lot differently because it was a good session: *It depends on the nature of the child who was eager. I could have labelled [judged] that the child looked tired, allowed a break*
and tightened the session. Both EPs reported that a standardised assessment would not have provided this kind of information. EP1: if given [standardised, static assessment test] blocks to make a pattern, the child may have attempted or not but I couldn’t have intervened. EP2 reported that dynamic assessment is looking at completely different things. For example the things around the child’s approach and what works: it’s the nature of what makes it better and how the child learns from it. That’s the big difference. Able to get the child to reflect upon it all.

**RQ3 - what implications does DA have for intervention for children in the Early Years Foundation Stage?**

In terms of the implications dynamic assessment has for intervention, EP1 reported that dynamic assessment makes closer links between assessment and intervention, it’s interactive and the challenge is to translate the information into something usable for staff: It also provides insight into next steps for learning. For EP2, it helped answer the big questions as well as the little questions. EP2 reported that the assessment will inform intervention at different levels by knowing more about the level of support for school and feed into the EHCP process: It will help staff massively and be incredibly reassuring for parents. It will inform the setting and create a shared understanding amongst the professionals. EP2 identified twofold benefits, firstly what helps the child to understand the task and secondly information about environmental factors under which the child learns the best, leading to intervention planning and strategies: how we can support the child, about suitability of provision, EHC planning.

The mediation itself can become a barrier when a cognitive function becomes stuck: it’s difficult in the early years as there is no structure and textbook. EP1 highlighted that successful dynamic assessment rests upon a combination of what the assessor and child bring to the situation: if the child is extremely anxious and the materials are not engaging, what you find out is only as good as the work that you do with the materials you choose. Other barriers include staff understanding and expectation of what you are doing
as the EP and your own professional stance: there is danger of becoming a blinkered professional. EP2 commented that the complexity of the child can be a barrier and if one can’t find anything that is of interest to the child. The setting factors can also be a barrier because they influence how you understand the child: It’s about cutting through staff frustration and dealing with their expectations and feelings of competency. According to EP1, colleagues don’t deliver dynamic assessment because of time pressures, mediation being difficult to do, not having scores at the end, insufficient training and supervision and a current professional focus on social, emotional and mental health needs, to which dynamic assessment has tended not to contribute. EP2 reported a lack of planning time, thinking time and time to reflect as potential barriers.

Both EPs highlighted links between dynamic assessment and their backgrounds. EP1 informed that working for an educational psychology service that didn’t require standardised scores: feeling that IQ testing is not helpful and the relationship between teaching and learning. EP2 informed that she found the adaptability of dynamic assessment appropriate to an effective assessment. EP1 felt comfortable and confident in delivering dynamic assessment due to experience: I don’t require further training rather coaching and supervision. EP2 believed she wasn’t confident in delivering dynamic assessment yet but was becoming more comfortable and wanted more practice: It takes a lot of thinking and doing, this experience [research participation] has helped. Both EPs reported that the session wasn’t hard to deliver: It wasn’t hard to deliver, just took a lot of thinking and I had to be clear about what I wanted to find out. EP1 reported that what takes place instead of a manual is: the principles and characteristics of mediation and a checklist. EP2 made reference to the knowledge of the child in her head, experience of managing feelings of competency: what you want out of the session has been planned in your head and testing out expectations.

**Discussion**
The present study highlights examples of two different cases in which dynamic assessment has been successfully used by EPs in the Early Years Foundation Stage, evaluating the usefulness of dynamic assessment, highlighting implications for intervention, and capturing EPs’ reflections of using dynamic assessment as an assessment tool. In terms of the type and level of mediation there was evidence of a high and varied level of mediation used by both EPs. Modelling and verbal prompting was used to focus the children during delivery of dynamic assessment. Hand over hand mediation was described to be the highest level of mediation by both EPs and was used by EP2. Positive responses were obtained from the children and useful information regarding the clarity and specificity of the task. Mediation was key to successful task completion for both children, which was heavily dependent upon the experiences of using dynamic assessment by the EPs. After specific mediation in both cases, the children were able to learn and successfully complete the presented task.

The findings of this study support the contentions that firstly, dynamic assessment can identify learning difficulties and secondly, it can inform intervention (Shepard, 1994). Deakin (2007) highlighted the pedagogical purposes such as the “learning power” that dynamic assessment serves. This information connected directly to the classroom instructional setting, as well as providing in-depth insight into the nature of the child's affective, cognitive and physical functioning, as the activities were typical of those found in early childhood programs. It provided insight to successful teaching strategies. Modelling was a strategy that EP1 recommended to staff. More specifically, showing the child what finished looks like was beneficial. Along with other strategies such as providing the child with a clear structure and clarity on the task. The importance of non-intellective factors in dynamic assessment as determinants of the child’s performance; a significant feature of EP1’s interaction, have been highlighted by Tzuriel (1991).

Dynamic assessment provided clarity on original hypotheses regarding the children and next steps in their learning. Both EPs reported that the
information obtained would not have been possible by carrying out a standardised assessment, with instructions given and how the child learns being the main difference. For EP1, dynamic assessment supported the hypothesis that non-intellective factors such as lack of concentration can have an effect on the child’s cognitive functions. EP2 ruled out that the child’s attention/concentration span does not affect her ability to complete tasks, rather, telling her where to look and repeating information was beneficial and guided task completion. Major themes emerging from the present study include understanding about the child’s development, insight into the effective elements and thinking skills. It was highlighted that dynamic assessment was a useful method in informing intervention. EPs made reference to teaching and managing the child. For example, staff being clear about the task, providing structure and mediating meaning. The importance of the child being able to evaluate their own progress in learning was highlighted. Both EPs identified different targets; supporting the child to complete the task in a systematic fashion and targets around general management strategies, focusing on managing frustration.

A significant finding of this study is that both EPs consider dynamic assessment to require a team approach and a supportive role from colleagues in terms of supervision. Deutsch and Reynolds (2000) highlighted awareness of dynamic assessment, positive attitudes but with low levels of implementation, attributed to insufficient training in dynamic assessment and to lack of time due to other assessment priorities. Both EPs commented that dynamic assessment required thinking and clarity about what the psychologist wanted to find out. They believed that colleagues do not deliver dynamic assessment due to time pressures, insufficient training, not having scores and mediation being difficult to do. Both EPs reported that principles and characteristics related to mediation, knowledge about the child, managing feelings of competency, testing out expectations and mediation strategies were present in their head rather than a handbook.

**Implications**
The present study has provided promising evidence regarding the utility of EPs’ play-based dynamic assessment approach with children in the Early Years Foundation Stage to elicit positive information about their skills, knowledge, learning potential and possible intervention strategies. Implications are discussed at a national (professional) level and at a service (team) level.

At a national (professional) level the study supports the relevance of using a dynamic assessment approach in the early years for EPs and highlights potential for development of service policy. Assessment of young children seeks to provide information on the processes of learning, the child’s cognition, social and emotional development and the impact of the context on these areas. The Framework for Psychological Assessment and Intervention for EPs drafted by the Division of Educational and Child Psychology (2002) emphasises the direct link between assessment and intervention which forms part of the graduated approach and a cycle of assess plan do review (DFE/DoH, 2014) an integral component of the role of an EP and SEN support in the early years. This area of work can be linked to teacher requirements to assess through evaluating the outcomes of teaching. Training could be provided by EPs to support staff in the use of dynamic assessment as it is well suited to the context of play in the child’s natural environment. As identified by EPs in this study, this data can inform planning next steps, setting targets and improving delivery of teaching for children by providing knowledge around learning potential; especially since results from the present study support that dynamic assessment offers a more adequate assessment of young children with a wide range of special educational needs than standardised tests do (Tzuriel, 1997).

Findings from the present study indicate a possible contribution to national standards in the delivery of dynamic assessment, through access to appropriate training and case based examples. A national standard of training and accreditation similar to the BPS’ nationally recognised Education Test User (ETU) certificate could incorporate dynamic assessment courses and even post training supervision, so a level of
competence for practitioners can be achieved. Lauchlan and Daly (2017) are delivering a training workshop to develop EPs’ skills in using video interactive guidance (VIG) and also video enhanced reflective practice (VERP) as a means of feeding back results of dynamic assessment in such a way as to promote the effectiveness of a subsequent intervention plan.

At a service level (team), the study also supports a strategic approach to overcoming barriers to the use of dynamic assessment. EP training needs to identify the distinctive contribution and challenges of dynamic assessment for EPs in practice. Service assessment policy could include guidelines for EPs who wish to use dynamic assessment in the early years within the overall assess, plan, do review cycle (graduated response). This could potentially harness a team approach to drive the use of dynamic assessment in a supportive capacity with the opportunity for peer supervision. For example, in the present study the process of the content analysis resembled VERP, allowing EP2 to reflect upon her delivery of dynamic assessment. She highlighted that this was a powerful exercise which helped her further develop the use of dynamic assessment in her practice. It can be a valuable support mechanism encouraging the use of dynamic assessment by offering supervision and coaching. Findings should be of interest to EPs who believe that environmental factors contribute to educational difficulties and their importance within assessment procedures (Freeman & Miller, 2010). These results have important implications for the validity of static measures of intelligence especially timed tests, which encourage children to work rapidly and produce answers as fast as possible. Some children can be impulsive and therefore manifest a low level of cognitive performance in assessments that require short reaction times. These children might have a relatively high learning potential which they can demonstrate if more time was available to them (Tzuriel, 1997).

Limitations

The study provides initial findings significant to the development of dynamic assessment in the field of educational psychology. This small scale
study was conducted with two different EPs in two diverse service contexts who had undertaken different EP training programmes, therefore this may provide only a partial picture of dynamic assessment practice across the wider population of EPs; however, the features of good practice identified here may as they stand be relevant to a wider population of EPs.

A further limitation relates to the reliability of the interpretations derived here from dynamic assessment as decisions on how to mediate and interpret the meaning of performance depend on the subjective judgement of the dynamic assessment practitioner (Tzuriel, 1997). Future research could look at using the Children's Analogical Thinking Modifiability Test (CATM), the Children's Inferential Thinking Modifiability Test (CITM), the Cognitive Modifiability Battery (CMB) and developmental checklists in a play-based summative way.

**Future directions in research and practice**

This study has responded to Deutsch and Reynolds (2000), concerns about the lack of empirical research, but noting the limitations above, there is still further need to continue a programme of research. Dynamic assessment requires more commitment, time and effort to explore its uniqueness (Tzuriel, 1997) in order to provide a more continuous, extensive and generalizable evidence base for professional practice. A suitable avenue would be to encourage trainee EPs on D.Ed.Ch.Psychol programmes to continue to capture dynamic assessment practice among EPs in a wider range of regional services via commissioning of research projects. Additionally, it could pursue the goal of Guthke et al. (1997) and look at identifying “types of learners” dynamic assessment could be used for children who have a range of special educational needs and are omitted from the norming of standardised tests (Lidz, Jepsen & Miller, 1997). Future research could look at developing dynamic assessment across the different age ranges and perhaps the more frequent use of dynamic...
assessment could be achieved through delivery by special support assistants in nursery and school settings.

It remains to be answered, why twenty years on, dynamic assessment still does not feature as a major component of the EPs repertoire of approaches (Waters & Stringer, 1997). It is an approach that has great natural appeal for many EPs yet which has, to date, failed to take root in mainstream practice (Elliott, 2003). The outcomes of this study further highlight that dynamic assessment deserves to be extended and developed in the UK than it is at present (Deutsch & Reynolds, 2010).
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Paper Three

‘The Dissemination of Evidence to Professional Practice’
Promoting the use of dynamic assessment as a useful assessment method among educational psychologists’ working in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

Introduction

This paper aims to reflect upon the dissemination process by evaluating ways to effectively disseminate the research findings of Papers one and two in this thesis to the appropriate fields of social and professional activity, over and above publications aimed at academic dissemination. For the purpose of this assignment, the author will consider the concepts of evidence-based practice (knowledge transfer) and practice-based research, followed by a review of the current literature in relation to the effective dissemination of research and notions of research impact. The paper will then move on to the significance of the findings of Papers one and two on the site in which the research was completed; further to this, a summary of the policy, practice and research development implications from the author’s research at organisation level and professional level will be considered. A strategy to promote and evaluate the dissemination and impact of the research reported in Paper one and Paper two above will also be discussed.

Section A: an overview of concepts of evidence based practice (knowledge transfer) and practice based research.

What is evidence based practice?

The idea of EBP has its origins in the field of medicine, initially developed to teach medical students, however it has gained remarkable momentum over the years (Reynolds, 2008) with developments in psychology, medicine (psychiatry), education, and prevention science (Hoagwood & Johnson, 2001; Kratochwill & Stoiber, 2000). Hoagwood and Johnson (2003) defined the term as follows:
“Evidence-based practice refers to a body of scientific knowledge, defined usually by reference to research methods or designs, about a range of service practices. The knowledge base is usually generated through application of particular inclusions criteria and it generally describes the impact of particular service practices on child, adolescent, or family outcomes. Evidence-based practice is a shorthand term denoting the quality, robustness, or validity of scientific evidence as it is brought to bear on these issues” (P.5).

In Psychology, EBP is defined as ‘the integration of the best available research with clinical expertise in the context of patient characteristics, culture and preferences’ (APA, 2006, p.273). For many professions, research is of paramount importance as it supports evidence based practice (EBP). According to Biesta (2007), EBP represents a broad spectrum of ideas about how the link between research/evidence and practice should be understood and established. Bowler and Gilbody (2010) link the concept of evidence to the basis of belief. The expectation that research can highlight what works, provide sound evidence about the likely effects of policy, practice and evidence of effectiveness. They describe quite practically that EBP is based on the viewpoint that several forms of evidence exist, from the most rigorous scientific research to the less rigorous scientific research. Bowler and Gilbody (2010) claim that RCTs provide the finest test of causal and comparative tests but they require repetition by other researchers to highlight that results are not just due to chance. Briner and Denyer (2012) stress the importance of a systematic literature review which brings together primary research information that has been published with the aim of providing an overview that is comprehensive and accurate; making explicit all sources of bias.

Practice-based evidence allows for the safe trialing of ground-breaking techniques to build an inclusive research evidence base (Barkham, Hardy & Mellor-Clark, 2010). According to Swicher (2010) practice based evidence is the key to applying the best research to inform practice. It is high-quality scientific evidence that is developed, refined, and implemented in a variety
of real-world settings (Hellerstein, 2008). Creswell (2008) referred to research as a process of steps used to collect and analyse information to increase understanding of a topic. It consists of a few steps: set a question, gather data to answer the question and practical application of such new theories.

The argument put forward by Kitson, Harvey and McCormack (1998) is that successful transfer of research into practice is a function of the interplay of three core elements. The nature of the evidence, the environment/context into which the research is to be engaged and the method in which the process is facilitated. Kitson et al. (1998) also advise that due to current research being inconclusive it is unknown which of the above three elements is of most importance in successful implementation. This concept of EBP has been further outlined by Fox (2003) and how it rests on the concept of good quality research, emphasizing the rigor of randomized controlled trials.

The area of EBP has developed for applied psychologists over the years (Guilford, 2015). Threats to internal validity within a study can be discounted by researchers therefore EBP seeks to employ meta-analytic approaches such as semantic reviews of evidence that are aggregated (Steckler & McLeroy, 2008). A systematic literature review of studies allows key features to be identified with an overview of understanding and awareness of methods used, understanding and awareness of the implications of statistical analysis (Khan, Kunz, Kleijnen & Gerd, 2003). To enhance the validity of the EBP process, Schraw and Pattall (2013) suggested a policy driven approach involving scrutiny of evidence by expert groups and application of criteria.

**Evidence Based Practice and educational psychology**

Dunsmuir, Brown, Iyadurai and Monsen (2009) highlighted that with the growing emphasis on accountability and EBP, evaluation has become increasingly significant in the settings in which educational psychologists (EPs) practice. EBP is standard professional requirement of Health and Care
The essential principle being that there must be a clear link between professional practice and its research base (Fox, 2003). In terms of research, single case methods may be relevant for EPs (McMillan & Morley, 2010). Stake (2008), notes that as a form of research the case study “is defined by interest in an individual case, not by the methods of inquiry used”, and that “the object of study is a specific, unique, bounded system” (P. 443). Case studies are planned to provide a level of detail and understanding that allows for the methodical analysis of the complex nature of diverse occurrences (Willis, 2014). Therefore it can be linked to the subject of ontology, epistemology, and methodology that are central to the principles of single case study research (Willis, 2014).

In an amalgamation of science and practice, the APA (2005) Presidential Task Force defines psychology’s essential commitment to sophisticated EBP by encouraging effective psychological practice by applying empirically sound principles of psychological assessment, case formulation and intervention (Anderson, 2006).

Fox (2011) examines EPs’ commitment with EBP, highlighting the complications of obtaining adequate evidence about the effectiveness of interventions. There is the likelihood that EPs continue to use psychological theories that have limited or no evidence to support their use. Relying on experiences becomes predominantly difficult if EPs become attached emotionally and cognitively to specific viewpoints and unsupported theories into their professional practice (Fox, 2011). Frederickson (2002) provided attention to three areas. Firstly, the competencies needed for using research in EBP. Secondly the contributions EPs can make to develop the research evidence on intervention efficacy and thirdly the effectiveness and emphasis on monitoring and evaluating outcomes for individual students as required by the Code of practice on special educational needs (DFE/DoH, 2014). Extended initial training and professional doctorates in educational psychology might be applied in developing the research basis for practice. Dunsmuir et al. (2009) consequently developed a Target Monitoring and
Evaluation (TME) system to evaluate outcomes of a wide range of interventions that were recognized as a result of an EP and an assistant EPs involvement in two local authorities. Pupils made progress on between 94% and 97% of targets with outcomes being considerably better than the baseline for both groups.

**Promoting EBP in educational psychology**

In order to overcome dispositional biases, training programmes such as the Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology must guarantee skills in data scrutiny such as the review of large data sets (Guilford, 2015). This signifies the role of the psychologist as a scientist practitioner in raising awareness and negotiating outcomes (British Psychological Society, (BPS)); 2005). Lane and Corrie (2006) highlight scientist practitioner functions of a psychologist: effective reasoning, judgement and problem solving, effective intervention planning, monitoring and self-evaluation. Findings from the present study can provide EPs with case examples of how dynamic assessment can be delivered in the Early Years Foundation Stage and potentially inform service policy.

**Section B: a review of current literature in relation to the effective dissemination of research and notions of research impact.**

It is argued that researchers have a duty to share new knowledge with a wider audience including the general public (Crosswaite & Curtice, 1994). The dissemination of research relates to ways in which research knowledge becomes practice knowledge, transforming it from one form to another (Huberman, 1993). Huberman (1993) highlighted the concept of sustained interactivity, which refers to the exchange between the researcher and potential audience of the study. This would include recognising the points of convergence between the scope of the study and the priorities of the audience and engaging the target audience to contribute in the study and transfer it to the user organisation. This concept can be applied to gap in literature identified in Paper one; hence recruiting the research audience in data collection for the empirical research with the purpose of disseminating
the research to that very same audience. The ultimate aim of the present study is to disseminate the research and findings to EPs. However according to Kratochwill and Stoiber (2000), one of the challenges is the transfer of evidence to practice, which is not a straightforward process.

**Methods of dissemination of research**

Dissemination is imperative to maintaining a national commitment to the support of research (Sherrod, 1999). In the context for EPs, it is essential to develop policies that effectively promote the positive development of children (Sherrod, 1999). In academia, journal publications and professional presentations are examples and major ways that research is disseminated (Vaughn, Jacoby, Williams, Guerra, Thomas & Richmond, 2013). Publication in a peer-reviewed journal indicates acceptance of the work within the community, a noticeable contribution to the field and an incentive for years of hard work (WHO, 2014). The latest innovation is what has become known as ‘social media’; Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, ResearchGate, YouTube, Skype and Flickr (Verhagen, Bower & Khan, 2013). The media is a vital audience for research findings because it is both disseminator and target for research evidence (WHO, 2014). The media can be used to reach stakeholders quickly, promote findings, pressure governments for change, and highlight inequities that may not be working (WHO, 2014). Thomas, Griffiths, Kai and O'dwyer (2001) support the use of research networks as they believe that they can produce multidisciplinary coalitions of researchers, provide extensive ownership of research activity, and motivate followers to disseminate research findings quickly. Jones and Walsh (2008) have highlighted that policy briefs can also be a powerful device for communicating research findings to development policy audiences. Hemsley-Brown and Sharp (2003) conveyed strategies for improving research impact. They shared that the development of communication networks, links between researchers and practitioners and greater involvement of practitioners in the research process were key. Hemsley-Brown and Sharp, (2003) further suggested that there is a need to create a culture in the public sector which supports and values research.
Examples of successful dissemination of research

Kratochwill and Shernoff (2004) highlighted the need for evidence-based practice guidelines to support implementation. It is assumed that the application of evidence-based interventions (EBIs) in practice requires the development and use of EBP guidelines (Drotar & Lemanek, 2001; Soldz & McCullough, 2000). For example, it is suggested that practitioners use manuals and other procedural guidelines to facilitate the implementation of interventions in settings (Kratochwill & Shernoff, 2003). Such practice guidelines can help to operationalize evidence-based practice in the field of educational psychology. The authors also stress the need for improved practice guidelines to confirm efficacy (Kratochwill & Shernoff, 2004).

It may be sensible for the EP profession to adopt effective dissemination strategies from neighboring professions (Miller & Shin, 2005). Carpenter, Nieva, Albaghal and Sorra (2005) highlight that employing only traditional methods of dissemination is unsuccessful. The authors designed a Dissemination Planning Tool to help researchers create a dissemination plan that reaches beyond the traditional ways of getting the message out (peer-reviewed publications and conference presentations). This planning tool encourages researchers to think through the dissemination process and assemble the sections needed to construct a formal dissemination plan specific to their specific research and interests of their target audience (Carpenter et al., 2005).

Challenges and barriers to effective dissemination of research

Song, Parekh, Hooper, Loke, Ryder, Sutton and Harvey (2010) emphasised that dissemination of research findings is likely to be a biased process. They highlighted that studies with significant or positive results were more likely to be published than those with non-significant results. Exclusion of non-English language studies seemed to result in a high risk of bias in some areas of research. Song et al. (2010) further reported that in systematic reviews, measures can be taken to reduce the impact of dissemination bias by systematically searching for relevant studies that are hard to access.
Further research is needed to develop methods for qualitatively assessing the risk of publication bias in systematic reviews and to evaluate the effect of potential registration of studies, open access policy and enhanced publication guidelines (Song et al., 2010).

According to Wilson, Petticrew, Calnan and Nazareth (2010) effective communication is an important aspect of dissemination, however there are many barriers to effective communication between researchers and users (Crosswaite & Curtice, 1994). Limitations to effective dissemination include barriers such as lack of interest from target audience, time constraints, lack of resources and awareness of dissemination (Saywell & Cotton, 1999). Biesta (2007) refers to the epistemological assumptions and beliefs the researcher holds and brings to the understanding of what research can actually achieve. Other barriers emphasized by Crosswaite and Curtice (1994) include career structures, ownership issues, prolonged process of publishing in academic journals, technical barriers and complications related to mistrust.

Addis (2002) referred to obstacles to successful dissemination such as the lack of research on training in the incorporation of practice at the undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate levels and the tendency to construct dissemination as a hierarchical progression of transmission from research to practice. Durlak and DuPre (2008) indicate that there are at least twenty-three contextual factors that can influence implementation. The implementation process is affected by variables related to communities, providers and the prevention support system (training and technical assistance). Kratochwill and Shernoff (2004) highlighted complications surrounding the acceptance and implementation of EBIs in practice settings is seen as the responsibility of practitioners. However such problems need to be a shared responsibility of researchers, trainers and practitioners alike. In educational settings, psychologists face administrative and practical barriers that are not always present in research settings. Consequently, even when psychologists are aware of the empirical evidence supporting a procedure, they may not permeate this evidence into practice because doing so would require more resources and work than time permits (Kratochwill &
Shernoff, 2004). Some psychologists may be more influenced by clinical judgment than by research supporting EBIs when designing, implementing, and evaluating their own interventions (Wilson, 1996). According to Shernoff, Kratochwill & Stoiber (2003) many psychologists do not have the training to implement EBIs in their school practice.

Reynolds (2008) acknowledged that supporters of EBP advocate that the approach results in the best practice and that critics hold an alternative view, which is that there is no evidence to suggest that EBP actually works. Biesta (2007) argues that although EBP may initially seem to provide an attractive framework for bringing research and professional practice closer together, it is debatable as to whether it offers a neutral framework that can be applied to any field of professional activity. Newman, Papadopoulos and Sigsworth (1998) stress that organizations will have to implement multiple strategies to facilitate and encourage the use of evidence in practice decision making as cultures within organizations can be important barriers to EBP.

Section C: a summary of the policy/practice/research development implications from the research at: the research site, organisational level, professional level.

As this writing forms part of submission for a professional doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology, it seemed relevant to conclude with a consideration of how dissemination fits with the role of the EP. The term dissemination can be best described as the transfer of a process or product (Harmsworth, Turpin, Rees & Pell, 2000). The following section will begin with a short description of the current context for dynamic assessment in the Early Years Foundation Stage as a background to the rationale for the research, prior to exploring the implications of the research study at the research site (refers to EPs and the early years settings in which the research took place), organisational and professional level.

Dynamic assessment represents an opportunity for EPs to utilise a play based approach for assessing the functional behaviour of children who cannot perform in formal testing situations (Tzuriel, 2000; Hill, 2015), yet previous research has indicated that dynamic assessment does not feature as a
predominant choice of assessment for EPs. Paper one aimed to evaluate available empirical research on the use of dynamic assessment approaches within the early years to provide a clearer view of the evidence for their use and to support EPs. Paper two aimed to provide a closer insight into the use of dynamic assessment by EPs in the Early Years’ Foundation Stage. The following section examines the implications of the research at the research site level, service/organisational level and a wider national/professional level.

Harmsworth et al. (2000) talk about the dissemination of research and think about the dissemination process in three ways: dissemination for awareness, dissemination for understanding and dissemination for action. This has been adopted by the author as the dissemination strategy for the findings of this research. It is intended that the findings of the research will create awareness amongst EPs, although the target audience do not require a detailed knowledge of dynamic assessment, it is helpful for them to be aware of the research activities and outcomes. Creating such an awareness of the research will help the “word of mouth” type dissemination and help build an identity and profile within the EP community. EPs are targeted specifically because it is believed that they can benefit from the research and gain a deeper understanding of the research. “Action” refers to a change of practice resulting from the adoption of products, materials or approaches offered by the research. EPs will be those that are in a position to influence and bring about change within their services. They are the groups that will need to be equipped with the correct knowledge, skills and understanding of the research in order to achieve genuine change.

Findings of the research

The research has provided promising evidence regarding the utility of EPs play-based dynamic assessment approach with children in the Early Years Foundation Stage to elicit positive information about their skills, knowledge, learning potential and possible intervention strategies. Implications are discussed at a national (professional) level and at a service (team) level.
Figure 2: The following diagram highlights the intended dissemination at the impact of the research site, service/organisational and national/professional level.

**Research site**

- Dynamic assessment is beneficial for parents of children in the Early Years Foundation Stage. In these cases, it provided reassurance for parents. Parents received feedback regarding the assessment findings during feedback meetings by the EPs. The video observations were also provided to parents on DVD.

- Development of positive EP practice through reflection thus increasing confidence in delivery. The evidence that there was any impact on the EPs who participated in the study resulted primarily from them expressing the view that the interview process had challenged them to reflect on several issues. One EP commented that reflecting upon her practice had been a powerful experience.

**Service organisational level – team**

According to Harmsworth et al. (2000) it is important to explain to the audience how this piece of work relates to previous work carried out in this
field. Academics will rightly expect to see evidence that builds on existing knowledge and expertise. This concept has influenced the following ideas:

- Service assessment policy highlighting guidelines for EPs who wish to use dynamic assessment in the early years within the overall assess, plan, do review cycle (graduated response).
- It was revealed in the interview with EP2 that a whole team approach is required. The need to plan a programme of whole team development in the area of dynamic assessment, in order to develop a consistent approach. It can be a valuable support mechanism encouraging the use of dynamic assessment by offering supervision and coaching.
- The possibility of developing a specialist role for dynamic assessment in the Early Years Foundation Stage within each EP service.
- Continuing Professional Development (CPD) refers to the process of tracking and documenting the skills, a professional requirement by the BPS (2017) and HCPC (2017). CPD opportunities using video interactive guidance (VIG) and video enhanced reflective practice (VERP) with Dr Daly and Dr Lachlan (2017) by combining dynamic assessment with VERP, a two day workshop in London. This will be a good opportunity to learn about VIG and VERP and how it can be used. Furthermore, this will be a good chance to share and learn from experiences of other EPs. It is an opportunity to talk to fellow professionals on an individual level about current research.
- The development of resources such as dynamic assessment kits and guidelines in individual services.

**National professional level**

- The systematic literature review is for submission for publication to the Journal of Educational and Child Psychology for review. This particular journal was chosen because its readership contains a large number of practitioner EPs. It also put out an open call for emerging issues which would seem to fit with the focus of the research.
• The empirical study is for submission to the journal of Educational Psychology in Practice. This journal was chosen as a discussion paper by Hill (2015), highlighted the need for EPs to use dynamic assessment in their practice. The journal is practitioner focused and aimed at EPs.

• The utility of a dynamic assessment approach in the early years for EPs and the potential for development of a service policy. Research findings should encourage a link between assessment and intervention and a cycle of assess plan do review (DFE/DoH, 2014), which is an integral component of the role of an EP in the early years.

• Training support staff in the use of dynamic assessment within the natural context for children. As this is well suited to the context of play, it can inform planning next steps, setting targets and improving delivery of teaching for children.

• A national standard of training and accreditation similar to the BPS’ nationally recognised Education Test User (ETU) certificate, so a level of competence for practitioners can be achieved. It is envisaged that the EPs who contributed to the research would use the video observations to train TEPs and colleagues as they teach on the Initial Training of EPs programme.

• The development of specialist interest groups both inter-professional (collaborating with other agencies within a local authority) and intra-professional (dynamic assessment or early years interest group (like the early years interest group) linking EPs across local and/or national EP services).

• Professional online forum for EPs such as EPNET will widen EP participation in on-going discussions regarding the use of dynamic assessment. EPNET is a forum for the exchange of ideas and information among University research/teaching staff working in the field of Educational Psychology and EPs throughout the UK and elsewhere.
• Furthermore, edpsy.org.uk is also the online space for EPs to create, share, engage, debate and work together in order to develop and improve the lives of children and young people. It is primarily built on the contributions of EPs from across the country at all levels of the profession. It delivers up to date information and signposting for anybody interested in training as an EP. It includes a features section with fully referenced articles about relevant topics related to practice, tools and materials, a blog section driven by personal reflection and commentary from a variety of contributors, and an events calendar that allows anybody running a course for EPs to advertise it for free.

• Educational Psychology Today is a social media page that EPs can ‘like’. It may be worthwhile to put on information regarding the use of dynamic assessment and see if there are any likes.

• The early years forum provides EPs interested in the early years to keep up-to-date with best practice, policy and research relating to how children learn and with the possibility of informing local policy and practice. Audiences are interested in understanding how particular pieces of work fit into a particular context and the extent to which adopting new approaches might have other implications, for example, on future policy, on infrastructure, on staffing, funding, quality assurance (Harmsworth et al., 2000). EPs may also be involved in, and advise, local authority groups considering additional support for learning policy or provision. The dates of the upcoming event have been circulated to all principal EPs. The author is due to present the research findings on the 19th of September 2017.

Section D: a strategy for promoting and evaluating the dissemination and impact of research.
According to Seglan (1997) evaluating scientific quality is an extremely difficult problem, which has no standard solution. This is no doubt a challenge for the findings (Kerner, Rimer & Emmons, 2005) of Papers one and two. There is a need for new approaches to supplement the existing approaches of research in order to bridge gaps (Wandersman, Duffy, Flaspohler, Noonan, Lubell, Stillman & Saul, 2008). Theories and frameworks enhance dissemination and implementation research by making the spread of EBIs more likely (Tabak, Khoong, Chambers & Brownson, 2012). Wilson, Petticrew, Calnan and Nazareth (2010) highlight that there are currently a number of theoretically-informed frameworks available to researchers which can be used to guide their dissemination.

Findings from Paper one indicate that within the field of EPs and the use of dynamic assessment, there is a lack of guidance and utility of using dynamic assessment and the evidence is now quite dated. Influential practitioners such as Lidz (2000), Tzuriel (2000) and Yeomans (2007) have advocated the use of dynamic assessment. Dynamic assessment represents an opportunity for EPs to utilise a play based approach for assessing the functional behaviour of children who cannot perform in formal testing situations (Hill, 2015). However the utility is low among EPs for a variety of reasons (Deutsch & Reynolds, 2000). Consequently Paper two explored EPs use of using dynamic assessment in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

A strategy to promote and evaluate the dissemination and impact of the research could follow that of Harmsworth and Turpin, (2000) through three different stages.

**Table 3:** A possible strategy to promote and evaluate the dissemination and impact of the research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three stages of dissemination using Harmsworth and Turpin’s (2000) research strategy</th>
<th>How the present research could be disseminated</th>
<th>Measuring impact of research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1 - Dissemination for Awareness.</strong> Helpful for EPs to be aware of research activities and outcomes. Creating such an awareness of the research will help the “word of mouth” type dissemination and help build an identity and profile within the EP community.</td>
<td>Publication in an academic journal – <em>Educational Psychology in Practice.</em></td>
<td>Downloads of paper and citation of paper in future papers by other authors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2 - Dissemination for Understanding.</strong> There will be a number of groups such as the EPs that attend the early years’ forum and are interested in dynamic assessment. It will be important, therefore, that this group have a deeper understanding of the research.</td>
<td>Research presentation at the early years’ forum in September 2017. Use case example from the research as a training video for students on the Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology training programme.</td>
<td>Increased awareness of dynamic assessment within EP services. Change in EPs’ attitude towards use of dynamic assessment within services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3 - Dissemination for Action.</strong> Refers to a change of practice resulting from the adoption of products, materials or approaches offered by the research at a</td>
<td>Research presentation to EPs in local authority.</td>
<td>Increased utilisation of dynamic assessment by EPs in their services. Professional colleagues to explore the use of dynamic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
service level. EPs who are in a position to “influence” and “bring about change” within their services will benefit from being equipped with the right skills, knowledge and understanding of the research in order to achieve genuine change.

Influence and inform service policy at a local level. Assessment, share and reflect upon experiences within a supportive context. Support within teams; supervision to discuss use of dynamic assessment.

Reviewing impact of research

Published research should be scrutinised by experts in the field and given scores for quality, known as peer review (Hames, 2008). An effective way of monitoring the impact of the dissemination strategy (and findings) is most likely to be achieved through internal benchmarking and if published, through tracking citations via ResearchGate; a social network site for academics to list their publications (Thelwall & Kousha, 2015). Seglan (1997) highlights that alternative methods for evaluating research are being considered, such as journal impact factors, which are quantitative and objective indicators directly related to published science.

Conclusion

The EBP movement has the potential to significantly advance the quality of psychological and educational services provided by psychologists working in schools (Kratochwill, 2007). It is expected that this small scale piece of research may be relevant to those EPs interested in bridging the theory to practice gap in dynamic assessment and help to provide a starting point for debate in their services. Efforts are needed to improve the dissemination and utilisation of research, including high-quality systematic reviews and appraisals (Davies, 1999). Strategies that can reduce the communication gap include: enhancing dialogue between researchers and users, developing networks, employment of research liaison officers and developing effective
dissemination strategies (Crosswaite & Curtice, 1994). Kratochwill and Shernoff (2004) stress the need for a scientist-practitioner training model to strengthen the connection between research and practice for graduate training and professional work. Ambassadors for dynamic assessment are required to act as promoters for this approach, encourage and inspire its use as well as bring it to the forefront (Yeomans, 2007).
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PRISMA framework

Identification

757 records identified through database searching

759-24 duplicates removed

Screening

735 abstracts screened

691 records not met inclusion criteria

Eligibility

44 full text articles screened

38 full text articles not met inclusion criteria

Included

1 mixed methods studies included in synthesis

0 studies included in Qualitative synthesis

5 studies included in quantitative synthesis

Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff and Altman (2009)
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Review framework for quantitative investigation research

Author(s): Wiedl, Mata, Waldorf and Calero

Title: Dynamic testing with native and migrant preschool children in Germany and Spain using the Application of Cognitive Functions Scale.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear research question or hypothesis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 Clear, leading to main hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate process for participant/ item identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 2 step, parent interviews, immigration status, clarified with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate data gathering method used</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 Classic DA used, ACFS used, normed – good effect size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive data gathering method</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 No static comparison, no control group, classic DA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of bias within participant recruitment/ item selection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 Extensive information regarding participants backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate/ item elicitation maximised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 Bias, dropped out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population subgroup data collected (e.g. participant gender; item context)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing data analysis</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time trends identified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Interaction between time and linguistic background – significant effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic considerations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Different areas within Germany and Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate statistical analyses (descriptive or inferential)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No power analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-level or inter-group analyses present</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data interpretation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear criteria for rating of findings</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Not clear of effect size – no cut off point (low, med, high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of the research considered in relation to initial aims</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Clearly identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications of findings linked to rationale of research question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Discussed in length and also future research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 10  
*Max 15*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background of EP</th>
<th>Age and nature of child’s difficulties</th>
<th>EPs purpose and hypotheses</th>
<th>Framework used</th>
<th>Assessment materials used</th>
<th>The level and type of mediation needed</th>
<th>Feedback to stakeholders</th>
<th>Outcomes and nature of intervention agreed with staff members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EP1 very experienced, has been an EP for over 25 years. From Midlands area. Uses DA in practice. Has an interest in 4 years old. The child is out of place in class. The child struggles to focus and attend and follow what is going on in the class compared with her peers.</td>
<td>What does it take for this child to complete a task independently? To identify non intellective factors that have an impact on cognitive functions.</td>
<td>ACFS (Haywood &amp; Lidz, 2006)</td>
<td>Compare bears, threading beads and shapes in order to explore sequence and sorting.</td>
<td>High level of mediation used. Focusing mediation (bringing child back to task), modelling, repetition, imitation. Structure and clarity of task, verbal prompts and visual clues required. With</td>
<td>Feedback was given in a feedback meeting with staff members. Parents were invited to a separate meeting and informed regarding the assessment and link to intervention.</td>
<td>Staff members to provide structure, be clear about first and next steps, be clear about the concept of order – what comes first/next, show what finish looks like, break down the task into small manageable steps, model the task to the child.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the early years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental delay with poor attention and concentration.</th>
<th>If the child is focused to begin with, can she complete the task?</th>
<th>The child is able to maintain focus. The child is able to learn via mediation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| The EP also wrote a report. | Provide staff with a framework, be clear about task instructions – what is part of the task and also what is not. Create a shared understanding amongst staff and inform the transition process. |

| EP2 from North West area. Has been an EP for over 10 years. | 4 years old / 4 years old
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scissors, containers and dried materials such as rice. Dried foods such as rice, different sized</th>
<th>Loads of mediation used. Visual prompts (visual clues), verbal prompts (telling her where to put her eyes and repeating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Feedback was given in a feedback meeting with staff members. | Approach to managing the child – how the child is spoken to and encouraged. Telling her where to put her eyes – providing |

| | | |
| | | |
| Uses DA in practice, part of early years group. | Does she fall when she loses her attention/concentration? | Does she have poor hand/eye co-ordination? | Does movement and eye gaze (vestibular issue) affect her balance? | cups and beakers, tray, paper. | this information) and physical prompts (hand over hand mediation is required). Mediation was high for things the child found difficult. Once you focused her eyes and attention, she was able to complete the task. The child’s skills can be improved via the use of mediation. | A separate meeting was held with parents and also the EP fed back the findings of the dynamic assessment at a multiagency meeting. The EP also wrote a report to inform statutory assessment. | specific direction, reminding her that is what is going to work for her. Staff members to speak slowly to the child, break down task into small manageable steps, repeat instruction frequently, provide direction of where to look whilst carrying out the task, model the task if necessary. |
Specific direction – where to look, where to focus eyes, visual clues, verbal prompts and hand over hand mediation is required.

Create a shared understanding amongst staff and inform the transition process.
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Overall, in the box below you need to provide the University with clear reassurance that you have attended to, and heeded, the advice which the UK authorities have given about your proposed destination. If you can identify other sources of similar advice, please do in this section also.

The following sections may pick up on issues already raised but you should nonetheless complete all sections below.

2. University Advice about the Proposed Destination (this up-to-date advice may also be helpful for staff)

What advice does the Study Abroad Unit give regarding the proposed destination? Summarise the main points below and for each separate point indicate what implications their advice have for you and your study.

__________________________________________________________________________
Travelling to your destination
What potential risks can you identify regarding travel to and from the proposed destination? Use the box below to identify such risks and to indicate what measures you are taking to reduce these risks wherever possible.

For example, if you plan to extend your stay beyond the period of the fieldwork, perhaps for a holiday, have you taken out travel insurance to cover any periods not covered by the University's insurance? Are certain means of transport seen as being particularly risky? What documentation do you need? How will you safeguard these documents? Will anyone else have copies of them? Who will know of your travel arrangements?

4. Health Considerations
What potential risks to your health can you identify (given your particular medical circumstances) when you visit this particular country? Use the box below to identify such risks and to indicate what measures you are taking to reduce these risks wherever possible.

For example, what health advice is given for travellers such as yourself (i.e. outsiders to the context in question) for visits to this context? Have you followed this advice? Are there any aspects of your own medical history and condition which need to be considered with regard to the health risks associated with the proposed destination? If you have health issues, have you completed a medical 'fit to travel' form with Occupational Health? Have you had all the necessary vaccinations? What medication / first aid are you taking with you?

5. Dietary Considerations
What potential risks to your health can you identify (given your particular dietary needs and habits) when you visit this particular country with its particular dietary traditions and (lack of) possibilities? Use the box below to identify such risks and to indicate what measures you are taking to reduce these risks wherever possible.

For example, what risks might be associated with locally-prepared food and how will you minimise these risks? What risks are associated with local drinking water supplies and what can you do to minimise these risks?
6. **Physical Hazards**
What potential risks can you identify given the range of climates and type of terrains you will be spending some time in during your proposed visit? Use the box below to identify such risks and to indicate what measures you are taking to reduce these risks wherever possible.

For example, are there climate risks such as monsoons and flooding, severe wintry conditions, tornados and so on? Is the terrain particularly challenging, e.g. mountainous, heavily-forested, off the beaten track etc?

---

8. **Biological hazards overseas**
What potential risks can you identify given the plant, insect and animal life of the country you are proposing to visit? The University’s Occupational Health Service can provide relevant advice, vaccinations etc, so you are advised to make an appointment with them. Use the box below to identify any risks and to indicate what measures you are taking to reduce these risks wherever possible.

---

9. **Potential stressors when travelling overseas**
Given your own character strengths (and weaknesses), and given the type of context in which you are proposing to spend time for your research study, what kinds of stress might be at play? Use the box below to identify such stressors and to indicate your proposed strategy for addressing them.

For example, how likely is it that you will, in the proposed context, experience significant culture shock, time pressures, loneliness, isolation, language barriers, unfamiliar and uncongenial settings (e.g. very crowded cities and transport), and so on?
Section 2: Off campus fieldwork locations

- Complete all sections below –
- Where you do not foresee any risks relating to a particular item, please state ‘No risks identified’, do not leave the item blank.

1. Belongings
While the number and value of personal belongings carried with you on fieldwork should be minimized to avoid unwanted attention or loss. You should have the following items with you when conducting fieldwork off campus:

1. your staff/student card
2. enough money for expected and unexpected expenses, including the use of taxis.
3. a phone card in case you need to use a public telephone.
4. a personal alarm – carried in a place that it is easily accessible (e.g. pocket and not briefcase).
5. A comprehensive A-Z of the area (and a torch and spare batteries) can also be very useful in an emergency.

What personal belongings will you take with you on fieldwork visits and how will you minimize risks associated with carrying any of these belongings?

- Student ID card
- Money (loose change and debit card)
- Mobile phone and phone top up card
- Relevant postcodes
- Map of the area
- A waterproof rucksack

2. Accommodation
What potential risks can you identify regarding all the places you are likely to stay during your visit? When staying in a hotel you should avoid letting others overhear your name and room number. Never let unknown people into your room unless it is clearly safe to do so. If you hear a disturbance, stay in your room and phone for help. Use the box below to identify these types of risk and indicate what measures you are taking to reduce them wherever possible.

For example, is suitable accommodation easily available to you? Have you organised this in advance? Is such accommodation fully secure? How will you safeguard your possession and valuables?

I will be travelling to the intended destination on the day the research is taking place. This will be organised in advance and relevant EPs will be informed. I will not need to stay before or after the research is done.
Fieldwork visits
Wherever possible, investigators should study a map of the area, or visit the location in advance to plan their journey. Do you know the location of hubs of activity such as shops, pubs, schools or the local police station which may provide you with a possible escape route should this be necessary?

If travelling by car, do you know the safest place to park, eg. a well lit area after dark? Try and park as close as possible to the destination, to allow for a ‘quick get-a-way’ if necessary. If forced to stop, stay in your car and speak through a slightly open window. Plan for what you will do if your car breaks down.

Can you ensure equipment and valuable items are kept out of sight during fieldwork travel?

If using public transport, have you checked its reliability? Do you have a telephone number for a reputable local taxi firm?

Whilst taxis can be hailed in the street, it is advisable to pre-book. Do not under any circumstances get into a private hire vehicle that you have not pre-booked as you will not be insured and this can potentially be very dangerous.

When walking, face oncoming traffic in areas where ‘kerb crawling’ is possible, and keep to busy, well lit roads if you can.

What do you know about the area where you will conduct your fieldwork? What are your travel arrangements? How will you minimise any risks you have identified?

I have been to the fieldwork sites before and I am familiar with the different areas. I will be travelling by car, I know where the nearest car parks are located.

4. Activities
What potential health risks can you identify in relation to all the activities you plan to be involved in whilst making fieldwork visits? Use the box below to identify such risks and to indicate what measures you are taking to reduce these risks wherever possible.

For example, what activities are involved in your research project? Are there any particular risks associated with them over and above what you have already covered in the RREA form? What other incidental activities might you be involved in? What risks can you identify for these activities and what steps are you taking to reduce the potential risks?

No health risks have been identified.
Fieldwork visits
Wherever possible, investigators should study a map of the area, or visit the location in advance to plan their journey. Do you know the location of hubs of activity such as shops, pubs, schools or the local police station which may provide you with a possible escape route should this be necessary?

If travelling by car, do you know the safest place to park, eg, a well-lit area after dark? Try and park as close as possible to the destination, to allow for a ‘quick get-a-way’ if necessary. If forced to stop, stay in your car and speak through a slightly open window. Plan for what you will do if your car breaks down.

Can you ensure equipment and valuable items are kept out of sight during fieldwork travel?

If using public transport, have you checked its reliability? Do you have a telephone number for a reputable local taxi firm?

Whilst taxis can be hailed in the street, it is advisable to pre-book. Do not under any circumstances get into a private hire vehicle that you have not pre-booked as you will not be insured and this can potentially be very dangerous.

When walking, face oncoming traffic in areas where ‘kerb crawling’ is possible, and keep to busy, well lit roads if you can.

What do you know about the area where you will conduct your fieldwork? What are your travel arrangements? How will you minimise any risks you have identified?

I have been to the fieldwork sites before and I am familiar with the different areas. I will be travelling by car, I know where the nearest car parks are located.

4. Activities
What potential health risks can you identify in relation to all the activities you plan to be involved in whilst making fieldwork visits? Use the box below to identify such risks and to indicate what measures you are taking to reduce these risks wherever possible.

For example, what activities are involved in your research project? Are there any particular risks associated with them ever and above what you have already covered in the BREA form? What other incidental activities might you be involved in? What risks can you identify for these activities and what steps are you taking to reduce the potential risks?

No health risks have been identified.
7. Intercultural Challenges
Spending time living in another society, or conducting research with cultural groups different from your own, brings with it the need to be prepared for possible intercultural challenges during your interactions. The Study Abroad Unit has relevant advice in this area, which may be helpful to those conducting research with different cultural groups both outside and within the UK. Use the box below to identify the possible cultural backgrounds you expect to encounter and to indicate what measures you are taking to become familiar with these cultural backgrounds whenever possible.

For example, are there particular religious practices that you need to be aware of and sensitive to? Are there taboos behaviours which you need to be aware of and abide by? How should you dress to appropriately take account of the cultural norms?

Suitable clothing will be worn at all times.

Section 3: Conducting fieldwork alone

NB: Personal Safety
Your personal safety working off-campus is paramount. It is considered more important than the successful completion of interviews.

You SHOULD NOT:
- Enter someone’s home if you feel uncomfortable or unsafe.
- Enter a house if the person you have arranged to see is not there.
- Undertake an interview or assessment in a bedroom.
- Give a personal telephone number or address to an interviewee.

⇒ Complete all sections below –
⇒ Where you do not foresee any risks relating to a particular item, please state ‘No risks identified’, do not leave the item blank.

1. Understanding interviewees
You should take time to investigate and understand the individual circumstances of interviewees before conducting an off-campus interview. If appropriate, you should be aware of the psychological, behavioural history of interviewees. Being aware of potentially volatile individuals and/or circumstances in advance can help you to plan accordingly. Where you have concerns, ‘vet’ the potential interviewee by phone first, and cancel if you are uneasy.

Are there any notable personal circumstances, individual to your interviewees? What measures will you put in place to take account of these factors?

Interviewees will be consulted before the research takes place. If there are any concerns, I will log them and speak to my supervisor before continuing the research.
2. Maintaining Contact
It is essential that, when conducting off-campus interviews, you maintain contact with a nominated member of University staff, family member or friend.

Who will be your nominated contact? What is their relationship to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact's name</th>
<th>Akmal Raza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your relationship to contact</td>
<td>Husband</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Checklist of details needed by your nominated contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your itinerary and appointment times - name, address and telephone contact of interviewee(s) / destination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight accommodation details where applicable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your mobile telephone number.</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time you leave the University / home.</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How you intend to get to the interview location (car registration if appropriate).</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of interviews and expected duration of the visit.</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact information for the Head of Manchester Institute / Head of Manchester Institute Administration for cases of emergency</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: You must contact your nominated person when you arrive at the interview location. In the presence of the interviewee, you should inform them where you are, and who you are with.

Please confirm that you will follow the guidelines above, OR provide information about how your plans will differ and what alternative safeguards you will put in place.

1 If a family member or friend is the nominated contact then the School Research Development Manager must be informed of their identity and contact details – see Declarations below.
2. Maintaining Contact

It is essential that, when conducting off-campus interviews, you maintain contact with a nominated member of University staff/family member or friend.

Who will be your nominated contact? What is their relationship to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact's name</th>
<th>Akmal Raza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your relationship to contact</td>
<td>Husband</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Checklist of details needed by your nominated contact

| Your itinerary and appointment times - name, address and telephone contact of interviewer(s)/destination | ☑
| Overnight accommodation details where applicable | ☑
| Your mobile telephone number | ☑
| Time you leave the University/home | ☑
| How you intend to get to the interview location (car registration if appropriate) | ☑
| Time of interviews and expected duration of the visit | ☑
| Contact information for the Head of Manchester Institute/Head of Manchester Institute Administration for cases of emergency | ☑

NB: You must contact your nominated person when you arrive at the interview location. In the presence of the interviewee, you should inform them where you are, and who you are with.

Please confirm that you will follow the guidelines above, OR provide information about how your plans will differ and what alternative safeguards you will put in place.

The above guidelines will be followed at all times.

1 If a family member or friend is the nominated contact then the School Research Development Manager must be informed of their identity and contact details – see Declarations below.
3. On Arrival

There are a number of ways in which you can further enhance your personal safety when conducting interviews alone and off campus. These include:

- Asking a colleague to accompany you if you feel uncomfortable.
- Let interviewees know you have a schedule. Upon arrival, establish you have the correct person by asking “by what name do you prefer to be called?” Explain your research role and the conditions of confidentiality to the interviewee(s) and offer them the opportunity to ask questions.
- If you prefer to decline refreshments, avoid offence by carrying your own water bottle.
- Develop an appropriate exit strategy (what to say etc) should you wish to terminate an interview early.
- Take steps to leave a situation immediately if you feel unsafe or uncomfortable.
- Adopt a friendly and professional manner when conducting interviews but be careful not to be over-familiar. Avoid sitting on settees next to the interviewee and try to sit nearest to the exit.
- Ask for household pets to be shut in another room if their presence during the interview is a cause of concern.

If at any point during the interview, you feel unsafe, you should excuse yourself, go to another room, and use your mobile to call for assistance. You may wish to consider introducing codes in case of a threatening situation. For example, phoning to ask the

contact to check if you have left a ring-binder on the desk could be a code for “I do not feel safe; please send someone to the house.”

Please confirm that you will follow the interview safety guidelines above, OR provide information about how your plans will differ and what alternative safeguards you will put in place.

The interview safety guidelines will be followed at all times.
4. On Completing an Interview

Once the interview has been completed, you should contact your nominated person to let them know you have left safely. If the interview goes on longer than anticipated, you should contact your nominated person to inform them.

The nominated person should be instructed to:

- ☑ ring you half an hour after the scheduled finish time.
- ☑ if there is no answer, they should ring again 30 minutes later.
- ☑ if there is still no reply, they should inform the Head of Manchester Institute/Head of Manchester Institute Administration.

Where the nominated contact has been unable to get in touch with you, the Head of Manchester Institute/Head of Manchester Institute Administration may then authorise two members of Manchester Institute staff to go to the interview location to check on your safety. If this is not practical, e.g., the fieldwork is taking place out of the Manchester area, or overseas, then the local police to the area will be informed.

Please confirm that you will follow the guidelines above, OR provide information about how your plans will differ and what alternative safeguards you will put in place.

I will follow the above guidelines at all times.

---

Declarations
Manchester Institute of Education (MIE) Emergency Contact Information Card:
All who conduct research off campus must carry a MIE Emergency Contact Information Card at all times. Please confirm that you will do so.

I confirm I will carry a MIE Emergency Contact Information Card during all fieldwork visits.

Signed: [Signature] Date: 06.09.15

Please also provide the following information, as appropriate:

**Travel details** (to fieldwork destination)
1. Date of departure
   
   Details of itinerary:

2. Date of return:
   
   Details of itinerary.
1. I can be contacted as follows during fieldwork:

   Email address: sobiahussain@blackburnlive.net

   Phone: 07793458737

2. Contact person at destination (overseas travel / accommodation):

   Name

   Relationship to you

   Email address: Phone:

3. Contact person for fieldwork visits (as nominated in item 2):

   Name

   Email address: Phone:

Supervisor sign off (where appropriate)

I/we have read the above and discussed it with the student applicant. I/we are satisfied that they are aware of and have taken reasonable steps to mitigate the risks associated with their planned fieldwork.

Supervisor signature Date
I agree that the above assessment satisfactorily addresses all relevant fieldwork risks identified in the named project.

**Authorised Fieldwork Risk Assessor**  
Authorised Signature  
Date  

Name (print)  

---

**RESEARCH RISK AND ETHICS ASSESSMENT**  
Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester  

The Manchester Institute of Education is committed to developing and supporting the highest standards of research in education and its associated fields. The Research Risk and Ethics Assessment (REA) resource has been created in order to maintain these high academic standards and associated codes of good research practice. The research portfolio within the Manchester Institute of Education (MIE) covers a wide range of fields and perspectives. Research within each of these areas poses responsibilities of a differing nature on supervisors and students subject to course, level, focus and participants. The aim of the Research Risk and Ethics Assessment is to assist supervisors and students in assessing these factors.

The Manchester Institute of Education has determined three levels of Research Risk each of which has a number of associated criteria and have implications for the degree of ethical review required. In general, the research risk level is considered to be:

- **High** if the research focuses on groups within society in need of special support, or where it may be non-standard, or if there is a possibility the research may be contentious in one or more ways.
- **Medium** if the research follows standard procedures and established research methodologies and is considered non-contentious.
- **Low** if the research is of a routine nature and is considered non-contentious.

The form guides you in assessing the research against each of these risk levels in turn. Agreement to proceed with research at each of these levels is provided by an appropriate University Research Ethics Committee, a MIE Research Integrity Committee member, or by the supervisor/sutor respectively.

**How to complete the Research Risk and Ethics Assessment (REA) form.**  
This form should be completed, in consultation with the MIE Ethical Practice Policy Guidelines, by Manchester Institute of Education students and their supervisors in all cases, except where a pre-approved assignment template currently exists. A separate

---

1 A reasonable person would agree that the study includes no issues of public or private objection, or of sensitive nature.  
2 [http://www.sed.manchester.ac.uk/students/area/mileadandhome/mephractics/](http://www.sed.manchester.ac.uk/students/area/mileadandhome/mephractics/)  
3 For courses with approved templates see: [http://www.sed.manchester.ac.uk/students/area/mileadandhome/mephractics/](http://www.sed.manchester.ac.uk/students/area/mileadandhome/mephractics/)
Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA) form must be completed if you will be making fieldwork visits but are not able to agree with ALL the criteria in the LOW Risk Fieldwork Statement (Section C). This is so you can plan how safety issues will be responded to during fieldwork visits. The FRA form is available on the MIE ethics intranet. Instructions on this and subsequent stages of the RREA process are provided within each of the following sections.

**ANY student**
- Section A – Summary of Research Proposal (page 1)
- Section B – Description of Research (page 2)
- Section C – LOW risk Fieldwork Declaration (page 3)
- Sections D.D-D.1 – Criteria for HIGH risk research (page 6)
- Section D.2 – Criteria for MEDIUM risk research (page 7)

- Section D.3 – Criteria for LOW risk research (page 8)

**LOW Risk UG / PGT / Doctorate Pilot studies/Research Papers only**
- Section E.1 – Criteria for LOW risk ethical approval (page 10)

**Supervisors and tutor approvals of LOW risk student research**
- Section E.2 – Supervisor confirmation that research matches LOW risk criteria (page 11)

**Minor amendments to MEDIUM OR LOW risk approvals**
- Section F.1 – Minor Amendments to MEDIUM OR LOW risk approvals (page 12)

It may be appropriate for supervisors and students to review and discuss responses to these questions together from the outset.
The following section to be completed by the SUPERVISOR

| A17. Date | 01.09.15 |

SECTION B – DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH

This section should be completed by the person undertaking the research.

B1. Provide an outline description of the planned research (250 words max).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A15. Assessed Risk Level</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>v</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>HRA req'd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| A16. Supervisor Signature |   |   |        |      |           |
Principal Research Question(s):

1. What type and level of mediation is required to support children in the EYFS?
2. How do EPs evaluate the usefulness of DA for assessing and identifying the needs of children in the EYFS?
3. What implications does DA have for intervention for children in the EYFS?

Academic justification:

EPs are now more likely to receive referrals concerning children in early years settings. EPs need to be aware of suitable assessment to identify need when standardised assessment is not an option. Haywood & Tzuriel (1992), claim that due to its relevance to the classroom and ability to examine the learning process, carrying out DA with young children can be valuable in not only determining factors that may impede a child’s learning abilities in school but also inform intervention. However DA still remains to be

B2. The principal research methods and methodologies are [250 words max]:

Project Design:

The proposed study is exploratory in nature and will therefore adopt a qualitative research design, using two case studies.

Data Collection Methods:

3 EPs with a child each

2 Semi-structured interviews with each EP.

Video observation of interaction between EP and child

Sampling:

Purpose convenience sample

Method(s) of Analysis:

Thematic Analysis using Braun and Clarke (2006) to analyse the two interviews with each EP and the video observation.

NB: If your research methods include collection of image or video data, you must complete the Video And Still Image REsearch (VASTRE) document (regardless of research risk). See http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integr/ethics/stillimageresearch/
B3. Please indicate which of the following groups are expected to participate in this research:

- Children under 16, other than those in school, youth club, or other accredited organisations.
- Adults with learning difficulties, other than those in familiar, supportive environments.
- Adults who are unable to self-consent.
- Adults with mental illness/terminal illness/dementia/residential care home.
- Adults or children in emergency situations.
- Those who could be considered to have a particularly dependent relationship with the researcher.
- Prisoners.
- Young Offenders.
- Other vulnerable groups (please detail).

OR

- None of the above groups are involved in this study.

B4. Total number of expected research participants.

- Number of different participant groups
  (e.g. Teacher, parent, pupil = 3 groups requiring differentiated information/consent sheet)

| Number of different participant groups | 2 |

B5. The research will take place (tick all that apply):

- within the UK.
- within the researcher’s home country if outside the UK.
- wholly or partly outside the UK and not in the home country of the researcher.

---

3 The person with learning difficulties has appropriate support within the setting from accredited support workers or family members.
4 The researcher’s “home country” is defined as one in which (1) the researcher holds a current passport through birthright or foreign birth registration, (2) a country where the researcher has residency status, or (3) where the researcher holds a permit or visa to work, has a contract of employment, and is not a UK tax-payer.

- this research will not involve fieldwork visits to organisations’ premises, other than those with which I have an existing established relationship through placement, employment or volunteering.
- I will provide a regularly updated fieldwork visit schedule to a nominated University contact, unless visits only involve travel to the homes of friends or relatives.
- I will carry a Manchester Institute of Education Emergency Contact Information Card during all fieldwork visits, unless visits only involve travel to the homes of friends or relatives.
OR

I am making fieldwork visits but I am unable to tick ALL the criteria above, I have therefore completed a separate full Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA). Go to Section D page 6
C. LOW Risk Fieldwork Statement and Declaration

If you are making fieldwork visits, BUT CANNOT TICK ALL the low risk fieldwork criteria in the Statement below, YOU MUST COMPLETE THE SEPARATE FIELDWORK RISK ASSESSMENT (FRA) FORM.

C.1 Fieldwork visits¹ (If you will not make any fieldwork visits, tick the alternative items in C.2)

Fieldwork Statement
I confirm:

☑ I will not travel outside the UK or my home nation.
☑ I will not visit any country where the Foreign and Commonwealth Office has issued a warning against travel².
☑ the fieldwork does not require overnight stays in hotels or other types of public temporary accommodation.
☑ public and private travel to and from the research location(s) are familiar to me and offer no discernable risk.
☑ I will not travel through, or work in research locations which have known hazards to health or safety such as unit areas, derelict areas, cliffs, or local endemic diseases.
☑ I will carry only necessary personal items when travelling to, and within, research locations.
☑ no specific vaccinations are required / I have had specific vaccinations required to undertake this research.
☑ first aid provision and a trained first aider are available where appropriate.
☑ I will only operate machinery / electrical equipment / workplace vehicles, or handle / work with animals, at the research location(s) where I have clear competence to do so / will be under close supervision from a qualified person.
☑ the fieldwork will be carried out within normal working hours³ at a time convenient to participants.
☑ I will not give out personal telephone information to participants, or owners of secondary data resources, in relation to the research project
☑ I am fully aware of, and sensitive to cultural and religious practices of participant groups, and will act accordingly.

¹ Fieldwork visits involve travel to research locations off campus to collect data.
² This can be checked on this website: http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travel-and-living-abroad/travel-advice-by-country/
³ For example, in the UK normal working hours are between 8am and 6pm Mon-Fri inclusive.
C.2 No Fieldwork visits

Fieldwork Statement

I confirm:

☐ this research does not involve fieldwork visits of any kind

☒ I will not give out personal telephone information to participants, or owners of secondary data resources, in relation to the research project

C.3 Student Declaration:

By signing this declaration, I declare that the completed statement above is accurate to the best of my knowledge and that I will complete any actions that I have indicated I will complete.

Signature:

S. Hussain

Name (in capitals): SOBIA HUSSAIN Date: 01.08.15

C.4 Supervisor Declaration:

By signing this declaration, I confirm that I have reviewed the health and safety aspects of this research with this student and that the completed statement above is accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Signature:

Name (in capitals): Date:

LOW Risk Fieldwork Declaration:

Students and Supervisors please
SECTION D – RESEARCH RISK ASSESSMENT

The following sections should be completed by the person undertaking the research in discussion with their supervisor/tutor.

D.0 – Criteria for research classified as HIGH RISK – Health Research Authority (HRA) review

☐ The study involves primary research with adults who are unable to self-consent
☐ The study involves primary research with NHS patients
☐ The study involves primary research with prisoners/young offenders

Students - If any of these options apply, you should complete an HRA application. See your supervisor for further guidance.

Supervisors – Forward this RRFA form to ethics.education@manchester.ac.uk when you are satisfied that the project requires approval through the HRA operated Integrated Research Application System (IRAS).1

D.1 – Criteria for research classified as HIGH RISK (tick any that apply)

I confirm that this research:

☐ involves vulnerable or potentially vulnerable individuals or groups as indicated in B3
☐ addresses themes or issues in respect of participant’s personal experience which may be of a sensitive nature (i.e. the research has the potential to create a degree of discomfort or anxiety amongst one or more participants)
☐ cannot be completed without data collection or associated activities which place the participants at personal risk
☐ requires participant informed consent and/or withdrawal procedures which are not consistent with accepted University practice
☐ addresses an area where access to personal records (e.g. medical), in collaboration with an authorised person, is not possible
☐ involves data collection on an area of public or social objection (e.g. terrorism, paedophilia)
☐ makes use of video or other images captured by the researcher, and/or research study participants, where the researcher cannot guarantee controlled access to authorised viewing.

IF ONE OR MORE of the HIGH risk criteria have been selected DO NOT COMPLETE FURTHER SECTIONS OF THIS FORM. Ethical approval must be sought from a UREC committee. In all other cases, go on to Section D.2.

ACTIONS – HIGH RISK RESEARCH

1. You and your supervisor should first agree this risk assessment.

1 For full details see http://www.hra.nhs.uk/research/applying-for-review/
D.2 – Criteria for research classified as MEDIUM RISK (tick any that apply)

I confirm that this:

☐ is research involving children or other vulnerable groups which involves direct contact with participants.¹

☐ study is on a subject that a reasonable person would agree addresses issues of legitimate interest, where there is a possibility that the topic may result in distress or upset in rare instances.

☐ is research which involves substantial direct contact² with adults in non-professional roles (eg parents).

☐ is research which focuses on data collection from professionals responding to questions outside of their professional concerns.

☐ is research with practitioners involving topics of a sensitive nature which are not personal to these participants.

☐ involves visits to site(s) where a specific risk to participants has been identified, and the researcher may not be closely supervised throughout

If one or more of the MEDIUM risk criteria have been selected, DO NOT COMPLETE FURTHER SECTIONS OF THIS FORM. Ethical approval must be sought from the Manchester Institute of Education (MIE) Research Integrity Committee (RIC). In all other cases, go on to Section D.3.

¹ This does not include research in locations where children are present if they are not the focus of the research.

² For example in focus group or one to one interview in private locations; and non-market research which is characterised by brief interaction with randomly selected individuals in public locations.
D3 – Criteria for research classified as LOW RISK

D 3.1  NO human participants

I confirm that this research (tick as appropriate):

- [ ] Is Secondary research (i.e. it will use material that has already been published or is in the public domain).
- [ ] Is Secondary data analysis (i.e. it will involve data from an established data archive)

If you have ticked one of the options in D3.1 above, and D3.2 does not apply, you should now complete section D3.3 below.

D3.2  Human participants

I confirm that this (tick as appropriate):

- [ ] Research does not constitute high nor medium risk to the participants, as indicated by the criteria provided in sections D.0, D.1 and D.2 respectively.
- [ ] A reasonable person would agree that the study addresses issues of legitimate interest without being in any way likely to inflame opinion or cause distress.
- [ ] Research on my practice (involving data collection on issues relating to my professional role, or for comparison against national or other targets or standards) in a setting where I am employed or on a placement.
- [ ] Research on the professional practice of others in professional roles and is conducted in my work / placement setting.
- [ ] Market research (i.e. the research may involve data collection from the general public approached or observed in public locations for the purposes of market investigation).
- [ ] Research using a questionnaire completed and returned by participants who will have no direct contact with me.
- [ ] Is part of a research methods course and participant groups are limited to peers, colleagues, family members and friends.
- [ ] Is a Pilot Study

D 3.3  Research context

I confirm (tick as appropriate):

---

1 A reasonable person would agree that the study includes no issues of public or private objection, or of a sensitive nature.
If one or more of the low risk criteria above have been selected, ethical approval must be sought from the Manchester Institute of Education (MIE) Research Integrity Committee (RIC).

**Actions – Low Risk Doctoral Research**

1. You and your supervisor should first agree this risk assessment.
2. You should then complete the MIE Ethical Approval Application form (available on the MIE Ethics Intranet) and all supporting documents, and give these to your supervisor for review and feedback.
3. When satisfied with the application, your supervisor will submit:
   1. This completed RREA form
   2. Your completed MIE form – appending all supporting documents.
   3. Your completed and approved Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA) form – where indicated

These documents should be submitted by your supervisor to: Ethics.Education@manchester.ac.uk

In doing so, supervisors confirm that they have agreed the assessed risk level and that the documents are complete and correct. The Ethics Administrator will arrange review of your documents to be completed by a member of the MIE Research Integrity Committee for approval against our UREC Templates.

---

3 The document and guidance can be downloaded from: [http://www.sead.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudents/integrityethics](http://www.sead.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudents/integrityethics)

4 Supporting documents include recruitment adverstement, draft questionnaires / interview topic guides, information sheets and consent forms.
UG / PGT Research OR Doctorate Pilot Studies/Research Papers
Section E.1 to be completed by students. Section E.2 to be completed by supervisors/tutors

E.1 Research ethics criteria

Tick as appropriate and/or indicate NA against items in bold where they do not apply to this research.

I confirm:

Codes of Practice
- I have read and understood the Manchester Institute of Education Ethical Practice and Policy Guidelines.
- I will abide by the Manchester Institute of Education’s Ethical Protocol detailed therein.
- I am aware of and will abide by any organisation’s codes of conduct relevant to this research.

Researcher skills/checks
- All necessary training procedures for this research have been completed.
- All appropriate permissions have been obtained to use any database or resource to be analysed in this research.
- All relevant enhanced DBS or other checks have been completed.
- I will inform the Ethics Administrator if my DBS (or related) status changes.
- Permission to be on the site to conduct research has been received.

Rights of participants
- Participant information sheets (PIS), consent forms, questionnaires, and all other documentation related to this research have been discussed with supervisor/tutor named in A.5.
- PIS and consent forms have been confirmed with the supervisor named in A.5, as covering required headings illustrated in the MIE Participant Information and consent templates, AND that they are on an accessible way for each proposed participant group.
- I understand that the Data Protection Act and the University Data Protection Policy and all data will be held confidentially and securely, including storage on encrypted devices.

Research Integrity
- No data will be collected before ethical approval of the study is confirmed by my supervisor/tutor.
- I will immediately report any issues arising during the course of the study that conflict with the MIE protocol, to my supervisor who has signed the ethics approval, and suspend data collection pending changes from that supervisor/tutor.
- I will report any proposed deviation from the research specification outlined in this assessment to my supervisor/tutor to update the current assessment or clarify any need for further approvals BEFORE changes are made.

Research output
- The only publication/output from this research or my practice or research methods study will be my assignment or dissertation.

SECTION E. Ethical Approval Application for LOW risk

ACTION: LOW RISK RESEARCH
1. You should email your final, completed REA form (with all required supporting documents appended to including your research proposal, or equivalent document giving full details of the research) to your supervisor.
2. Your supervisor will first agree that this is LOW risk research. They will then, confirm that your proposed method matches our LOW RISK ethics criteria and that in doing so, that it is approved under our UREC ethics template.
3. Your supervisor will send you an email to confirm this assessment.
4. The ethics administrator will send formal confirmation of approval once all relevant documents have been received.
E.2 Supervisor confirmation that research matches LOW risk criteria above.

When satisfied that the assessment is correct, supervisors should complete this section.

**SUPERVISOR ACTION: LOW RISK RESEARCH**

1. Confirm items in bold by ticking or marking as NA if not applicable to this research, and one or more of the specific research criteria as appropriate.

I confirm:

- This submission has been discussed and agreed with the student undertaking the research.
- The student has had appropriate training and has the skills to undertake this study, or has close, qualified supervision in place.
- The research activities outlined in the proposal involve no substantive risks to the student researcher or potential participants.

**AND** one or more of the following as appropriate:

- This research will not address issues of public or social objection, or of a sensitive nature.
- Information giving and consent taking processes follow Manchester institute of Education guidance.
- Where fieldwork visits\(^3\) do not correspond to ALL items in the LOW Risk Fieldwork Declaration, a separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment form has been completed and approved.
- This secondary research assignment/project has appropriate resource or database access permissions.
- I will act as custodian for data used for any study that results in a publication (Masters/PhD dissertation or other output) and will arrange for archiving of data with MIE for a minimum period of 5 years.

Confirm that the proposed research matches the low risk ethics criteria (indicated in E.1) and that the documents supplied are complete and correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please specify:</th>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number submitted</td>
<td>Completed RREA form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) Fieldwork visits involve travel to research locations off campus to collect data.
SECTION 3: MINOR AMENDMENT TO RESEARCH PROJECT

Application for Approval of Minor Amendment¹ to a Research Study

Details of proposed amendment (please give as much detail as possible)

Supervisor Declaration
I agree that the amendment proposed does not change the character of this research or the participant groups.

I confirm that the research risk assessment for the study as MEDIUM remains.

Supervisor’s signature* | Date.

Please send applications for amendment to ethical approval for MEDIUM risk research to the Manchester Institute Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork at ethics.education@manchester.ac.uk who will pass on the request to the REC member who authorised the original application wherever possible.

¹ Minor amendments are those that do not alter the character of the research or the participant groups
Manchester Institute of Education
Ethical Approval Application Form

This ethical approval application form has been revised to incorporate changes made to the new University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) form. It has been designed to incorporate prompts for information needed to ascertain whether the proposed research matches MIE’s research template pre-approved by UREC and to facilitate completion of the form to a standard that will allow speedier review, and approval, by RIC members. Please follow all directions contained in this document.

### SECTION 1: Student Details /Identification of the person responsible for the research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Student</th>
<th>Subha Hussain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student ID (quoted on library/swipe card)</td>
<td>9563057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:subha.hussain@blackburnlive.net">subha.hussain@blackburnlive.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Supervisor</td>
<td>Kevin Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme (PhD, Prof Doc, MEd, PGCE, MSc, BA etc):</td>
<td>Professional Doctorate in Child and Educational Psychology DECPychol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
** Supervisor signature confirms that the student has the relevant experience, knowledge and skills to carry out the study in an appropriate manner

---

** Year of Study | 1  
** Full/Half-time | FT  
** Title of Research Project: | Exploring Educational Psychologists use of Dynamic Assessm children in the Early Years Foundation Stage.  
** Recruitment and Data Collection | Start Date: On receipt of confirmation of ethical approval  
| End Date: 2017  
** Location(s) where the project will be carried out: | Blackburn EPS  
Preston EPS  
** Student Signature: | S. Hussain  
** Supervisor Signature:**  
** Date: | ** Supervisor signature confirms that the student has the relevant experience, knowledge and skills to carry out the study in an appropriate manner
SECTION 2: PROJECT DETAILS
(Please write your answers in the boxes provided. Boxes will expand to fit answers as necessary)

1. Aims and Objectives of the Project

1.1 Research Question
State the principal research question(s).

Research Questions

1. What type and level of mediation is required to support children in the early years foundation stage (EYFS)?
2. How do Educational Psychologists evaluate the usefulness of dynamic assessment for assessing and identifying the needs of children in the EYFS?
3. What implications does dynamic assessment have for intervention for children in the EYFS?

1.2 Academic justification
Briefly describe the academic justification for the research. (Why is it an area of importance/ has any similar research been done?)

Educational Psychologists (EPs) are now more likely to receive referrals concerning children in early years settings. EPs need to be aware of suitable assessment to identify need when standardised assessment is not an option. Haywood & Tzuriel (1992), claim that due to its relevance to the classroom and ability to examine the learning process, carrying out dynamic assessment with young children can be valuable in not only determining factors that may impede a child's learning abilities in school but also inform intervention. However dynamic assessment still remains to be identified in terms of its usefulness and its understanding regarding child development and its implications for intervention. The type and level of mediation required is a particular focus of this study as well as the implications dynamic assessment has for intervention. Dynamic assessment should be explored in terms of its usefulness when assessing and identifying needs.

Up to date research is required in the area, although similar research has been done by Deutch and Reynolds (2000).

2. Methodology
Please briefly outline the design and methodological approach of the project, including the theoretical framework that informs it.

This study will adopt an exploratory qualitative research design, using two case studies. The case in the case studies will be the EPs themselves as they are the ones being observed in their practice delivering dynamic assessment. They are the ones being interviewed and will reflect on their practice. Although the child will be their casework, he/she is not the case.

It is a process of enquiry into the effectiveness of an assessment method (Coats, 2005). The EPs will be interviewed to begin with using semi-structured interviews, followed by a videoed observation of their interaction with the child using dynamic assessment. Lastly, they will be interviewed again where the EPs' reflections will be captured regarding the whole process.

2.2 Data Collection Methods
Describe the research procedures/activities as they affect the study participants and any other parties involved. Which of the following will your research involve and what will you be asking your participants to do.

2.2.1. Interviews

Yes [ ]   No [ ]

*If Yes, describe how these are to be conducted (please provide your interview guide):*

The EPs will be interviewed to begin with using semi-structured interviews, followed by a videoed observation of their interaction with the child using dynamic assessment. Lastly, they will be interviewed again where the EPs' reflections will be captured regarding the whole process.

Please see interview schedules 1 and 2.
Please briefly outline the design and methodological approach of the project, including the theoretical framework that informs it.

This study will adopt an exploratory qualitative research design, using two case studies. The cases in the case studies will be the EPs themselves as they are the ones being observed in their practice delivering dynamic assessment. They are the ones being interviewed and will reflect on their practice. Although the child will be their casework, he/she is not the case.

It is a process of enquiry into the effectiveness of an assessment method (Coats, 2005). The EPs will be interviewed to begin with using semi-structured interviews, followed by a videoed observation of their interaction with the child using dynamic assessment. Lastly, they will be interviewed again where the EPs’ reflections will be captured regarding the whole process.

2.2 Data Collection Methods:
Describe the research procedures/activities as they affect the study participant and any other parties involved. Which of the following will your research involve and what will you be asking your participants to do.

2.2.1. Interviews
Yes □ No □

If Yes, describe how these are to be conducted (Append your interview guide):

The EPs will be interviewed to begin with using semi-structured interviews, followed by a videoed observation of their interaction with the child using dynamic assessment. Lastly they will be interviewed again where the EPs’ reflections will be captured regarding the whole process.

Please see interview schedules 1 and 2.

2.2.2. Questionnaires
Yes □ No □

If Yes, how will these be delivered to and collected from participants? (Append your draft questionnaire(s)):

2.2.3. Observations
Yes □ No □
If yes, describe the context for the observation and what participants will be engaged in. (Append copy of any observation framework or other data collection guide to be used):

Data will be collected by observing two EPs using formative dynamic assessment with children in the EYFS. A checklist will be used by the EPs to prompt discussion between the researcher and EP identify abilities of the child (to be selected). In addition to this, EPs will also use a mediation checklist (to be selected). The focused observation will be participant led as a great deal depends upon the willingness and co-operation of the child. The observations will be video recorded in the setting to preserve some of the context in its original form for analysis. The video is merely a data gathering tool to support the EP responses in interview.

Video equipment will be used from the University of Manchester and will be downloaded onto a password protected computer. Access will be allowed to only the researcher and supervisor and material will not be transferred anywhere else. All materials will be deleted after use.

2.2.4. Diary
Yes [ ] No [ ]
If yes, describe the context for use of the diary and what participants will be asked to do. (Append copy of the diary instructions and format):

2.2.5. Intervention
Yes [ ] No [ ]
If yes, describe the intervention and what participants will be asked to do. (Append a detailed description and any images necessary to support the description):

2.2.6. Assessments
Yes [ ] No [ ]
If yes, give full details of the assessment(s) and what participants will be asked to do. (Append a copy of the assessment schedules to be used):

2.2.7. Other
Yes [ ] No [ ]
If yes, give full details and what participants will be asked to do. (Append supporting documentation as appropriate):
2.2.6. Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If Yes, give full details of the assessment(s) and what participants will be asked to do. (Append a copy of the assessment schedules to be used):

2.2.7. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If Yes, give full details and what participants will be asked to do. (Append supporting documentation as appropriate):

2.2.8. Does data collection use video or still image?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If Yes, complete the VASTRE documentation - Available from: [http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/inagrntyethics/stillimageresearch/](http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/inagrntyethics/stillimageresearch/)

2.2.9 Research Experience

Please state your experience in conducting these research interventions or assessments (where applicable) and methodologies outlined above - provide supporting evidence (e.g. course unit code).
2.3 Sampling
What type of sampling method do you propose to use?

2.3.1. Statistical
Yes [ ] No [ ]

If Yes, describe the type, your justification for taking this approach and proposed sample size:

2.3.2. Other
Yes [ ] No [ ]

If Yes, describe the type, your justification for taking this approach and proposed sample size:

Purposive convenience sample

2.4 Analysis method
What type of analyses do you propose to use to explore this data?

2.4.1. Quantitative analyses
Yes [ ] No [ ]

If Yes, please give details:

2.4.2. Qualitative analyses
Yes [ ] No [ ]

If Yes, please give details:

An exploratory qualitative research design, using three case studies.

2.5 Ethical issues

Briefly state the main ethical issues raised by the methodology outlined above.

All data will be transcribed and deleted after use. All data will be anonymised and kept on a password protected computer. No information about the participants will be disclosed at any point.
3. Participant Details

3.1 Characteristics of participants

Please specify the characteristics of the participants you wish to recruit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number</th>
<th>3 experienced EPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>Female or male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age group(s)</td>
<td>25-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Blackburn EPS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Vulnerable groups

5.2.1. Will your project include participants from either of the following groups? (Tick as appropriate)

- [ ] Children under 16 in school, youth club or other accredited organisation.
- [ ] Adults with learning difficulties in familiar, supportive environments
- [ ] NONE OF THE ABOVE (go to item 4.)

3.2.2. Inclusion of vulnerable groups

Please describe measures you will undertake to avoid coercion during the recruitment stage.

3.2.3. Research in UK with vulnerable groups

Please confirm you have relevant clearance for working with vulnerable groups from DBS and/or other relevant sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DBS*</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Other, please describe

*NB: You will need a DBS application through the University. Any work related DBS clearance is not valid for your University research.

3.2.4. Please confirm that you will notify the Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork (AEF) immediately if your DBS status changes.

I will immediately notify the AEF if my DBS status changes

4. Recruitment

4.1 Permissions

Do you have permission to collect data from an organisational fieldwork site from...

4.1.1. The organisation where the research will take place

[eg. School head etc]?

Yes | / | NA

4.1.2. Sub-settings within the organisation [eg. class teacher etc]?

Yes | / | NA
3.2.4. Please confirm that you will notify the Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork (AEF) immediately if your DBS status changes.

I will immediately notify the AEF if my DBS status changes [ ]
NA [ ]

4. Recruitment

4.1 Permissions

Do you have permission to collect data from an organisational fieldwork site from...

4.1.1. The organisation where the research will take place
(e.g. school head etc)?
Yes [ ]
NA [ ]

4.1.2. Sub-settings within the organisation (e.g. class teacher etc)?
Yes [ ]
NA [ ]

If Yes, append letter/email confirming access to this application

If NA, please explain why permission is not applicable.

4.1 Participant recruitment

4.2.1. How will your pool of potential participants be identified? (tick all that apply)

- Letters/emails and follow up phone calls to organisations
- Posters/Advertisements
- Website/Internet (including Facebook/other social media)
- Known or named client groups (students, etc.)
- Networks and recommendations
- Person in a position of authority in organisation
- Directory/database/register in public domain

Describe the nature of these routes to identify your pool of potential participants.
4.2.2. Who will the potential participants be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons unknown to the researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client groups (students, etc) within an organisation known by the researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons accessed through networks and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ Persons nominated by a position of authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (describe here):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate whether there is any existing relationship between yourself and the source/group of potential participants.

The researcher will be familiar with the EPs but not the children.

4.2.3. How will you approach potential participants? (tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/ Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website/internet (including Facebook/other social media site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ Presentation at meeting or similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (describe here):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate how information about your study will be delivered to potential participants and how they will (directly or indirectly) let you know they would like to take part in your research.

In person, two weeks before research the interviews are conducted.

Append text of letters / emails / posters / advertisements / presentation etc
4.2.2. Who will the potential participants be?

- Persons unknown to the researcher
- Client groups (students, etc.) within an organisation known by the researcher
- Persons accessed through networks and recommendations
- Persons nominated by a position of authority
- Other (describe here):

Indicate whether there is any existing relationship between yourself and the source/group of potential participants.

The researcher will be familiar with the EPs but not the children.

4.2.3. How will you approach potential participants? (tick all that apply)

- Letter
- Email
  - Website/internet (including Facebook/other social media site)
- Presentation at meeting or similar
- Other (describe here):

Indicate how information about your study will be delivered to potential participants and how they will (directly or indirectly) let you know they would like to take part in your research.

In person, two weeks before research the interviews are conducted.

Append text of letters / emails / posters / advertisements / presentation etc.
Information giving will be undertaken by:

- the researcher
- someone in a position of authority
- a neutral third party to known or named client groups
- Other (describe here):

Provide details on how you will fully inform potential participants about your study:
I will talk to EPs about the research and provide them with information sheets.

4.2.5 Information accessibility

What arrangements have you made to ensure information is accessible to those unable to read standard English? (low literacy level, non-English speaker, persons with learning disabilities)

All participants can communicate in English.

Please confirm:

- I have supplied information relevant to each participating group
- The information provided follows the guidance provided in the University of Manchester Participant Information Sheet Template
### Participation in the research

#### Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>maximum of 1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>maximum of 1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>maximum of 1 hour with breaks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Benefits to participation

Are there any benefits to participation for participants (beyond incentive noted above)?

None

#### Deficits to participation

Will any benefit or service otherwise received by participants be withheld (e.g., pupil misses lesson, or part thereof) as a consequence of taking part in this study?

None
5. Participation in the research

5.1 Duration
How long will each participant be expected to take part in activities?
- Interview 1 – maximum of 1 hour
- Interview 2 – maximum of 1 hour
- Observation – maximum of 1 hour with breaks

5.2 Benefits to participation
Are there any benefits to participation for participants (beyond incentive noted above)?
none

5.3 Deficits to participation
Will any benefit or service otherwise received by participants be withheld (e.g., pupil misses lesson, or part thereof) as a consequence of taking part in this study?
none
Please confirm:

- My consent taking procedures are relevant to each participating group
- The consent taking procedures follow the guidance provided in the University of Manchester Consent Form Template

4.3.1 Special arrangements

Please outline any special consent taking arrangements relevant to your research study.

5. **Participation in the research**

5.1 **Duration**

- How long will each participant be expected to take part in activities?
- Interview 1 – maximum of 1 hour
- Interview 2 – maximum of 1 hour
- Observation – maximum of 1 hour with breaks

5.2 **Benefits to participation**

Are there any benefits to participation for participants (beyond incentive noted above)?

- None

5.3 **Deficit to participation**

Will any benefit or service otherwise received by participants be withheld (e.g., pupil misses lesson, or part thereof) as a consequence of taking part in this study?

- None
7.3 Research monitoring and auditing: Please confirm:

The student researcher’s supervisor(s) will monitor the research

If other arrangements apply please specify:

7.4 Data Protection

Please provide confirmation that you will employ measures that comply with the Data Protection Act and the University Data Protection Policy (UDPP)?

**Data Protection Act**: I confirm that all data collected will be:

- Fairly and lawfully processed
- Processed for limited purposes as outlined in this application and only used in the way(s) for which consent has been given.
- Adequate for the purpose, relevant and not excessive
- Accurate
- Not kept longer than necessary
- Processed in accordance with the participant’s rights
- Secure – on an encrypted storage device
- Only transferred to other settings with appropriate protection.

**University Data Protection Policy (UDPP)**: I confirm

- My data and its storage will comply with the UDPP
- Paper copies of data and encrypted storage devices will be stored in a locked drawer or cupboard

**For UG research**: On completion of my research, the data will be kept until the study has been completed and will then be shredded/destroyed

**For MRes/PhD research**: On completion of my research, the data will be passed to my supervisor for archiving at the University for a period of 5 years after which it will be shredded/destroyed

7.5 Privacy during data analysis: Please confirm:

- Analysis will be undertaken by the student researcher
- Analysis will take place in a private study area
7.6 Custody and control of the data. Please confirm:

☐ The student researcher’s supervisor will have custody of the data
☐ The student researcher will have control of the data

*If other arrangements apply please describe:

7.7 Access to the data

☐ The student researcher will have access to the data
☐ The student’s supervisor(s) will have access to anonymised data

*If other/additional arrangements apply, please describe:

7.8 Use of data in future studies

Will the data be stored for use in future studies? Yes ☐ No ☐
If Yes, confirm this is addressed in the information giving/consent taking process by ticking here.

☐
8. Reporting Arrangements

8.1 Dissemination
How do you intend to report and disseminate the results of the study?
(Tick all that apply)
- Peer reviewed scientific journals
- Book / Chapter contribution
- Published review (ESRC, Cochrane)
- Internal report
- Conference presentation
- Thesis/dissertation
- Other e.g. Creative works (describe here):

8.2 Participant and community feedback
How will the results of research be made available to research participants and communities from which they are drawn? (Tick all that apply)
- Written feedback to research participants
- Presentation to participants or relevant community groups
- Other e.g. Video/Website (describe here):

9. Research Sponsorship

9.1 External funding
Are you in receipt of any external funding for your study? (tick one)
- External Funding
- No external funding

If you have funding please provide details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2 Sponsoring organisation
Who will be responsible for governance and ensuring the study? (tick one)

The University of Manchester
8. Reporting Arrangements

8.1 Dissemination
How do you intend to report and disseminate the results of the study? (Tick all that apply)

/ Peer reviewed scientific journals
/ Book / Chapter contribution
/ Published review (ESRC, Cochrane)
/ Internal report
/ Conference presentation
/ Thesis/dissertation
/ Other e.g. Creative works (describe here):

8.2 Participant and community feedback
How will the results of research be made available to research participants and communities from which they are drawn? (Tick all that apply)

/ Written feedback to research participants
/ Presentation to participants or relevant community groups
/ Other e.g. Video/Website (describe here):

9. Research Sponsorship

9.1 External funding
Are you in receipt of any external funding for your study? (tick one)

/ External Funding
/ No external funding

If you have funding please provide details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9.2 Sponsoring organisation
Who will be responsible for governance and insuring the study? (tick one)

/ The University of Manchester
8. Reporting Arrangements

8.1 Dissemination
   How do you intend to report and disseminate the results of the study?
   (Tick all that apply)
   / Peer reviewed scientific journals
   / Book / Chapter contribution
   / Published review (ESRC, Cochrane)
   / Internal report
   / Conference presentation
   / Thesis/dissertation
   Other e.g. Creative works (describe here):

8.2 Participant and community feedback
   How will the results of research be made available to research participants and communities from
   which they are drawn? (Tick all that apply)
   / Written feedback to research participants
   / Presentation to participants or relevant community groups
   Other e.g. video/Website (describe here):

9. Research Sponsorship

9.1 External funding
   Are you in receipt of any external funding for your study? (tick one)
   / External Funding
   / No external funding
   If you have funding please provide details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2 Sponsoring organisation
   Who will be responsible for governance and insuring the study? (tick one)

   The University of Manchester
10. Conflict of Interest

Have any conflicts of interest been identified in relation to this project? (tick at least one option)

- Payment for doing this research?
  - If so, how much and on what basis?

- Direct personal involvement in the research of a spouse/funder?
  - If so, please provide details:

- Does your department/the University receive payment (apart from costs)?
  - If so, please provide details:

/ NONE of the ABOVE APPLY

Thank you
This is the end of the form

Please use the checklist below to ensure that you append all necessary supporting documents

CHECKLIST

Please tick to indicate whether the document is APPENDED OR NOT APPLICABLE for this application.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection instruments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft copy of each data collection instrument named in Q2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Questionnaire, interview guide, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and Still Image Recording Declaration [VASTRE]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant recruitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter(s) of permission to conduct research within each organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment advertisement(s) specified in Q4.2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(poster/email/letter/presentation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Information giving – one for each participant type specified in Q3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Information sheet/letter/email/script)</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent taking – one for each participant type specified in Q3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Consent form or alternative procedure)</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fieldwork risk assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork Risk Assessment Form (approved)</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RREA form Low Risk Fieldwork Declaration (Section C) completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3: MINOR AMENDMENT TO RESEARCH PROJECT

Application for Approval of Minor Amendment¹ to a Research Study

Details of proposed amendment (please give as much detail as possible)

Supervisor Declaration
I agree that the amendment proposed does not change the character of this research or the participant groups.

I confirm that the research risk assessment for the study as MEDIUM remains.

Signature* Date

Please send applications for amendment to ethical approval for MEDIUM risk research to the Manchester Institute Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork at ethics.education@manchester.ac.uk who will pass on the request to the REC member who authorised the original application wherever possible.

¹ Minor amendments are those that do not alter the character of the research or the participant groups
Manchester Institute of Education
Research Risk and Ethics Assessment
Video and Still Image Recording Declaration

This form should be completed by all research students who seek to utilise still image capture or video recording of prospective research participants. This form should be completed and by the researcher in discussion with their supervisor and submitted with the current Manchester Institute of Education Research Risk and Assessment (RREA) and other relevant documentation. Please read the guidance document available prior to completing this form.

Name of researcher: Sobia Hussain

Title of research study: Exploring Educational Psychologists use of Dynamic Assessment for children in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

Degree programme and unit: Professional Doctorate in Child and Educational Psychology DECPychol

This study seeks to utilise: [ ] Still image [ ] Video recording [ ] Still image & video recording

This project intends to make use of the following type(s) of still image and/or video recordings for research purposes (please tick):

1. Still image or video resources available from a library or archive;

2. Still image or video recorded independently by the researcher using their own or local available resources;

3. Still image or video produced by the researcher within an independence production team;

4. Still image or video production initiated by the researcher and recorded independently by research participants.
The researcher should complete the following declaration (Please tick):

- [ ] I have read and understood my responsibilities as a video ethnographer as outlined in "Video recording and still image capture for research purposes in the MIE, University of Manchester".  
- [ ] The use of still image and/or video for this study has been discussed by the researcher and supervisor and the manner in which still image or video recordings are to be used have been agreed as indicated.  
- [ ] All aspects of information provision to participants, consent, and related health and safety issues, as outlined in the current MIE Research Risk and Ethics Assessment documentation, have been discussed and are made available with this form.  
- [ ] The researcher will provide an unedited copy of all original still image and/or video recorded materials for the above research activity for archive to the School of Environment, Education and Development Ethics and Fieldwork Administrator for archive and audit or inspection purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed (researcher)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|  | Date: 01.08.15

- Available from [http://www.education.manchester.ac.uk/intranet/ethics/](http://www.education.manchester.ac.uk/intranet/ethics/)
Appendix 8: Participant consent forms and information sheets
Consent form and information sheet for EPs

Exploring Educational Psychologists use of Dynamic Assessment for children in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

Participant Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a research study as part of a student project exploring the Educational Psychologists use of dynamic assessment when assessing children in the early years foundation stage (EYFS). This research project will form part of a Doctorate thesis in Child and Educational Psychology. Before you agree, it is important for you to decide why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

Who will conduct the research?

Sobia Husain – Trainee Educational Psychologist

Title of the Research

Exploring Educational Psychologists use of Dynamic Assessment for children in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

What is the aim of the research?

The aim of the research is to explore your use of dynamic assessment when assessing children in the early years foundation stage (EYFS). I hope to gain an insight into the frameworks you might use, the usefulness of dynamic assessment, the understanding it may provide in terms of child development and the implications it has for intervention. This is a Doctoral Thesis.

Why have I been chosen?

As an Educational Psychologist you have knowledge and experience of using dynamic assessment.

What would I be asked to do if I took part?

You will be asked to select a case, a child from the EYFS. As part of your assessment, you will be asked to use dynamic assessment. If you decided to be involved in the research, you will be asked to take part in a semi-structured interview that will last approximately for one hour. This will be followed by a video observation of you doing some dynamic assessment with the child. Lastly, you will be interviewed again where you will be asked to reflect upon the process. All data will be transcribed and analysed.
What happens to the data collected?

The interviews will be audio recorded and the observation will be collected on a digital recording device. The data will be transcribed and analysed for any themes emerging during the interaction.

How is confidentiality maintained?

All data gathered will be analysed and written up by the researcher. Any sort of transcription obtained will be anonymised and any digital recordings will be deleted after analysis. Once written up, all data will be kept on a password protected computer.

What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and to be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason and without detriment to yourself.

Will I be paid for taking part?

Your involvement in the research is completely voluntary and you will not be paid for taking part.

What is the duration of the research?

Both interviews and the observation will last for a maximum of one hour each. Convenient dates and times will be discussed with you in due course.

Where will the research be conducted?

Interviews will take place at a convenient location. The observation will take place at the child’s setting.

Will the outcomes of the research be published?

The outcomes of this research may be published after completion in 2017.

Contact for further information

Researcher — sobia.hussain-2@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk
Supervisor of research — Kevin.Woods@manchester.ac.uk

What if something goes wrong?

If you have any concerns or wish to complain, you should contact the researcher Sobia Hussain or Kevin Woods in the first instance.
If there are any issues regarding this research that you would prefer not to discuss with members of the research team, please contact the Research Governance and Integrity Team by either writing to The Research Governance and Integrity Manager, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL; by emailing: Research.complaints@manchester.ac.uk; or by telephoning 0161 275 8093 or 275 2074.

Thank you very much for considering participation in my study.
Consent form and information sheet for EPs

Exploring Educational Psychologists use of Dynamic Assessment for children in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

Participant Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a research study as part of a student project exploring the Educational Psychologist's use of dynamic assessment when assessing children in the early years foundation stage (EYFS). This research project will form part of a Doctorate thesis in Child and Educational Psychology. Before you agree, it is important for you to decide why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

Who will conduct the research?

Sobia Hussain – Trainee Educational Psychologist

Title of the Research

Exploring Educational Psychologists use of Dynamic Assessment for children in the Early Years Foundation Stage.

What is the aim of the research?

The aim of the research is to explore your use of dynamic assessment when assessing children in the early years foundation stage (EYFS). I hope to gain an insight into the frameworks you might use, the usefulness of dynamic assessment, the understanding it may provide in terms of child development and the implications it has for intervention. This is a Doctoral Thesis.

Why have I been chosen?

As an Educational Psychologist you have knowledge and experience of using dynamic assessment.

What would I be asked to do if I took part?

You will be asked to select a case, a child from the EYFS. As part of your assessment, you will be asked to use dynamic assessment. If you decide to be involved in the research, you will be asked to take part in a semi-structured interview that will last approximately for one hour. This will be followed by a video observation of you doing some dynamic assessment with the child. Lastly, you will be interviewed again where you will be asked to reflect upon the process. All data will be transcribed and analysed.
What happens to the data collected?

The interviews will be audio recorded and the observation will be collected on a digital recording device, the data will be transcribed and analysed for any themes emerging during the interaction.

How is confidentiality maintained?

All data gathered will be analysed and written up by the researcher. Any sort of transcription obtained will be anonymised and any digital recordings will be deleted after analysis. Once written up, all data will be kept on a password protected computer.

What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and to be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason and without detriment to yourself.

Will I be paid for taking part?

Your involvement in the research is completely voluntary and you will not be paid for taking part.

What is the duration of the research?

Both interviews and the observation will last for a maximum of one hour each. Convenient dates and times will be discussed with you in due course.

Where will the research be conducted?

Interviews will take place at in a convenient location. The observation will take place at the child’s setting.

Will the outcomes of the research be published?

The outcomes of this research may be published after completion in 2017.

Contact for further information

Researcher – sobia.hussain-2@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk
Supervisor of research – Kevin.Woods@manchester.ac.uk

What if something goes wrong?

If you have any concerns or wish to complain, you should contact the researcher Sobia Hussain or Kevin Woods in the first instance.
If there are any issues regarding this research that you would prefer not to discuss with members of the research team, please contact the Research Governance and Integrity Team by either writing to 'The Research Governance and Integrity Manager, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL', by emailing: Research.complaints@manchester.ac.uk, or by telephoning 0161 275 8093 or 275 2074.

Thank you very much for considering participation in my study.
# Consent Form

*If you are happy to participate in the research then please complete and sign the consent below.*

*Please initial box*

1. I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above study and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and have these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw him at any time without giving a reason.

3. I understand that the interviews will be audio recorded and the observation will be video recorded. The data will then be transcribed and deleted after use.

4. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes.

5. I agree that any data collected may be passed to other researchers.

6. I agree that any data collected may be published in an anonymous form in academic books or journals.

7. I understand that data generated from this study, may inform a Doctoral thesis.

8. I agree to taking part in the above research project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of person giving consent</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Consent form and information sheet for parents

The Educational Psychologist working with your child has been invited to take part in a research study as part of a student project exploring the usefulness of dynamic assessment, which will form part of a Doctorate thesis in Child and Educational Psychology.

Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

Who will conduct the research?

Sobia Hussain – Trainee Educational Psychologist

What is the aim of the research?

I hope to gain an insight into the use of dynamic assessment used by a qualified Educational Psychologist working with your child. I aim to explore the Educational Psychologists use of dynamic assessment in their practice.

What would my child be required to do?

Your child will work with the Educational Psychologist, who will be using different resources such as toys. I will be making observations of the Educational Psychologist during the interaction. Your child is not the focus of the research and the research will not affect the assessment of your child.

What happens to the data collected?

The data will be collected on a digital recording device and will be deleted once analysis has taken place. The Educational Psychologist will talk about their use of dynamic assessment.

How is confidentiality maintained?

All data gathered will be analysed and written up by the researcher. Transcriptions will be anonymised and any digital recordings will be deleted after analysis.

What happens if I don’t want my child to take part or if I change my mind?

It is up to you to decide whether or not your child takes part. If you allow them to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and to be asked to sign a consent form. If you do allow your child to take part, you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason and without detriment to yourself.
What is the duration of the research?

Your child’s part in the research will consist of a single observation that will last up to an hour. The observation will be cut short if your child becomes upset at any time or will be cancelled. If this is the case, we will inform you when it is rearranged.

Where will the research be conducted?

The research will be conducted in a quiet room at your child’s setting.

Will the outcomes of the research be published?

The outcomes of this research may be published and some of the data from this research may inform the researchers Doctoral thesis which may be published after completion in 2017. However, the Educational Psychologist will feedback the findings from the assessment to you at a convenient time before then.

Contact for further information

Email – sobia.hussain-2@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk

Supervisor of research – Kevin.Woods@manchester.ac.uk
Phone - 0161 2757583.

What if something goes wrong?

If you have any concerns or wish to complain, you should contact the researcher Sobia Hussain or Kevin Woods in the first instance.

If there are any issues regarding this research that you would prefer not to discuss with members of the research team, please contact the research practice and Governance co-ordinator by either writing to “The Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL” by emailing Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk, or by telephoning 0161 2757583.

Thank you very much for considering participation in my study.
Consent form

If you are happy for your child to participate in the research then please complete and sign the consent below.

1. I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above study and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my child’s participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw her/him at any time without giving a reason.

3. I understand that the observation will be video recorded.

4. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes.

5. I agree that any data collected may be passed onto other researchers.

6. I agree that any data collected may be published in anonymous form in academic books or journals.

7. I agree for my child to take part in the above research project.

Name of participant                                      Date                              signature

Name of person giving consent                             Date                              signature
Appendix 9: Interview schedule 1
Schedule for semi-structured interview 1

Interview length:

About the interviewee:

Profession: Trainee Educational Psychologist

Length of employment as an EP:

Date:

Time:

Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to take part in the first interview of two in this research project. Can I first of all assure you that, all your responses will remain completely anonymous and no records of the interview will be kept with your name. Also I would like to ask you for permission to audio record this interview. The main reason behind this recording is to have the set of accurate data – your responses and opinions. Also it will facilitate the analysis of the data I have to conduct during the course of the project.

Do you have any questions before you start?

If you don’t have any further questions, I would like briefly to introduce you to the subject of this interview. As you know, this research is looking at your dynamic assessment (DA) practice with regards to children in the early years foundation stage (EYFS). I am interested in your honest views, reflections and opinions about this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Probe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What type and level of mediation is required to support children in the EYFS?</td>
<td>What framework if any are you going to use when delivering DA with this child?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why have you chosen this framework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How will you record the information obtained?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you done any planning for the observation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roughly how much time have you spent planning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What resources are you going to use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why have you chosen these resources to use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type and level of mediation do you hope to use with this child? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What areas of child development are you hoping that DA will provide insight into?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How do EPs evaluate the usefulness of DA for assessing and identifying the needs of children in the EYFS? |
| When do you think it is/would be useful to use DA with this group? |
| Can you tell me more about the possible purposes of using DA with EYFS children? |
| What would be useful to use in the future? |

3. What implications does DA have for intervention for children in the EYFS? |
| What barriers may limit your understanding of child development? |
| How will this assessment inform your intervention for this child? |

**CLOSURE**
We seem to have covered a great deal of ground and you have been very patient. But do you think there's anything we've missed out? Do you have any other comments about what we have discussed, or about the research as a whole? Do you want to see a transcript of the interview? I will send you a summary of the research findings some time towards the end of 2017 and you are welcome to have a full copy of the final report too.
Appendix 10: interview schedule 2
Schedule for semi-structured interview 2

Interview length:
About the interviewee:
Profession: Trainee Educational Psychologist
Length of employment as an EP:
Date:
Time:

Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to take part in the second interview in this research project. Again, can I first of all assure you that, all your responses will remain completely anonymous and no records of the interview will be kept with your name. Also I would like to ask you for permission to audio record this interview. The main reason behind this recording is to have the set of accurate data – your responses and opinions. Also it will facilitate the analysis of the data I have to conduct during the course of the project.

Do you have any questions before you start?

If you don’t have any further questions, I would like briefly to introduce you to the subject of this interview. As you know, this research is looking at your DA assessment practice with regards to children in the early years foundation stage (EYFS). I am interested in your honest views, reflections and opinions about this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Probe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What type and level of mediation is required to support children in the EYFS?</td>
<td>What type of mediation did you use to support the child?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What level of mediation did you use to support the child?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did you obtain useful information?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you give examples from the video please?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What responses did you get from the child?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which toys/objects worked well?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What went well in terms of the mediation used?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did not go according to your framework/plan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do EPs evaluate the usefulness of DA for assessing and identifying the needs of children in the EYFS?</td>
<td>How useful has this method of assessment been in terms of identification of need?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has this been a useful exercise for you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What did you find useful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What did you find went well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What didn’t go well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you feel could have improved the process/delivery?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would you recommend this approach to other EPs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What was the best part of the interaction for you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could you have obtained this information from a standardised assessment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What information have you obtained that is different from doing a standardised assessment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How may you have done things differently?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How useful has this method of assessment been in terms of informing intervention?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What understanding did DA provide about the child’s development?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What areas of child development have you identified?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you know now that you didn’t know before about this child?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What implications does DA have for intervention for children in the EYFS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How can you use the information obtained from the interaction to inform intervention?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will you use this information?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What implications does DA have for intervention?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your targets going to be for this child?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whom will these strategies be shared with?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSURE**

We seem to have covered a great deal of ground and you have been very patient. But do you think there is anything we’ve missed out? Do you have any other comments about what we have discussed, or about the research as a whole? Do you want to see a transcript of the interview? I will send you a summary of the research findings some time towards the end of 2017 and you are welcome to have a full copy of the final report too.
Appendix 11: Braun and Clarke’s (2006) Thematic Analysis
Braun and Clarke’s (2006) phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information will be transcribed before it is analysed using Braun and Clarke’s (2006) 6 phase Thematic Analysis in order identify, analyse, and report patterns.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Familiarising yourself with your data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Generating initial codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Searching for themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reviewing themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Defining and naming themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Producing the report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 12: Thematic analysis data trail
Data trail

EP1 - transcript interview 2 – RQ1

Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to take part in the second interview in this research project. Again, can I first of all assure you that, all your responses will remain completely anonymous and no records of the interview will be kept with your name. Also I would like to ask you for permission to audio record this interview. The main reason behind this recording is to have the set of accurate data – your responses and opinions. Also it will facilitate the analysis of the data I have to conduct during the course of the project.

Do you have any questions before you start?

If you don’t have any further questions, I would like briefly to introduce you to the subject of this interview. As you know, this research is looking at your DA assessment practice with regards to children in the early years foundation stage (EYFS). I am interested in your honest views, reflections and opinions about this area.

TEP: So the first question is just looking at the type and level of mediation that is required to support children in the EYFS. So what type of mediation did you use to support the child?

EP: I think it was mainly focusing mediation and a little bit about relevance which is related to the focusing because sort of not left to her own devices necessarily, but she did tend to wonder of onto sort of irrelevant tracks and so needed bringing back to this is the task, the task is, so that is the main type of mediation. But there was also mediation about pattern and I was keen to use the word pattern and to see her understanding of pattern because I think initially I felt that she put out a random collection of objects and so I wasn’t modelling the idea of patterns so I guess the modelling was the level of mediation as well, so there was some modelling to start things of, having hopefully trying to see what she was doing spontaneously so when I asked her to make a pattern I felt she just put them together randomly. I then modelled making a pattern and the idea of the repetition that you have of you know you have red blue, red blue whatever it is and you repeat the pattern, and the sort of approximation as well so when she was looking at the sizes of the bears and she wants to check whether they are different sizes, I just moved the two bears nearer to each other but I didn’t push them side by side because I just wanted to see what she made of it when she could see the two bears, and she then pushed them side by side to see if they were the same
size, now and I sort of stopped myself from pushing them and so I just moved them towards her and moved the two bears and there you are.

**TEP:** What level of mediation did you use to support the child?

**EP:** well indeed in terms of level I suppose you know you talk about how close it is the tasks and modelling and imitation would be fairly close to the task. So it would be a high level of mediation, you know on the thing I give out to trainees about levels of mediations we have this concept of nought to ten and I never talk about numbers but nought would be the most distance where you would do nothing almost and ten would be hand over hand prompting so we weren’t doing that so had she continued to do things randomly I might of, I might of more explicitly modelled in doing red, yellow, red yellow and vocalised as well and I didn’t have to do hand over hand and get her to hold her hand but modelling and demonstration is fairly close to the actual task.

**Example of coding**

**TEP:** So the first question is just looking at the type and level of mediation that is required to support children in the EYFS. So what type of mediation did you use to support the child?

1. **Focusing mediation**
   I think it was mainly focusing mediation

2. **Relevance**
   and a little bit about relevance which is related to the focusing because sort of not left to her own devices necessarily,

3. **Needed bringing back**
   but she did tend to wander of onto sort of irrelevant tracks and so needed bringing back to this is the task, the task is, so that is the main type of mediation.

4. **Mediation about pattern**
   But there was also mediation about pattern and I was keen to use the word pattern and to see her understanding of pattern because I think initially I felt that she put out a random collection of objects and so I wasn’t modelling the idea of patterns

5. **Level of mediation**
   I guess the modelling was the level of mediation as well

6. **Modelling**
so there was some modelling to start things of, having hopefully trying to see what she was doing spontaneously so when I asked her to make a pattern I felt she just put them together randomly.

7. Repetition
I then modelled making a pattern and the idea of the repetition that you have of you know you have red blue, red blue whatever it is and you repeat the pattern,

8. Approximation of size
and the sort of approximation as well so when she was looking at the sizes of the bears and she wants to check whether they are different sizes,

9. Moved objects closer to each other
I just moved the two bears nearer to each other but I didn’t push them side by side because I just wanted to see what she made of it when she could see the two bears, and she then pushed them side by side to see if they were the same size,

10. Moved them towards her
now and I sort of stopped myself from pushing them and so I just moved them towards her and moved the two bears and there you are.

TEP: What level of mediation did you use to support the child?

11. High level of mediation using modelling
well indeed in terms of level, I suppose you know you talk about how close it is the tasks and modelling and imitation would be fairly close to the task. So it would be a high level of mediation,

12. Concept of 0 to 10
you know on the thing I give out to trainees about levels of mediations we have this concept of nought to ten

13. 0- nothing almost
and I never talk about numbers but nought would be the most distance where you would do nothing almost

14. 10-hand over hand
and ten would be hand over hand prompting so we weren’t doing that so had she continued to do things randomly I might of,
15. Modelling and demonstration
I might of more explicitly modelled in doing red, yellow, red yellow and vocalised as well and I didn’t have to do hand over hand and get her to hold her hand but modelling and demonstration is fairly close to the actual task.

Generating initial themes

TEP: So the first question is just looking at the type and level of mediation that is required to support children in the EYFS. So what type of mediation did you use to support the child?

1. High level of mediation - focusing mediation
I think it was mainly focusing mediation

2. Relevance
and a little bit about relevance which is related to the focusing because sort of not left to her own devices necessarily,

3. Needed bringing back
but she did tend to wander of onto sort of irrelevant tracks and so needed bringing back to this is the task, the task is, so that is the main type of mediation.

4. Successful use of mediation - mediation about pattern
But there was also mediation about pattern

5. Keen to use word pattern
and I was keen to use the word pattern and to see her understanding of pattern because I think

6. I was modelling pattern
initially I felt that she put out a random collection of objects and so I was modelling the idea of patterns

7. Level of mediation
I guess the modelling was the level of mediation as well

8. Modelling
so there was some modelling to start things off, having hopefully trying to see what she was doing spontaneously so when I asked her to make a pattern I felt she just put them together randomly. I then modelled making a pattern

9. Repetition
I then modelled making a pattern and the idea of the repetition that you have of you know you have red blue, red blue whatever it is and you repeat the pattern,

10. **Approximation of size**
and the sort of approximation as well so when she was looking at the sizes of the bears and she wants to check whether they are different sizes,

11. **Moved objects closer to each other**
I just moved the two bears nearer to each other but I didn’t push them side by side because I just wanted to see what she made of it when she could see the two bears, and she then pushed them side by side to see if they were the same size,

12. **Moved objects towards her**
now and I sort of stopped myself from pushing them and so I just moved them towards her and moved the two bears and there you are.

TEP: What level of mediation did you use to support the child?

13. **High level of mediation using modelling**
well indeed in terms of level, I suppose you know you talk about how close it is the tasks and modelling and imitation would be fairly close to the task. So it would be a high level of mediation,

14. **Modelling and imitation**
I might of more explicitly modelled in doing red, yellow, red yellow and vocalised as well and

15. **No hand over hand**
I didn’t have to do hand over hand and get her to hold her hand

16. **Close to task**
but modelling and demonstration is fairly close to the actual task.

17. **Concept of 0 to 10**
you know on the thing I give out to trainees about levels of mediations we have this concept of nought to ten

18. **0- nothing almost**
and I never talk about numbers but nought would be the most distance where you would do nothing almost
19. **10-hand over hand**

and ten would be hand over hand prompting so we weren’t doing that so had she continued to do things randomly I might of.
### Interview 2 - Example Sub Themes and Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focusing mediation (1)</th>
<th>Relevance (2) Needed bringing back (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-I think it was mainly focusing mediation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-and a little bit about relevance which is related to the focusing because sort of not left to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-her own devices necessarily, but she did tend to wander of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onto sort of irrelevant tracks and so needed bringing back to this is the task, the task is, so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that is the main type of mediation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediation about pattern (4)</th>
<th>Keen to use word pattern (5) I wasn’t modelling pattern (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>But there was also mediation about pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 -and I was keen to use the word pattern and to see her understanding of pattern because I think</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-initially I felt that she put out a random collection of objects and so I wasn’t modelling the idea of patterns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of mediation (7)</th>
<th>Modelling (8) Repetition (9) Approximation of size (10) Moved objects closer to each other (11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-I guess the modelling was the level of mediation as well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so there was some modelling to start things off, having hopefully trying to see what she was doing spontaneously so when I asked her to make a pattern I felt she just put them together randomly. I then modelled making a pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-I then modelled making a pattern and the idea of the repetition that you have of you know you have red blue, red blue whatever it is and you repeat the pattern,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| High level of mediation using modelling (13) | Moved objects towards her (12) | 10-and the sort of approximation as well so when she was looking at the sizes of the bears and she wants to check whether they are different sizes,  
11-I just moved the two bears nearer to each other but I didn’t push them side by side because I just wanted to see what she made of it when she could see the two bears, and she then pushed them side by side to see if they were the same size (child made pattern),  
12-now and I sort of stopped myself from pushing them and so I just moved them towards her and moved the two bears and there you are.  
13-well indeed in terms of level, I suppose you know you talk about how close it is the tasks and modelling and imitation would be fairly close to the task. So it would be a high level of mediation,  
14-I might of more explicitly modelled in doing red, yellow, red yellow and vocalised as well and  
15-I didn’t have to do hand over hand and get her to hold her hand  
16-but modelling and demonstration is fairly close to the actual task.  
17-you know on the thing I give out to trainees about levels of mediations we have this concept of nought to ten  
18-and I never talk about numbers but nought would be the most distance where you would do nothing almost |}

| Modelling and demonstration (14) | No hand over hand (15) Close to task (16) | 10-and the sort of approximation as well so when she was looking at the sizes of the bears and she wants to check whether they are different sizes,  
11-I just moved the two bears nearer to each other but I didn’t push them side by side because I just wanted to see what she made of it when she could see the two bears, and she then pushed them side by side to see if they were the same size (child made pattern),  
12-now and I sort of stopped myself from pushing them and so I just moved them towards her and moved the two bears and there you are.  
13-well indeed in terms of level, I suppose you know you talk about how close it is the tasks and modelling and imitation would be fairly close to the task. So it would be a high level of mediation,  
14-I might of more explicitly modelled in doing red, yellow, red yellow and vocalised as well and  
15-I didn’t have to do hand over hand and get her to hold her hand  
16-but modelling and demonstration is fairly close to the actual task.  
17-you know on the thing I give out to trainees about levels of mediations we have this concept of nought to ten  
18-and I never talk about numbers but nought would be the most distance where you would do nothing almost |}

| Concept of 0 to 10 (17) | 0-nothing almost (18) 10-hand over hand (19) | 10-and the sort of approximation as well so when she was looking at the sizes of the bears and she wants to check whether they are different sizes,  
11-I just moved the two bears nearer to each other but I didn’t push them side by side because I just wanted to see what she made of it when she could see the two bears, and she then pushed them side by side to see if they were the same size (child made pattern),  
12-now and I sort of stopped myself from pushing them and so I just moved them towards her and moved the two bears and there you are.  
13-well indeed in terms of level, I suppose you know you talk about how close it is the tasks and modelling and imitation would be fairly close to the task. So it would be a high level of mediation,  
14-I might of more explicitly modelled in doing red, yellow, red yellow and vocalised as well and  
15-I didn’t have to do hand over hand and get her to hold her hand  
16-but modelling and demonstration is fairly close to the actual task.  
17-you know on the thing I give out to trainees about levels of mediations we have this concept of nought to ten  
18-and I never talk about numbers but nought would be the most distance where you would do nothing almost |
Interview 2 – example sub themes and codes pertaining to the overarching theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focusing mediation (1)</th>
<th>Relevance (2) Needed bringing back (3)</th>
<th>RQ1 high level of mediation used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-I think it was mainly focusing mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-and a little bit about relevance which is related to the focusing because sort of not left to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-her own devices necessarily, but she did tend to wander of onto sort of irrelevant tracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and so needed bringing back to this is the task, the task is, so that is the main type of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mediation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation about pattern (4)</td>
<td>Keen to use word pattern (5) I was modelling pattern (9) Moved bears nearer towards child (12) Child produced a systematic pattern (12)</td>
<td>RQ1 successful use of mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-But there was also mediation about pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-and I was keen to use the word pattern and to see her understanding of pattern because I think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-initially I felt that she put out a random collection of objects and so I was modelling the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>idea of patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-I then modelled making a pattern and the idea of the repetition that you have of you know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>you have red blue, red blue whatever it is and you repeat the pattern,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12-now and I sort of stopped myself from pushing them and so I just moved them towards her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and moved the two bears and there you are (child produced a systematic pattern).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level of mediation (7), Modelling (8), Repetition (9) | Modelling (8)  
| Repetition (9)  
| Approximation of size (10)  
| Moved objects closer to each other (11)  
| Moved objects towards her (12) | RQ1 level of mediation used  
| 7-I guess the modelling was the level of mediation as well  
| 8-so there was some modelling to start things off, having hopefully trying to see what she was doing spontaneously so when I asked her to make a pattern I felt she just put them together randomly. I then modelled making a pattern  
| 9-I then modelled making a pattern and the idea of the repetition that you have of you know you have red blue, red blue whatever it is and you repeat the pattern,  
| 10-and the sort of approximation as well so when she was looking at the sizes of the bears and she wants to check whether they are different sizes,  
| 11-I just moved the two bears nearer to each other but I didn’t push them side by side because I just wanted to see what she made of it when she could see the two bears, and she then pushed them side by side to see if they were the same size,  
| 12-now and I sort of stopped myself from pushing them and so I just moved them towards her and moved the two bears and there you are. |
| High level of mediation using modelling/ imitation (13) | High level of mediation using modelling/ imitation (13)  
| RQ1 high level of mediation used  
| 13-well indeed in terms of level, I suppose you know you talk about how close it is the tasks and modelling and imitation would be fairly close to the task. So it would be a high level of mediation, |
| Modelling and imitation (14) | No hand over hand (15)  
| Close to task (16) | RQ1 high level of |
| 14-I might of more explicitly modelled in doing red, yellow, red yellow and vocalised as well and |
| Concept of 0 to 10 (17) | 0-nothing almost (18) | **RQ1 Level of mediation used** | 15-I didn’t have to do hand over hand and get her to hold her hand
16-but modelling and demonstration is fairly close to the actual task.

| Concept of 0 to 10 (17) | 0-nothing almost (18) | **RQ1 Level of mediation used** | 17-you know on the thing I give out to trainees about levels of mediations we have this concept of nought to ten
18-and I never talk about numbers but nought would be the most distance where you would do nothing almost
19-and ten would be hand over hand prompting so we weren’t doing that so had she continued to do things randomly I might of.

| Interesting information regarding language (20) | Language screen (21) | **RQ1 Level of mediation used** | 20-I think I have because the thing I found interesting is that you know initially some of the concerns were around not being totally coming and
21-I did a language screen and some area of language did come out as quite poor

| Resources worked well (48) | Didn’t appear uninterested (49) | **RQ1 Level of mediation used** | 48-I think so,
49-she didn’t appear uninterested with them so yeah I think overall, given I wanted to concentrate on pattern and sequence so they were ideal for that as you’ve got different sizes and colours and so on. she did concentrate, she did play with them
50-I mean it, its’ hard to tell,
51-I might’ve used something else which would’ve been more engaging,
Examples of thematic map generated

High level of mediation used
- Focusing mediation
  - Modelling/imitation

Successful use of mediation
- Mediating the pattern
  - Child produced systematic pattern

Level of mediation used
- Language screen – interesting information
  - Resources worked well
  - Modelling/imitation
  - Concept of mediation 1-10
**EP 1 interview 2 summary**

DA provided useful information in terms of providing structure for the child. For example sequence and order, clarity regarding task, given framework be clear about first and next and concept of order. This has implications for moving to year 1 and begin more formal stories. I noticed she required small prompts then did put bears together and compare the size. She also requires structure, I was looking to see if she could structure a narrative, its about looking at the process and not content. Again with prompt, she could recall the narrative in some sort of order. She was able to touch count to 30, Feuerstein does talk about number techniques.

If left, she does become side tracked and not thinking about first and next steps. I intervened and brought her back to the narrative. She then focused well. There was a systematic response coming through. She was thinking about order and size but she was getting tired towards the end.

**High level of mediation used**

I used focusing mediation mainly and a little about relevance, which is related to focusing. She needed bringing back to task. There was also mediation about pattern and her understanding of pattern. I explicitly modelled and vocalised but I didn’t hand over hand. Modelling and demonstration are fairly close to the task.

**Level of mediation used**

A high level of mediation was used. For example modelling and imitation was fairly close to the task. The modelling was the level of mediation as well. Modelling to start off then, the idea of repetition of colours, approximation of size (I moved the objects closer together), I moved the objects towards her. Zero would be most distance where you would do nothing and 10 would be hand over hand prompting. If she had continued to do things randomly, I may have done the hand over hand. Her language came out poor on the language screen.

**Successful use of mediation**
Mediating the pattern element was successful, trying to get her to make more systematic patterns. She produced pattern when there was repetition. The best part of the intervention was that she picked upon mediation and then produced something more systematic.
Appendix 13: Thematic maps for EP1
EP 1: themes emerging from interview 1 – RQ1 - What type and level of mediation is required to support children in the EYFS?
EP 1: themes emerging from interview 1 – RQ2 – evaluating the usefulness of DA

Planning DA
- Half an hour planning time
- Observe child in learning environment
- Read referral notes

DA resources chosen
- Resources chosen on basis of exploration

Barriers to using DA
- Not having a clear idea
- Staff understanding and expectations
- Difficulty in the early years
- Own professional stance
- Mediation itself
- Mediation is difficult to do
- Staff bring to the situation
- What the assessor and child bring to the situation
EP1: themes emerging from interview 1 -- RQ3 - Implications of using DA.

- Useful in the future
  - Training
  - Have a go
  - Combination of structure/less structure
- Implications for intervention
  - Insight into next steps
  - Discussion with staff about thinking skills
  - Cognitive assessment
  - Intervention
- Judy Waters guide is useful
  - Use resources the child likes
- Speech and language development using DA
EP1: themes emerging from interview 2 – RQ1 – the type and level of mediation used.
Confidence in delivering DA

What takes the place of a framework in head

Very confident

Principles and characteristics of mediation

Checklist

LA not wanting scores

First job

Background and link to DA

What did not go according to plan

More structured way

How dynamic was it?

DA not too hard to deliver

I look a lot of thinking

I deliver DA training

Some appreciation

Previous experience
EPI: themes emerging from interview 2 – RQ2 – evaluating the usefulness of DA.
EPI: themes emerging from interview 2 – RQ3 – what implications does DA have for intervention.

- **Implications for intervention**
  - Provide clear structure
  - Small prompts
  - Link between assessment and intervention
  - Can become side-tracked
  - Systematic approach/response
  - Next steps for learning
  - Share/feedback to staff
  - Transition/going to year 1
  - Expectations on child’s part
  - Contrast to standardised assessment

- **Why EP colleagues don’t deliver DA**
  - Time pressure
  - Focus on SEMH
  - Mediation is difficult
  - Insufficient training and supervision
Appendix 14: Thematic maps for EP2
EP2 interview 1 - RQ1 - What type and level of mediation is required to support children in the EYFS?
EP2: themes emerging from interview 1 – RQ2 – evaluating the usefulness of DA.

- Evaluating the usefulness of DA
  - Reflecting
  - Don't evaluate any approach
  - Feedback to key people

- Useful to use DA
  - With complex children
  - Good for asking what it takes

- Purpose of DA
  - Feedback success
  - Rich information and holistic picture
  - Deeper understanding
  - What it takes to do something better
EP2: themes emerging from interview 1 – RQ3 - what implications does DA have for intervention.
EP2: themes emerging from interview 2 – RQ1 – the type and level of mediation used.

- High level of mediation used
  - Managing feelings of competence
  - Making the task specific
  - Things child found difficult

- Varied level of mediation used
  - Focusing attention
  - Physical prompts
  - Verbal prompts
  - Highest level of mediation for tasks child found hard

- Successful mediation used
  - Feedback to staff that this works
  - Managing feelings of failure
  - Specific direction, repeating, and questioning child
  - Loads of mediation used
  - Focusing attention to help child do the task

- What did not go well
  - Gross motor stuff – use of balls
  - Labelling behaviour
EP2: themes emerging from interview 2 – RQ2 – evaluating the usefulness of DA.
EP2: Themes emerging from interview 2 – RQ3 - what implications does DA have for intervention.

Useful method in terms of informing intervention
- Creating framework for staff
- Visually model
- Get child to evaluate

How information will be used
- 2 ways
  - Feed into EHCP process
  - Around staff managing approach

Using the information obtained
- Set the pace
- Give specific direction
- Manage the competence
- Talk about what worked well with staff

DA gives something different
- Gives specifics
- Can explain why it works well

Targets
- General management strategies
- Managing frustration
- Slowing down
Appendix 15: Content Analysis Framework for EP1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of mediation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Successful or not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Creating curiosity/suspense | 1         | The EP introduced the bucket full of compare bears (materials: compare bears and coloured beads). The child was motivated and engaged throughout the session.  
  
  *So shall we see what I have got down here? Child showed curiosity and motivation.* | Y |
| Praise            | 23        | Praise was offered regularly by the EP after successful task completion. Child completed task independently after being modelled to. She was able to complete the pattern once shown what to do. Child made a pattern using the coloured bears. She worked in a systematic fashion.  
  
  *Wow, you’re really clever, very good.* | Y |
| Classification    | 17        | Pile of compare bears and coloured beads were placed in the centre. The child had to sort them accordingly. EP provided verbal prompts initially and questioned the child’s thinking. The EP wanted to see whether the child could group and use alternative thinking.  
  
  *Find another one to go with that. Can you find any more to* | Y |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HL</th>
<th>Perspective taking</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>The EP wanted to see how the child was communicating in a way that reflects awareness of another's presence and the need to understand their point of view. This was done a lot through questioning the child’s choices and decisions she was making. (Materials: compare bears, coloured beads, paper and crayons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Why have you sorted them out like that (touches them?)**
| **So we’ve got these shapes (points) and that shape and that one, that shape and that shape**
| **Where does that one go then?**
| **Does that roll? Where will you put it then?**
| **Ok, good, so find another one to go here (points)** |
| HL | Short Term Auditory Memory | 11 | The EP wanted to assess short term auditory recall and sequential narrative. The child was told the story and then asked to recall the story in order. She struggled and therefore was provided with visual pictures to help her. Once shown visual |
material, she was able to recall in order.

(Materials: short stories, visual materials)

*Do you know a story of the 3 bears? I wonder if you can tell me the story of Goldilocks and the 3 bears. Can you remember what I just said? So can you now tell me what happens at the end of the story?*

| HI Visual Sequential Memory | 22 | The EP assessed short term rote recall of visual objects and application of visual memory strategies. The EP used variation in the resources to assess this. For example, items of the same colour but different size to question the child’s understanding. The child needed verbal prompts to help her and visual clues.  

(materials: small toys)  

*So how are all these the same? That’s how they are different, how they are all the same? What can we do with these but not these?* | Y |

| HI Verbal Planning Reflecting | 37 | After the EP introduced a task to the child, she guided completion by asking the child what she was about to do. The EP wanted to | Y |
see if the child had an approach that she was going to use. Most of the time, the child was unsure and verbal prompting in terms of order was very useful for the child. Breaking down the task and providing clear steps to guide completion. The EP also reflected this back to the child to reinforce the strategies and skills. It provided the child with a sense of order.

(materials: picture sequence; processes: communication of strategic plan for completion of a familiar activity)

What are you going to do first?
Think about what you would do first?

I saw that you were able to do this really well. You were able to sort very well when you looked and listened to what I was saying.

| HL-Sequential Pattern Completion of the pattern) | 5 | The EP assessed the child’s awareness of repeated shape pattern and completion. The EP asked the child to complete some patterns. To begin with the child was unsure. However after the EP offered verbal prompting and modelling, the child was able to imitate and complete the | Y |
task. This EP went onto explore complex patterns with the child.
The child found the element of competition motivating.

(materials: set of diagrams, compare bears)

Can we put the bears away now because I have something different to show you now?

Let’s have a think, you make one and I will guess the pattern and I’ll see if I can carry on your pattern. You can be the teacher.

So you sorted them out for me didn’t you? You put some of the colours together didn’t you?

P practitioner

HL Haywood and Lidz (2006)
Appendix 16: Content Analysis Framework for EP2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of mediation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Successful or not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating curiosity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The EP created curiosity for the child. She was very creative in her approach and the party theme was very motivating for the child.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthday party theme – what do I have here? Shall we see if humpty dumpty wants a plate for his food?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing attention on the task (physical nature of task)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>The child had to be reminded frequently about where to look when carrying out most of the activities. The EP wanted to see whether focus on task leads to task completion. She wanted to see whether the lack of attention leads to failure of the task.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at all the things on the tray while you are carrying them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making it clear – giving the task meaning – being specific in task</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>All the activities used by the EP had meaning for the child. The EP was very task specific and clear. The child knew why she was engaging in an activity. For example when getting the child to hold a tray, she made her walk towards the teddies pretending to be carrying some food for them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EP wanted to see whether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Questioning and evaluating the child’s skills/processes and awareness of task</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>The EP questioned the child’s choices and the processes she used for task completion. She aimed to reinforce the steps and provide the child with some logical order. Questioning the child helped the EP to work out what she can and cannot do for herself. It allowed her to identify where the child was going wrong or what she was struggling with. This then helped inform intervention later on. For example providing the child clear structure by breaking up the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Making it fun</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>The EP used a teddy bear’s party as a theme for carrying out the dynamic assessment. The child was engaged and motivated throughout the session.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plate for teddy, party games, Can you pour this into there? Can you spin like this?

Which one do you think is best for pouring? Why do you think that one? Is it easier now? What do we keep our eye on? What were the magic things we do?

Party games - Spinning in chair, dancing to music with humpty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choosing the correct resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The EP made the tasks meaningful and fun for the child. She chose the resources based on what the child did not have success with. She wanted to see what it takes for the child to be able to carry out certain activities. Dried rice, tray, containers, sponge balls (different sizes), paper plate, teddies, plastic chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>After successful completion of the task, the child was praised by the EP. This made the child try harder and put more effort into completion of the tasks. This worked well throughout the session. Well done, fab, good girl, clever girl, clapping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modelling</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>The EP modelled activities to the child and this proved to be beneficial because after observing the EP, the child was able to carry out the activity independently. This proved to be very successful and showed that the child is able to watch, learn and imitate. Cutting, rolling balls, kicking the ball, wow, see my pointy bit has to go there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for failure – normalising and giving</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Once the EP had established that the child was unable to complete the task independently, she normalised the activity and gave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
permission to fail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permission to fail</th>
<th>the child permission to fail. For example, when the child was unable to carry the tray across to the cabinet independently. The EP was quick to manage and normalise this so that the child did not feel incompetent. This was a good example of the EP managing failure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical prompts – hand over hand mediation to manage failure</td>
<td>The EP had to use hand over hand mediation to help guide the child and support completion of task. This was evident when she was doing the practical activities such as pouring the rice into the beaker or cutting the plate for the teddy. She needed support with her fine motor skills. Again the EP was quick to provide the support and minimise failure. Once hand over hand mediation was provided, the child was able to try again and complete the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal prompts</td>
<td>The child needed a lot of verbal mediation from the EP. This helped the child to focus and stay on task. This was evident during completion of each task by the child. The EP wanted to see</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
whether the child could stay on task and maintain focus in order to complete the task. Verbal prompts helped bring the child’s attention back to the task.

*Can you see here, are you looking? Ready steady, roll it, put your hands on the floor and get up, twist your wrist round, do it slowly, hold that one still, hold your cup, move your hand round.*

| Setting expectations and managing feelings of competence | 15 | The EP provided verbal encouragement and set expectations before asking the child to conduct an activity. For example, *I know you can cut me a plate for the teddy bears party. He would like you to cut a plate for him.* The provided clarity for the child.

*I think you can do this, was that easier? I’m going to give you a special thing to look for.* | Y |

<p>| Allowing child limitations | 4 | The child looked for opportunities to sit down whilst engaging in activities. For example, when playing musical chairs or dancing to party songs. The EP allowed for her to do this within the session and this was noted and fed back to staff. The EP wanted to work out the child’s needs and what she finds difficult to help her inform intervention. She realised that short | Y |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breaks would be beneficial for the child.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child wanting to sit down when rolling the ball, EP followed lead and did the same.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Challenge | 6 | The EP set some challenge. She allowed the child to spin in the chair independently to give her insight into her gross motor skills. The child then aimed to please her and tried harder, although this proved to be a difficult task for the child. The EP wanted to see what the child would do when demand was placed on her. For example, she made her spin around in a small chair and then point to some objects. *Shall we see if you can do this? I think you can go really high.* |

| Giving child control over task | 10 | The EP allowed the child to repeat the activity after mediation was offered. This reinforced the skill and gave the child some control. For example, the EP allowed the child to carry the tray back to the table or pour the rice into the beaker independently after the child initially struggled to do so. *Your turn, can you take this back over? You can cut it all off.* |

| Setting the pace | 10 | The child had to be slowed down and encouraged to take her time | Y |
when engaging in the cutting and pouring activities. Hand over hand mediation was used along with verbal prompting to help her do this. The EP had to break down the tasks and provide step by step instructions. Verbal prompts and modelling was used. This was also a useful strategy because it helped the child to successfully complete the task.

*Let’s do it nice and slowly, slowly snip, do it slowly. First you need to do this, then we do this.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflecting back – labelling what the child is doing</th>
<th>The EP reflected back what the child did well and what helped her to complete the task independently. This helped the child to hear the order of the instructions and provided a structure. The EP provided the child clear steps for task completion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="#">Practitioner</a></td>
<td><em>Remember when you did this? You did that really slowly, remember what you have to keep your eye on, you’ve made him a plate, you are cutting it all off.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practitioner

Lidz (2003)
Appendix 17: Thematic Maps for Research Questions 1, 2 and 3.
Thematic Map 1: RQ1 – What type and level of mediation is used to support children in the Early Years Foundation Stage?
Thematic Map 2: RQ2 - How do EPs evaluate the usefulness of dynamic assessment for assessing and identifying the needs of children in the Early Years Foundation Stage?
Thematic Map 3: RQ3 - what implications does DA have for intervention for children in the Early Years Foundation Stage?

**KEY**
- Overarching theme
- Sub theme