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Motivational interviewing (MI) has been used extensively and often effectively in medical settings to support behaviour change in adults. There is emerging evidence that MI may also be a useful approach for working with young people in schools. This thesis investigated the effectiveness of MI in educational settings and is presented in three sections.

The first paper is an evaluative systematic literature review examining the evidence for student-focused MI in educational settings. Eleven studies were included in the review, although just eight were identified as ‘best evidence’ and included in the synthesis. Overall there is evidence for the effectiveness of student-focused MI in the areas of behaviour, school-based motivation and academic achievement. However, a number of methodological weaknesses were identified in the existing literature, which provides clear pointers for future research.

Previous research has highlighted the potential usefulness of MI when used as a therapeutic intervention with disaffected students. However, to date, there has been little published research investigating students’ views on MI. The second paper aims to investigate students’ views on an MI intervention. Three disaffected students took part in an individual MI intervention, which was delivered by three educational psychologists (EPs). Semi-structured interviews were used to obtain the students’ views, immediately after the intervention and again at a follow-up interview three months later. The results indicated that students were enthusiastic about the intervention and most perceived that there had been a positive impact on their learning motivation and classroom behaviour. However, these results were not consistent with questionnaire responses and two of the students experienced exclusions around the time of the intervention. The implications of these ambiguous findings are discussed in relation to the use of therapeutic interventions by EPs and the possible factors that are crucial to the success of MI interventions.

The third paper provides a critical appraisal of the overall research process, including implications of the work, wider context of the research and dissemination of evidence to professional practice.
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Abstract
The current systematic literature review sought to determine the effectiveness of Motivational Interviewing (MI) in educational settings. Student-focused school-based MI (SBMI) studies were assessed using qualitative and quantitative assessment frameworks and data were reported using PRISMA guidelines. Eleven studies met the inclusion criteria, although just eight were classified as ‘best evidence’ and included in the final synthesis. Seven of the included studies yielded positive findings and one study was neutral. Although there are methodological weaknesses in existing literature on student-focused SBMI, there is emerging evidence of its effectiveness for improving student outcomes in relation to academic achievement, behaviour and school-based motivation. Clear pointers for future research emerge from the review.

Keywords: Motivational interviewing, intervention, young people, children, systematic review.
Introduction

Background to motivational interviewing

Motivational Interviewing (MI) is described as a “collaborative conversation style for strengthening a person’s own motivation and commitment to change” (Miller & Rollnick, 2012, p.12). When using MI, the emphasis is on using effective language about change to allow individuals to explore and challenge their own patterns of behaviour, “so that people talk themselves into change, based on their own values and interests” (Miller & Rollnick, 2012, p.4). The skills and processes central to MI offer a framework and guidance to support client autonomy and assess perceived importance of and confidence in approaching change. Furthermore, MI is based on person-centred principles (cf. Rogers, 1965); has the therapeutic alliance at its core; and explicitly seeks to avoid behaviours which can lead to client disengagement, such as persuasion and confrontation. MI has been used extensively and often effectively in medical and clinical settings to support behaviour change in adults across numerous areas including alcohol, drug and tobacco use, diet, exercise, safe sex, gambling and engagement in treatment (Lundahl, Kunz, Brownwell, Tollefson & Burke, 2010).

Since its emergence in the 1980s, MI has been adapted and changed. Indeed, there have been significant changes to the central structure of MI across the three editions of the core text produced by Miller and Rollnick (1991, 2002, 2012). Much of the existing evidence base relates to the work of Miller and Rollnick (2002) within which the central tenets of MI were three aims that formed the ‘spirit’ of MI (autonomy, collaboration and evocation) and the four overall ‘principles’ (expressing empathy, developing discrepancy, rolling with resistance and supporting self-efficacy). More recently, Miller and Rollnick (2012) reconceptualised MI in response to its ongoing development within practice, further emphasising the processes of MI and the underlying premise of demonstrating a genuine desire to promote the well-being of the client. To this effect, they redefined the spirit as having four dimensions (acceptance, collaboration, compassion and evocation) and changed the focus to processes (engaging, focusing, evoking and planning) rather than principles. Differences between the central elements of MI as defined by Miller and Rollnick (2002; 2012) are summarized in Table 1 below.
A fundamental set of skills are also used throughout MI to promote ‘active listening’ described by the acronym ‘OARS’, which reminds practitioners to use open-ended questions, affirmations, reflections and summaries (Miller & Rollnick, 2002). Demonstration of OARS is fundamental to assessments of MI competence (e.g. Moyers, Martin, Manuel, Hendrickson, & Miller, 2005) and therefore an important feature in ensuring MI fidelity.

In the past a number of frameworks have been developed to support the use of MI as an intervention, including the Menu of Strategies (Rollnick, Heather and Bell, 1992), Motivation Enhancement Therapy (Miller, Zweben, DiClemente & Rychtarik, 1994) and FRAMES (Miller & Sanchez, 1994). These may have arisen from the needs of practitioners who requested greater direction in using MI (Rollnick et al. 1992). Whilst such models and frameworks have proved popular, Rollnick and Miller (1995) questioned whether MI might be weakened or simplified when used in this way. However, structured or manualised approaches to MI continue to be popular, particularly in domains where MI might be practised by non-specialists. In some cases, frameworks have continued the historic link with the Transtheoretical Model (TTM) (DiClemente & Prochaska, 1982) with the aim of improving client agency and empowering non-specialist professionals with a visual framework for assessing and accounting for readiness to change (Atkinson, 2013, 2014; McNamara, 2009).

---

**Table 1: Changes to the central components of Motivational Interviewing (Miller & Rollnick, 2002; 2012)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Spirit</th>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller &amp; Rollnick (2002)</td>
<td>Three elements – collaboration, evocation and autonomy</td>
<td>Four principles - Express empathy; develop discrepancy; roll with resistance; support self-efficacy.</td>
<td>Processes not explicitly defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller &amp; Rollnick (2012)</td>
<td>Four elements – acceptance, collaboration, compassion and evocation</td>
<td>Principles not explicitly defined</td>
<td>Four processes – engaging, focusing, evoking, planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of MI in educational settings

Kaplan (2014) argued that MI may work particularly well with children and young people (CYP), as the underlying principles, including valuing an individual’s autonomy and using a collaborative approach, align well with the needs of adolescents for independence and identity formation. There is evidence that MI has been used successfully with CYP in a range of different clinical areas such as substance abuse (Barnett, Sussman, Smith, Rohrbach & Spruijt-Metz, 2012), depression (Brody, 2009) and self-harm (Kamen, 2009). Strait, McQuillin, Smith and Englund (2012) cautioned however, that the use of MI with CYP is at an early stage of evaluation and that there may be limits to its transferability, particularly to work with younger children, given the cognitive and neuropsychological demands of the MI process. To provide a tangible example of this, Miller and Rollnick (2012) emphasised that exploring and understanding client values can play a key role in MI. When working with CYP, it is likely to be more challenging to explore and resolve ambivalence through contrasting behaviour with values, as these are still very much in emergence.

Although, more frequently used with CYP in medical and health settings, there is emerging evidence that MI is increasingly being used in schools and educational establishments. Frey et al. (2011) reported on the promise of MI in educational settings due to its flexibility and supporting evidence base. A survey indicated that MI was the fourth most popular therapeutic intervention used by educational psychologists in the United Kingdom (UK) (Atkinson, Bragg, Squires, Muscutt & Wasilewksi, 2011). Furthermore, in a recent editorial, Strait, McQuillin, Terry and Smith (2014) proposed two approaches to using MI in schools: student-focused SBMI and consultative-focused SBMI. Student-focused SBMI involves carrying out MI directly with CYP; whereas, consultative-focused SBMI involves using MI with teachers and parents, for instance, to enhance teachers’ motivation to implement new learning programmes and increase implementation fidelity of existing interventions (e.g. Frey et al., 2011; Frey et al., 2013; Lee, Frey, Herman & Reinke, 2014). This paper focuses on student-focused MI.

Rationale and aims of the current review

Given the promise of SBMI and recent interest in using MI with young people in educational settings, the current review aims to 1) establish the evidence for the effectiveness of student-focused SBMI and 2) determine the features of MI that have been used to date in student-focused SBMI interventions. Although, systematic
literature reviews are common in other areas of MI, Woods, McArdle and Tabassum (2014) published the only literature review on SBMI, however, this was small scale, restricted to UK-based studies and limited to studies published before 2011. Given the recent interest and research in SBMI, this paper aims to provide an up-to-date, international literature review on the effectiveness of SBMI. The current review focuses solely on student-focused SBMI as, although, there is emerging evidence for the use of consultative-focused SBMI, to date published research is mainly descriptive and currently there are insufficient empirical data to warrant the undertaking of a separate systematic literature review.

Method

Search strategy
A systematic search of the literature was conducted to include all studies relevant to the review questions using the following databases: PsycInfo, Education Resources Information Centre (ERIC) and the British Education Index (BEI). Literature searches were completed between January and August 2015 and the following search terms were used: ‘motivational interviewing’, ‘school’, ‘young people’ and ‘education’. Exclusions were made for ‘drug*’, “smok*” and ‘alcohol*’, in order to limit the number of articles from clinical and medical settings. Pertinent journals and article reference lists were also manually searched. Inclusion criteria were devised and all of the included studies met the following criteria: 1) participants must include CYP ranging in age from 5-21 years-old; 2) interventions must take place within a school or educational setting; 3) interventions are based on MI techniques; 4) studies are empirical (given the relative dearth of research into student-focused SBMI, the decision was taken to include studies which involved the collection of quantitative and/or qualitative data); 5) written in English; and 6) subjected to peer review in an academic journal.

Data classification
All studies that met the inclusion criteria were coded for quality using the framework developed for Bond, Woods, Humphrey, Symes and Green’s (2013) systematic literature review on the effectiveness of solution-focused brief therapy (SFBT). The papers were read by both authors, and rated by the first author as part of a professional doctoral assignment. Thereafter, all ratings were discussed with the second author (in the role of academic supervisor) and moderated accordingly, with discussions taking
place to achieve a consensus view. Descriptive and evaluative information were obtained for each included study. Information was also obtained about the MI techniques that were used in the different research studies.

Quantitative studies were evaluated using criteria drawn from the American Psychological Association (APA, 2006), which gave credit for use of a randomised group design; focus on a specific, well-defined disorder or problem; comparison with treatment-as-usual, placebo, or less preferably, standard control; use of manuals and procedures for monitoring and fidelity checks; sample large enough to detect effect (Cohen, 1992) and use of outcome measures(s) that has demonstrated good reliability and validity. One point was awarded for the presence of each of the criteria listed above. Quantitative studies were classified as ‘low’ quality research if a score of 0-2 points was achieved; ‘medium’ quality research scored 3-4 points and ‘high’ quality research achieved 5-7 points. Quantitative evaluation research ratings can be found in Appendix B1.

Qualitative studies were evaluated using criteria drawn from Spencer, Ritchie, Lewis and Dillon (2003) and Henwood and Pidgeon (1992). This checklist included the following criteria and one point was awarded for the presence of each: appropriateness of the research design; clear sampling rationale; well executed data collection; analysis close to the data; emergent theory related to the problem; evidence of explicit reflexivity; comprehensiveness of documentation; negative case analysis; clarity and coherence of the reporting; evidence of researcher-participant negotiation; transferable conclusions and evidence of attention to ethical issues. A qualitative study was categorised as ‘low’ quality if a total point score of 0-4 was achieved; ‘medium’ quality studies were rated at 5-8 points and ‘high’ quality achieved 9-12 points. Qualitative evaluation research ratings can be found in Appendix B2. Mixed methods studies were dual coded using both the qualitative and quantitative frameworks and were then awarded the highest point rating. Both qualitative and quantitative evaluations were based only on the information available within the academic journals.

Each study was also rated in terms of ‘methodological appropriateness’ and ‘focus of the study’ (Gough, 2007). Methodological appropriateness ratings took into account having an objective outcome measure; a clear rationale for participant selection and a clear description of the MI process. Scores of 1, 2 and 3 respectively were awarded for studies of low, medium and high appropriateness. Methodological appropriateness ratings can be found in Appendix B3. The focus of the study ratings was whether the
study contained key MI elements (e.g. reference to OARS and/or spirit and principles); was school-based and student-focused. Scores of 1, 2 or 3 were awarded depending on whether studies were of low, medium or high focus. Focus of the study ratings can be found in Appendix B4. Once a ‘high’, ‘medium’ or ‘low’ judgment had been made on each of the components, a combined score was created for each study. This score demonstrated the ‘overall weight of evidence’. See Appendix B5 for overall weight of evidence ratings.

**Results**

A Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flowchart (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff & Altman, 2009) illustrates the number of articles at each stage of the review (Figure 1). The process yielded 11 studies, which met the criteria, five of which were qualitative, five quantitative and one mixed methods. A description of the studies can be found in Table 2.

![Figure 1: PRISMA flowchart](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/ year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Follow Up</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
<th>Delivers</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson and Woods (2003)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1 x female 6th grade student aged 14-15 years</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td><em>Weekly weekly one hour MI sessions</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Use of other therapeutic and consultative techniques detailed</em></td>
<td>None</td>
<td><em>Teacher reported improvements in attendance and punctuality, attitude towards school and confidence</em></td>
<td>School psychology intern</td>
<td><em>Teacher reported improvements in attendance and punctuality, attitude towards school and confidence</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td><em>Teacher reported improvements in attendance and punctuality, attitude towards school and confidence</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enea &amp; Dafinoui (2009)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>38 adolescents aged 16-17 years from one high school</td>
<td>Non-randomised pilot study</td>
<td><em>19 experimental students undertook motivational stimulation techniques, including MI, solution-focused counseling and existentic methods</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Eight one-hour sessions</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Control group</em></td>
<td>None</td>
<td><em>Teacher reported improvements in attendance and teacher reports</em></td>
<td>Social work manager</td>
<td><em>Teacher reported improvements in class and at home</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td><em>Teacher reported improvements in attendance and teacher reports</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait et al. (2012)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>103 6th, 7th and 8th grade students</td>
<td>Randomised controlled study</td>
<td><em>Students randomly assigned to a wait-list control (n=53) or MI treatment group (n=50)</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Students in the treatment group took part in one session of MI</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Facilitators followed a structured interview protocol</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Facilitators had attended a 90-minute training session on MI techniques</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Supplemental materials were used, including a normative feedback worksheet and a goal sheet</em></td>
<td>None</td>
<td><em>Teacher reported improvements in attendance and teacher reports</em></td>
<td>School psychologists</td>
<td><em>Teacher reported improvements in attendance and teacher reports</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td><em>Teacher reported improvements in attendance and teacher reports</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Smith, Strait &amp; McQuillin (2013)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>49 6th, 7th and 8th grade students</td>
<td>Randomised controlled study</td>
<td><em>Students randomly assigned to a MI treatment (n=25) or wait-list control (n=24) condition</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>MI intervention based on the protocol developed by Strait et al. (2012)</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Students took part in a single 45 minute session of MI</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Report card coaches (facilitators) took part in three weekly trainings</em></td>
<td>None</td>
<td><em>Teacher reported improvements in attendance and teacher reports</em></td>
<td>3 graduate clinical community doctoral students and 2 bachelor-level research specialists</td>
<td><em>Teacher reported improvements in attendance and teacher reports</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td><em>Teacher reported improvements in attendance and teacher reports</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channon, Marsh, Jenkins &amp; Robing (2013)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>6th grade students (number not specified)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td><em>Peer support programme was developed, based on the principles of MI and delivered in one high school setting</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>6th grade students supported by 8th grade students with the aim of promoting well-being and academic achievement and reducing behavioural problems</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>8th grade facilitators attended two days training delivered by an experienced MI practitioner</em></td>
<td>None</td>
<td><em>A logical model framework summarized the resources, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact of the programme</em></td>
<td>8th grade students (up to 60)</td>
<td><em>A logical model framework summarized the resources, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact of the programme</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author/ year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Follow Up</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>Delivers</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Terry, Strait, McQuillin & Smith (2014) | USA | 42 6th, 7th and 8th grade students | Randomized controlled study | *Students randomly assigned to either a one session or two sessions of MI group with performance feedback (n=23 per group)  
*45 minute single session MI intervention developed by Strait et al. (2012)  
*Students in the two-session MI group participated in a MI session identical to the single-session MI group, but also received a performance feedback goal worksheet designed to elicit change talk via written format and to develop discrepancy every two weeks between the first session and second session  
*During the second session, facilitators reviewed the student’s summary of the problem and carried out activities to elicit change talk, develop discrepancy, support self-efficacy and increase intentions to change  
*Report card coaches took part in three bi-weekly trainings lasting approximately 1.5 hours each | None | *Pre- and post-intervention academic grades for maths, ELA, history and science  
*Self-efficacy subscale (Figueras & Miller), including items from the Children’s Perceived Self-efficacy scale (Bandura, 1990)  
*Student Engagement and Motivation Questionnaire (SEMQ; Sacki, 2012)  
*Student’s Life Satisfaction Scale (SLSS; Hurhens, 1991)  
*School Motivation and Learning Strategies Inventory (SMALSI; Stroud & Reynold, 2006) | *One way analysis of variance tests  
*Two-level hierarchical linear model | 3 graduate clinical community doctoral students and 3 bachelor-level research specialists | *Participants who received two sessions of MI demonstrated significantly higher grades in maths, science and history at post-test  
*No statistically significant effects of the two-session MI was found for ELA  
*Two sessions of MI increased affective engagement significantly more than one session  
*The effects for the other outcomes e.g. self-efficacy, life satisfaction, behavioral engagement were statistically insignificant |
| ShelBel, Lindstrom & Mc-Whiter (2014) | USA | 135 high school students, aged 12-20 years, in six schools | Pre-post-test one-group research design | *Sessions were an MI-based group career intervention called Motivational Enhancement Group Intervention (MEGI)  
*Facilitators received up to 8 hours of training in MI and MEGI by a member of the motivational interviewing network of trainers  
*Students took part in 10 one-hour weekly sessions implemented within existing transition and special education classes | None | *Demographic questionnaire  
*Adapted version of the Vocational Skills Self-efficacy Scale (VSE; Dweck, Lombar, Lindstrom & Gas, 2012)  
*Subscales from the Arc’s self-determination scale (ARC; Wehmeyer & Kelchner, 1995)  
*Vocational Outcomes Expectations- Revised (VOE-R, McWhiter & Matheny, 2009) | *Latent Change Score Model (LCSM) was used to analyse the change in pretest and posttest scores | Nine interventionists, which included special education teachers, transition specialists and a vocational rehabilitation counselor | *Participants reported a positive and significant change in vocational skills self-efficacy, self-determination and vocational outcome expectations |
| Cryer & Atkinson (2015) | UK | 1 x male elementary student aged 10 years old (Although the case study is part of a larger dataset of 3 participants) | Case study | *Four weekly sessions of MI  
*Sessions based on Facilitating Change 2 (Atkinson, 2013) resource pack, which was adapted to meet the needs of younger students | None | *Session evaluation  
*Researcher diary  
*Self-formulated assessment form  
*Student and teacher interviews | *Thematic analysis | School psychology intern | *Teacher reports of improved behaviour, engagement and confidence |
*Each session was conducted on an individual basis, with the student and facilitator  
*Delivered by five paraprofessionals after taking part in a 90-minute MI training session | None | *Pre- and post-intervention PFSSW Inventory  
*Staff focus group | *Descriptive statistics reported for PFSSW inventory  
*Thematic analysis of focus group responses | High school pastoral staff, including a student inclusion manager, assistant SENCO, attendance officer and two specialist teaching assistants | *Quantitative data indicated mixed but overall minimal impact on students’ school-based motivation  
*Paraprofessionals expressed positive views about the effectiveness of the intervention and identified benefits for the students |
Quality of the included studies

From the 11 studies, an initial pool of current ‘best evidence’ was drawn. However, given that the status of research literature in this area is still underdeveloped, and only a small sample of studies met review criteria, definitive conclusions about the effectiveness of SBMI must be made with caution. In the present review, a study was included as best evidence if it was evaluated as being at least medium quality in the overall weight of evidence judgment and at least medium in terms of methodological quality. Of the 11 studies, three were excluded due to low quality ratings. Of the remaining studies, six were high quality studies and two were medium quality studies. All quality ratings can be found in Appendix B5 and best evidence studies are highlighted in Table 2.

Study characteristics

The eight best evidence studies consisted of: three randomised control studies (RCTs), three case studies, one quasi-experimental design, and one mixed methods design. Four of the studies were conducted in the United States (US), while four were conducted in the UK. All studies were published between the years 2003 and 2015.

Sample

Sample sizes ranged from single cases to 135. Most studies reported on the use of MI with middle or high school students, although one study described an intervention with an elementary school child and another study’s sample ranged from 12-20 years old. Across the eight studies, the MI interventions were delivered by 12 different professionals, including, school psychology interns and graduate students, clinical psychology graduate students, clinical community doctoral students, bachelor-level research specialists, assistant special educational needs coordinator (SENCO), student inclusion manager, attendance officer, specialist teaching assistants, special education teachers, transition specialists and a vocational rehabilitation counsellor.

Intervention

Most of the best evidence studies applied MI directly with individual CYP, with just one study using group delivery. Four studies targeted disaffected students with emotional, behavioural and attendance concerns, three were focused on improving academic outcomes and one aimed to enhance career development in young people with disabilities. Intervention length varied from 10 sessions, to just one session of MI.
The intervention duration also varied considerably. In most studies the sessions were completed weekly, therefore the longest duration was 10 weeks.

In order to support the delivery of the MI interventions, facilitator training was mentioned in five of the studies. One of the studies described an extensive training programme, which took place over eight hours and was delivered by an experienced MI practitioner, whereas facilitators in other studies received only 90 minutes of training. MI interventions were manualised in five studies and fidelity monitoring was carried out in six. This ranged from facilitators completing self-report fidelity checklists (n=4) to scheduled session observations (n=2).

A number of MI process elements were described in the included studies (see Table 3). Most of the best evidence studies referred to the spirit and principles of MI (n=6) and one study mentioned the use of OARS. Reference was made to the use of the TTM in all four of the UK-based studies, although this was not a described feature of the US interventions. Other aspects included the Menu of Strategies (Rollnick et al, 1992) (n=4), active listening techniques (n=1) and change talk (n=2). Six of the studies used other techniques alongside MI including consultation (n=2), personal construct psychology (PCP) (n=1) and SFBT (n=1).

**Outcome measures**

A number of different outcome measures were used in the included studies. This included qualitative outcome measures, including interviews (n=2), focus groups (n=1) and transcribed sessions (n=3). Quantitative outcome measures ranged from pre- and post-intervention academic grades to self-report checklists, some of which had known validity and reliability and others were designed for the purpose of the intervention. Two studies relied solely on subjective assessments based on student self-reports, whereas other studies triangulated student data by obtaining more objective information from other sources, such as teachers, parents and school data. None of the studies included follow-up assessments.

**Findings**

Of the eight studies included in the pool of best evidence, seven provide positive evidence for MI and one study was neutral. The four UK-based studies report on the effectiveness of MI in relation to improving school-based motivation in disaffected students. Atkinson and Woods (2003) found improvements in attendance and punctuality, confidence with schoolwork and general attitude towards school after a 9th
## Table 3: Features of MI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/year</th>
<th>Spirit of MI</th>
<th>OARS</th>
<th>TTM</th>
<th>Menu of Strategies</th>
<th>Active Listening Techniques</th>
<th>Change Talk</th>
<th>Fidelity Monitoring</th>
<th>Other Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson &amp; Woods</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>PCP, SFBT, consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson &amp; Amesu</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Amesu (2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittles &amp; Atkinson</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action planning, summary letters, consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Atkinson (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enea &amp; Dafinou</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objective and solution-orientated counselling, extrinsic motivational stimulation e.g. behaviour contracts, reinforcements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait et al.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structured interview protocol, self-report fidelity checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Smith</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As Strait et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait &amp; McQuillin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channon, Marsh</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As Strait et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Jenkins &amp; Robing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Strait</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As Strait et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; McQuillin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Smith (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheftel, Lindstrom</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>MEGI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; McWhirter (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryer &amp; Atkinson</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-formulated MI assessment sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snape &amp; Atkinson</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Fidelity checks at MI session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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grade student took part in five sessions of MI. Kittles and Atkinson (2009) used MI as part of an initial consultation and found that two out of three students were positive about the MI process. Additionally useful assessment information was obtained from a single session of MI to support future interventions. In Cryer and Atkinson’s (2015) study, a 4th grade student displayed improvements in his behaviour and showed greater confidence after four, weekly sessions of MI. Snape and Atkinson’s (2015) study yielded mixed findings. Although, facilitators expressed positive views about the effectiveness of the MI intervention this was not necessarily supported by quantitative student self-reported data.

Three studies conducted in the US used MI as an intervention to improve students’ academic outcomes. In a RCT, Strait et al. (2012) found students who participated in a single MI session demonstrated significant improvements in their post-test maths scores, when compared to a control group. In a replication study, Terry, Smith, Strait and McQuilllin (2013) observed the same positive impact on students’ maths grades, in comparison to a wait-list control condition. Terry, Strait, McQuilllin and Smith (2014) then found that students who were randomly assigned to take part in two sessions of MI, combined with a performance feedback goal worksheet, demonstrated significantly higher grades in maths, science and history at post-intervention, than students who had participated in one MI session, indicating that two sessions of MI might have a larger and broader impact on academic grades. Effect sizes across the three studies can be found in Table 4 (adapted from Terry et al., 2014), where it is clear that the double-dosage effect improved effect sizes in maths and most notably in science. While meta-analytic techniques comparing the three studies are beyond the scope of this review, this is a potential focus for further review, particularly if more RCT studies are conducted in the area of student-focused SBMI.

Table 4: Effect sizes in RCT studies (adapted from Terry et al., 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall behaviour</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math grades</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.55*</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA grades</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science grades</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05
A further US study looked at the impact of MI on career development. Sheftel, Lindstrom & McWhirter (2014) found that students with disabilities, who took part in ten sessions of a group-based MI and Motivational Enhancement Group Intervention (MEGI) programme, demonstrated a positive and significant change in vocational skills self-efficacy, self-determination and vocational outcome expectations at post-intervention.

**Discussion**

The present study aimed to review the literature on the effectiveness of student-focused SBMI in educational settings. It extended the review conducted by Woods et al. (2014) on the same topic, due to the inclusion of an extended and updated search period, reflecting a recent surge in published papers focusing on SBMI. Additionally, this review included international studies, whereas the previous study was solely focused on UK-based research. In the present review, 11 studies were identified as meeting the inclusion criteria. Although, this is a small sample, it was an improvement on the Woods et al. (2014) review, which included just three studies. In the present review, six studies were rated as high-quality research, three studies were rated as medium-quality and two as low-quality. It is encouraging that over two thirds of the studies were rated at least medium-quality overall, given that previous, larger reviews evaluating the effectiveness of other therapeutic approaches have reported difficulties in identifying high-quality research (Bond et al, 2013).

A pool of best evidence generated a total of eight studies as both low-quality studies were removed from the sample (Atkinson & Amesu, 2007; Channon, Marsh, Jenkins & Robling, 2013) and one medium-quality study was excluded due to a low rating on the ‘methodological quality’ scale (Enea & Dafinouli, 2009). The best evidence studies indicate that overall there is evidence for the effectiveness of student-focused SBMI in different contexts and provide preliminary support for its use in educational settings.

A number of additional themes have emerged from the present review. Firstly, it highlighted a relationship between the focus of the intervention and the country in which the research took place. To date, US student-focused SBMI studies have sought to improve academic achievement and student outcomes, while UK studies have aimed to improve behaviour and school-based motivation. It seems likely that UK research has been heavily influenced by the influential work of McNamara (cf 1992, 2009) who first described how MI could be adapted to support disaffected students. Publication dates
also indicate that the US-based research is in its infancy, with the first empirical paper on student-focused SBMI, published by Strait et al (2012) maybe stemming from interest generated by Frey et al’s (2011) seminal paper.

RCTs (Strait et al, 2012; Terry et al, 2013; Terry et al, 2014) and case studies (Atkinson & Woods, 2003; Cryer & Atkinson, 2015; Kittles & Atkinson, 2009) were the most popular research designs used in the best evidence studies. RCTs have traditionally been seen as the ‘gold standard’ in research design and the American Psychological Association (APA, 2006) has identified RCTs as the most favourable design for drawing causal inferences about the effectiveness of interventions. It is especially encouraging that RCTs are being used in student-focused SBMI research, as the robust research design helps to ensure that differences between groups are a result of the MI intervention. Given that all of the RCT studies were conducted in the US, international findings could be strengthened by more widespread use of RCTs. Case studies are considered as a lower ranked form of evidence, as the small-scale findings lack statistical generalisability and the findings may be specific to the CYP that took part in the intervention. However, the detail and richness of the presented data can illustrate potential causal relationships between the observed outcomes and the MI intervention (Woods et al, 2014).

The measures used in the best evidence studies ranged from the administration of standardised pre- and post-intervention measures (Sheftel et al, 2014; Strait et al, 2012; Terry et al, 2013; Terry et al, 2014) to qualitative data gathering measures, such as interviews and session audio recordings (Cryer & Atkinson, 2015; Kittles & Atkinson, 2009). Studies that employed a mixture of both qualitative and quantitative measures (Atkinson & Woods, 2003; Snape & Atkinson, 2015) were useful for ensuring triangulation of findings.

Across the eight best evidence studies, participants were mostly of middle or high school age, although one study suggests MI could be adapted for use with elementary school students (Cryer & Atkinson, 2015). Sheftel et al’s (2015) study suggests the usefulness of MI for supporting students with learning difficulties, although some studies suggest that MI may not be a suitable intervention for students with social and communication difficulties or low levels of emotional literacy (Kittles & Atkinson, 2009; Snape & Atkinson, 2015).

The duration of the MI sessions varied between the best evidence studies, ranging from one single session of MI in some studies (Kittles & Atkinson, 2009; Strait et al,
2012; Terry et al, 2013) to 10 one-hour weekly sessions in Sheftel et al’s (2014) research. Encouragingly, there were positive outcomes in the studies that delivered just one session of MI, suggesting this may be a cost effective method of delivering student-based SBMI in schools. However, Terry et al (2014) found that two sessions of MI were superior to one in terms of improving students’ academic performance in a range of different curriculum areas. Interestingly, none of the eight best evidence studies used a follow-up, which would have strengthened the design and allowed for the exploration and evaluation of the longer-term impact of MI.

In three of the best evidence studies, the facilitator was also the researcher (Atkinson & Woods, 2003; Cryer & Atkinson, 2015; Kittles & Atkinson, 2009) which has possible limitations in terms of the student not wishing to express negativity towards the researcher (Kittles and Atkinson, 2009). Furthermore, a number of different facilitators are reported to have delivered the MI interventions. While, school psychology interns were the most common facilitators; others were paraprofessionals or non-specialists, without a background in counselling or psychology. Snape and Atkinson’s (2015) study was conducted by paraprofessionals who had participated in a 90 minute MI training session. The fact that this study yielded neutral results leads to questions about who is best qualified to deliver SBMI interventions. Rollnick et al. (1992) suggested one time training in MI might be insufficient, while Miller and Rollnick (2009) highlighted the complexity of MI and need for competency training. Despite this, Sheftel et al’s (2014) study, employed the Motivational Interviewing Treatment Integrity (MITI) 3.1.1 scale (Moyers et al., 2005), adapted to incorporate conceptual changes to MI (Miller & Rollnick, 2012) for the purpose of fidelity checks. These indicated that there was a reasonable level of MI proficiency among facilitators - nine school staff, including special education teachers, transition specialists and one rehabilitation counsellor. Only one other study (Snape & Atkinson, 2015) reported fidelity monitoring via direct observation. It should be noted however, that Sheftel et al (2014) measured the quality of MI delivered, including whether the MI spirit and core OARS skills were in evidence, rather than just adherence to the intervention (as reported by Snape and Atkinson, 2015). While fidelity and quality are different concepts, both are key to improving the strength of evidence for the effectiveness of MI applications in school.

Another aim of the current review was to determine the features used in student-focused SBMI. All four of the UK best evidence studies, but none of those conducted in the US refer to using the TTM. In the UK, McNamara (1992) first proposed that the
TTM could be used within MI to identify students’ readiness for change and appropriate intervention strategies (Atkinson, 2014). Since then, MI and the TTM have often become synonymous within UK-based educational practice (Atkinson & Amesu, 2007). It should be noted however, that these differences may only exist between the studies in this review, and further research would need to be undertaken to establish whether there is international variation in student-focused SBMI practice.

Although, the TTM was a central concept in Miller and Rollnick’s (1991) early theory of MI, more recently, they have distanced MI from the TTM (Miller & Rollnick, 2009). This has coincided with some criticisms of the TTM, due to the limited evidence base for its effectiveness as a model of intervention (West, 2005; Wilson & Schlam, 2004). Despite this, research suggests some advantages to using the TTM within SBMI particularly as it provides a structure for non-specialists to follow and has also been positively evaluated by students (Atkinson, 2014; Kittles & Atkinson, 2009).

The use of OARS is a central component and fundamental to MI (Miller & Rollnick, 2002; 2012). However, just one study referred to this approach (Sheftel et al, 2014). The fact that this crucial element was omitted from seven out of eight of the best evidence studies, suggests that the studies may be better described as Adoptions of Motivational Interviewing (AMIs), as they have been specifically adapted for use with non-specialists or incorporate additional non-MI techniques, whilst retaining the MI principles (Burke, Arkowitz & Menchola, 2003). To date no reported studies have investigated the effectiveness of student-focused SBMI in educational settings, when delivered in its ‘pure’ form. It is possible that adapted and manualised approaches are necessary when conducting student-focused SBMI, as without a structured process, MI may be inaccessible to non-specialists. However, AMIs are not unique to educational settings, as Barnett et al. (2012) found that MI delivered with feedback (MIF) and MI delivered with another intervention (MI+) were common features of studies on MI and adolescent substance abuse.

**Limitations of the review**

The review aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of student-focused SBMI and has successfully provided an overview of the studies in the area. However, there are potential limitations, which require consideration. First, the present review was limited to published studies, which were subjected to peer review in an academic journal. Therefore there may be a number of noteworthy studies that have been omitted from the
review, such as book chapters, masters-level dissertations and doctoral theses. It is also important to consider the “file drawer problem” (Rosenthal, 1979) which suggests that potentially studies with non-significant or null findings remain unpublished, and highlights the need to publish student-focused SBMI studies which yield null findings. Additionally, the search parameters could have been widened to include other terms (e.g. motivational enhancement therapy, adolescents, academic) and other databases could have been searched (e.g. Google Scholar).

Furthermore qualitative and quantitative studies were evaluated for methodological quality using the framework developed for Bond et al’s (2013) systematic literature review on the effectiveness of SFBT. While some of the small-scale case study research articles (e.g. Atkinson & Woods, 2003; Cryer & Atkinson, 2015; Kittles & Atkinson, 2009) scored particularly highly on methodological quality this should be considered objectively against the fact that the RCT design is generally 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 take more account of the research design.

Conclusions and recommendations for future research

This review has built on and added to the review by Woods et al. (2014), which included just three published studies. Seven out of the 11 studies in the present review were published post-2011 succeeding the publication of the seminal paper of Frey et al. (2011). This growing body of evidence suggests that MI is an effective intervention for use in educational settings. The best evidence presented in this review, indicates that there are two main areas in which MI has been found to have a positive impact on student outcomes: disaffection and academic achievement. Despite the recent surge of interest, there is still very limited published research on the use of student-focused SBMI and there is a need for further research in this area. MI is a popular intervention used by school psychologists and therefore there is a need to identify the most effective and efficient way of using MI for both resource and ethical reasons. It also remains unclear which elements of MI contribute to its effectiveness as an intervention and this would also be an area worthy of further study.

The included studies in the present review are marked by methodological limitations, and these give clear pointers for future research on student-focused SBMI. First, it is necessary to carry out larger scale research studies. It is recommended that
mixed methods studies are used, which allow for the collection of both qualitative and quantitative data. It would also be helpful if future studies on student-focused SBMI could include follow-up measures and use independent researchers. Furthermore, given the prominence of OARS in MI it may be important to establish this as a feature of future MI interventions. Future studies may also wish to investigate the effectiveness of student-focused SBMI when delivered by specialists compared to non-specialists; the effect of session duration on student outcomes and whether MI interventions can be adapted for certain groups of students, such as students with autistic spectrum condition.

Finally, the present review has focused on student-focused SBMI and did not consider the effectiveness of consultative-focused SBMI, which is an emerging and promising area of research. As further, empirical data is published in this area, it would be useful to conduct a systematic literature review to investigate the effectiveness of consultative-focused SBMI.
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Paper 2: Students’ views on the effectiveness of motivational interviewing for challenging disaffection.

Abstract

Emerging evidence suggests Motivational Interviewing (MI) is an effective intervention for supporting disaffected students. However, to date, relevant literature has failed to establish students’ views on MI. In the present study, three students took part in an individual MI intervention, delivered by three educational psychologists (EPs). Self-report measures of school-based motivation and semi-structured interviews were used to obtain student views, post-intervention and at three month follow-up. Data were triangulated with EP reports about the effectiveness of the intervention. Qualitative findings indicated that students were generally enthusiastic about the intervention and perceived some positive impact on behaviour. However, these views were not consistent with questionnaire responses and two of the students experienced exclusions around the time of the intervention. The implications of these ambiguous findings are discussed, in relation to contextual factors that are likely to have influenced the effectiveness of the interventions.

Keywords: motivational interviewing, educational psychologists, intervention, disaffection, children and young people, student views.

2 This paper has been prepared for publication in Educational Psychology in Practice. Author guidelines can be found in Appendix A2.
Introduction

Motivational Interviewing (MI) is a counselling technique originally used with adults with alcohol and drug problems (Miller & Rollnick, 2002). It encourages individuals to explore and challenge their own patterns of behaviour, in order to strengthen motivation and commitment to change (Miller & Rollnick, 2012). MI may be particularly suitable for children and young people (CYP) due to its emphasis on autonomy and collaboration, which align well with the needs of adolescents for independence and identity formation (Kaplan, 2014). However, Strait, McQuillin, Smith and Englund (2012) argue that evidence for the developmental appropriateness of MI for children and adolescents is mixed, due to the cognitive and neurodevelopmental demands of engaging in MI processes; and MI may also be less successful for certain groups of CYP, such as children with social communication difficulties and low levels of emotional literacy (Kittles & Atkinson, 2009; Snape & Atkinson, 2015).

The use of MI in educational settings

In recent years, there has been increasing research interest in school-based MI (SBMI). Frey et al. (2011) encouraged the use of SBMI due to its flexibility and promising evidence base. In the UK, 31% of a sample of 455 educational psychologists (EPs) reported using SBMI, making it the fourth most popular therapeutic intervention (Atkinson, Bragg, Squires, Muscutt & Wasilewksi, 2011).

A limitation of the Atkinson et al. (2011) study was that it gave no indication of how SBMI was used. Recently, Strait, McQuillin, Terry and Smith (2014) proposed two distinct approaches: consultative-focused SBMI, involving work with adults, typically parents and teachers; and student-focused SBMI, where MI was used directly with students. Consultative-focused approaches include, incorporating MI strategies into teacher consultations (Blom-Hoffman & Rose, 2007); and using MI to improve programme implementation and fidelity (Frey et al, 2013).

A systematic literature review of student-focused SBMI (Snape & Atkinson, 2016), revealed a growing body of evidence indicating its positive impact on student outcomes, particularly in the areas of academic achievement and disaffection. The use of SBMI to promote academic achievement is a contemporary application of MI and recent Randomised Control Trials (RCTs) have yielded promising findings (see Terry, Strait, McQuillin & Smith, 2014 for an overview). While this is an interesting area for future
research by UK EPs, the current paper will build on the previous body of research into the application of SBMI in supporting disaffected students.

**School-based motivational interviewing for supporting student disaffection**

McNamara (2009) defined disaffection as “an integrated set of negative attitudes, beliefs and behaviours with respect to the demands of school life generally and with respect to academic demands in particular” (p.8). Disaffection is associated with an increase in disruptive behaviours and truancy, as well as a reduction in attendance, curriculum engagement and academic achievement (Atkinson & Woods, 2003; Wilding, 2015). There is evidence to suggest that mental health difficulties often overlap with disaffection or disengagement from school (Cole, 2015).

Previously, benefits to using MI to support disaffection amongst high school students have been reported in case study research (Atkinson & Woods, 2003; Kittles & Atkinson, 2009). More recently, Cryer and Atkinson (2015) found that a primary school student participating in four MI sessions demonstrated improvements in classroom behaviour and learning motivation. Snape and Atkinson’s (2015) study revealed mixed findings when five paraprofessionals delivered an MI intervention to disaffected high school students. While positive views were expressed about the intervention’s effectiveness, these outcomes were not supported by student self-reported measures.

**Rationale for the current study**

The current study adds three, new, distinct dimensions to the growing evidence-base for the use of SBMI in supporting student disaffection. Firstly, while a number of studies have focused on the importance of obtaining the voice of the child (e.g. Ingram, 2013), to date, student views have been overlooked in SBMI research (Snape & Atkinson, 2015). While Kittles and Atkinson (2009) partly addressed this, their study involved MI as an initial consultation and assessment tool, rather than an intervention. Cryer and Atkinson’s (2015) study incorporated student views but these were analysed thematically alongside other data, making them impossible to isolate.

Secondly, in all previous studies, the facilitator was also the main researcher, potentially limiting the extent to which students might express negativity about the intervention. Thirdly, to date, SBMI studies addressing student disaffection have failed to incorporate follow-up data, meaning the longer-term impact of SBMI for disaffected students has not yet been explored (Snape & Atkinson, 2016).
In addressing these three knowledge gaps, the present study aimed to answer the following research question:

- What are students’ views of a MI programme to support disaffection and to what extent do they feel that it has helped improve their school-based motivation?

**Method**

**Epistemological position**

A critical realist stance underpinned the research. More information can be found in Appendix H1.

**Design**

A mixed methods case study design was used to address the research question. Whilst case study research has been criticised, due to the limited basis for generalising the findings, it was hoped it would allow a contemporary phenomenon to be studied in depth and in a real world context (Yin, 2009). Reflections on how issues of trustworthiness were addressed in the current research can be found in Appendix H2.

**Participants**

EPs working in two local authorities in the North West of England were invited to participate. Three volunteered to take part and each delivered an MI intervention to one student, described as disaffected. EPs were recruited through opportunistic sampling and the student sample was purposive. Student profiles can be found in Table 5. Participants were selected who met the following criteria:

- Aged 11-13 and at mainstream secondary school (older students were not chosen to avoid potential conflict with exams);
- The EP believed the MI programme was appropriate, given referral concerns;
- The primary concern was disaffection and the student was not experiencing any extenuating circumstances outside school (e.g. bereavements, parental separation);
- The student was not at immediate risk of permanent exclusion;

---

3 Indicators of disaffection from school could include; non-compliance; disruptive behaviour; lack of interest during lessons; arriving late to lessons; unauthorised absences; not completing homework tasks etc.
• The student was of broadly average ability, capable of meeting the language demands of the MI sessions and did not have an autistic spectrum condition diagnosis or social and communication difficulties.

Data gathering

Semi-structured interviews were used to obtain student views about the MI intervention immediately post-intervention and at three-month follow-up. The first author, who played no role in the intervention, conducted these. Questions aimed to determine the students’ views on the MI process and whether they felt the intervention had a positive impact. Interview schedules for post-intervention and follow-up interviews can be found in Appendix C1.

EPs were also interviewed immediately after the intervention ended. See Appendix C2 for EP interview schedule. Whilst full analysis of EP views is beyond the scope of this paper, an overview is presented in Table 5 to contextualise and triangulate findings from student interviews.

Additionally, quantitative data were collected for each student, through completion of Part A of the Pupils’ Feelings about School and School Work (PFSSW) inventory (Entwistle & Kozeki, 1985) at pre-intervention, post-intervention and at three-month follow-up. The measure was used to determine whether there had been changes in school-based motivation. The PFSSW was developed by British and Hungarian researchers and used a large study sample (N = 1193), with questionnaire/ response groupings being confirmed by factor analysis. The PFSSW was chosen as it has been standardised for use with secondary school students and previously used in SBMI research (Atkinson & Woods, 2003; Snape & Atkinson, 2015). A copy of the PFSSW can be found in Appendix C3.

Intervention

Students took part in five or six individual, weekly sessions of MI. The intervention was based on the Facilitating Change 2 resources (Atkinson, 2013), which follows the brief MI Menu of Strategies (Rollnick, Heather & Bell, 1992) alongside a child-friendly version of the Transtheoretical Model (TTM, DiClemente & Prochaska, 1982) (See Figure 2). The pack was used flexibly in order to meet the needs of the students.
Table 5: Student profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of MI sessions</th>
<th>School Context</th>
<th>Presenting Concerns at Referral (Reported by EP)</th>
<th>Outcomes at Post-intervention interview (Reported by EP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Six 50-minute sessions</td>
<td>Mainstream secondary school Attended Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) whilst at primary school Statement with 27 hours TA support Change in TA before intervention began TA observed all MI sessions</td>
<td>Self-injurious behaviour - hitting head when angry Low-level disruptive behaviour in class Particularly disruptive during French lessons Over-eating Lack of exercise</td>
<td>Improved attendance Improved punctuality Danny expressing a desire to change behaviour EP felt that Danny was using change language Better relationship with TA More engaged during PE sessions Plans to complete project on healthy eating with TA Possible referral to CAMHS due to flat affect TA to complete follow-up MI work on relapse Displaying greater focus on future and aspirations e.g. working in building trade Joshua expressing a desire to change behaviour Possible lack of generalisation into classroom EP felt Joshua needed support from staff to make a change EP hoped to arrange person centred meeting to address systemic factors potentially contributing to behaviour (unfortunately due to a lack of school engagement the meeting did not take place) Taio motivated to change Future aspirations identified e.g. wanted to become a lawyer Intervention highlighted a number of systemic factors, which were addressed at a feedback consultation meeting with school staff and parent EP felt Taio needed support from staff to make a change At the meeting, it was agreed that Taio would be supported to improve his sleep hygiene, eating habits, career planning and peer relationships. Changes to his report card were also agreed and it was arranged that he would have regular ‘check-ins’ with a key adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Five 60-minute sessions</td>
<td>Mainstream secondary school Excluded during intervention for fighting and attended PRU on a part-time basis for two days a week and three days at school</td>
<td>Lack of rapport with some teachers. Difficulties trusting adults Particularly difficult relationship with maths teacher Answering back/ swearing at teachers Not following teacher instructions Need to have ‘last word’ Physical fights with peers</td>
<td>Danny expressing a desire to change behaviour EP felt that Danny was using change language Better relationship with TA More engaged during PE sessions Plans to complete project on healthy eating with TA Possible referral to CAMHS due to flat affect TA to complete follow-up MI work on relapse Displaying greater focus on future and aspirations e.g. working in building trade Joshua expressing a desire to change behaviour Possible lack of generalisation into classroom EP felt Joshua needed support from staff to make a change EP hoped to arrange person centred meeting to address systemic factors potentially contributing to behaviour (unfortunately due to a lack of school engagement the meeting did not take place) Taio motivated to change Future aspirations identified e.g. wanted to become a lawyer Intervention highlighted a number of systemic factors, which were addressed at a feedback consultation meeting with school staff and parent EP felt Taio needed support from staff to make a change At the meeting, it was agreed that Taio would be supported to improve his sleep hygiene, eating habits, career planning and peer relationships. Changes to his report card were also agreed and it was arranged that he would have regular ‘check-ins’ with a key adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taio</td>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Six 60-minute sessions</td>
<td>Mainstream secondary school Permanently excluded after the intervention ended Follow-up interview took place at the local PRU Due to start at a new mainstream secondary school the week after the follow-up interview</td>
<td>Difficult interactions with staff e.g. swearing and answering back Lack of engagement in learning. Frequent isolations Difficulties trusting adults</td>
<td>Improved attendance Improved punctuality Danny expressing a desire to change behaviour EP felt that Danny was using change language Better relationship with TA More engaged during PE sessions Plans to complete project on healthy eating with TA Possible referral to CAMHS due to flat affect TA to complete follow-up MI work on relapse Displaying greater focus on future and aspirations e.g. working in building trade Joshua expressing a desire to change behaviour Possible lack of generalisation into classroom EP felt Joshua needed support from staff to make a change EP hoped to arrange person centred meeting to address systemic factors potentially contributing to behaviour (unfortunately due to a lack of school engagement the meeting did not take place) Taio motivated to change Future aspirations identified e.g. wanted to become a lawyer Intervention highlighted a number of systemic factors, which were addressed at a feedback consultation meeting with school staff and parent EP felt Taio needed support from staff to make a change At the meeting, it was agreed that Taio would be supported to improve his sleep hygiene, eating habits, career planning and peer relationships. Changes to his report card were also agreed and it was arranged that he would have regular ‘check-ins’ with a key adult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All the EPs had previous training in MI and had some prior experience of using MI as a therapeutic intervention. Before commencing the intervention, each EP received a copy of Facilitating Change 2 and an MI information pack (See Appendix D1), which reinforced the ‘spirit’ (autonomy, collaboration and evocation) and ‘principles’ of MI (expressing empathy, developing discrepancy, rolling with resistance and supporting self-efficacy) (Miller & Rollnick, 2002). Two of the EPs also attended refresher training, delivered by the first author (See Appendix D2).

To ensure fidelity, all MI sessions were audio-recorded and EPs asked to complete a diary after each session (See Appendix C4), which were both monitored by the first author. Session quality was also examined: EPs were asked to complete a post-session self-assessment checklist (See Appendix C5), to determine whether they had adhered to MI ‘spirit’ and ‘principles’ (Miller & Rollnick, 2002). Copies of the students’ worksheets were also obtained and examples can be found in Appendix D4.

**Ethical considerations**

Prior to commencing the intervention, written parental, student and EP consent was gained and students made aware that they could withdraw from the research at any
Parent, student and EP information sheets and consent forms can be found in Appendix E1, E2 and E3, respectively. EP facilitators were encouraged to terminate the sessions or consult teaching staff, if they felt a student was upset or anxious after the sessions. Supervision was available on request. Further reflections on key ethical issues can be found in Appendix H3. Ethics forms can be found in Appendix E4 and emails confirming ethical approval can be found in Appendix E5.

**Data analysis**

Interviews were analysed using the six-step thematic analysis process outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). An inductive approach was used to identify themes and patterns, which meant that data were not analysed using a pre-existing coding framework. However, the researchers recognised it can be difficult to separate the analysis from their own theoretical interest (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

During the initial coding phase, an independent researcher coded a section of one interview transcript, with inter-coder agreement found to be 93% (See Appendix F1). Later, all emergent themes were reviewed with the second author and were renamed or restructured where necessary, in order to best reflect the dataset. Please refer to Appendix F2 for photographic representation of the process.

**Results**

Table 6 shows pre-, post-intervention and follow-up scores on the PFSSW inventory for the three students. Findings indicate that desired outcomes were not achieved across different motivational domains and will be explored further in the discussion section.

Nineteen subthemes emerged from the interview data and were organised into five main themes (illustrated in Figure 3). Themes and subthemes are now discussed in more detail, with emergent themes italicised throughout the text. Individual thematic maps for Danny, Joshua and Taio can be found in Appendix F3.

**Student enthusiasm**

The students all reported *session enjoyment*, with Joshua and Danny describing the intervention as “fun”. All referred to *helpful sessions* and Joshua and Danny felt the sessions helped promote positive behavioural change. Danny explained, “I think it’s all going to help me. It’s going to stop me from hitting myself on the head. And stop me getting into trouble as much.” Taio also identified benefits, although recognised his inability to maintain change.
Table 6: Pre-intervention, post-intervention and follow-up school-based motivation scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pre-Intervention Affective Total</th>
<th>Pre-Intervention Cognitive Total</th>
<th>Pre-Intervention Moral Total</th>
<th>Pre-Intervention Total (Affective + Cognitive + Moral)</th>
<th>Pre-Intervention Pressure and Excessive Demands from adults</th>
<th>Post-Intervention Affective Total</th>
<th>Post-Intervention Cognitive Total</th>
<th>Post-Intervention Moral Total</th>
<th>Post-Intervention Total (Affective + Cognitive + Moral)</th>
<th>Post-Intervention Pressure and Excessive Demands from adults</th>
<th>Post-Follow-up Affective Total</th>
<th>Post-Follow-up Cognitive Total</th>
<th>Post-Follow-up Moral Total</th>
<th>Post-Follow-up Total (Affective + Cognitive + Moral)</th>
<th>Post-Follow-up Pressure and Excessive Demands from adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taio</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures in bold represent a positive change
Figure 3: Themes and subthemes emerging from student interview data
Session resources were positively received, Joshua explaining the activities had helped him to reflect about his behaviour differently. Danny felt that ‘Jordan’s story*4’, had important morals and taught him about change. Taio and Joshua referred to how ‘the future and the present*’ had helped in identifying aspirations. Joshua realised he wanted to work in construction and own a house and car and spoke about “turning over a new leaf” to achieve this. Danny felt the ‘skills profile*’ helped him identify his strengths.

Relationship with EP

The EP-student relationship was important in feeling comfortable and able to open up, with all three students reporting being able to speak openly to the EP. Danny mentioned that, despite feeling ashamed when discussing his behaviour, he could still be open. Joshua, felt increasingly comfortable and willing to be honest:

Because I normally don’t really speak to someone, because when I had counselling, I didn’t speak to my counsellor and I didn’t speak to anyone really because like I didn’t feel comfortable but it felt like I could say something to [EP] and have no regrets about telling her. And it made me feel better telling someone so I don’t need to keep it to myself.

Joshua and Taio spoke about the importance of confidentiality and privacy. Both mentioned that knowing information would remain private allowed them to be open. Taio’s remarks highlighted the benefits of speaking to a peripatetic professional:

Say like if I was speaking to my normal teacher, like I wouldn’t say anything that I thought because they’d probably just tell everyone, but I could say anything, I could say what I actually thought about school and teachers or students.

A number of personal qualities of the EP emerged from the interview data. Taio mentioned the EP had good listening skills, adding, “she was really nice and she didn’t really shout.” Joshua seemed to value that the EP did not try to persuade or argue for change:

Just being able to come into a room and just like talk to someone I know who’s not going to like say anything or give me, like, won’t give me, like a life lesson.

---

4 Where specific activities are mentioned, these are marked with an asterisk. More detail is provided in Appendix D3.
Because I don’t like it when people give me like a life lesson, like, what if this doesn’t happen and just keep going on with stuff like that, I don’t like that.

A sense of student agency was suggested by Taio, who explained he had a choice to attend the sessions; and his attendance was indication that he enjoyed them.

**Experiencing positive outcomes**

All students identified positive behavioural changes with Danny and Taio reporting feeling calmer. Post-intervention Taio highlighted improved behaviour in Geography and at follow-up, Danny reported: “Well if you ask my old French teacher, the one that used to teach me like, I was like a nightmare and everything in French lessons and that’s like not as bad anymore.”

All students mentioned receiving fewer detentions post-intervention, although for Taio this had been a short-term change. Joshua commented that: “normally, I always get detentions but when I started doing what we came up with to do, I’ve not had any detentions or really been told off that much.”

In relation to specific target behaviours, at follow-up, Danny explained the intervention had helped him manage his emotions: “it’s stopped me hitting myself on the head and stuff and it’s helped me calm down when I get angry.” Post-intervention Joshua explained he had been excluded for arguing with teachers, however, at follow-up he felt he had made progress: “before I had the meetings, I was being like really bad. But since I’ve had them, I’ve improved like really good.” Taio recognised his behaviour towards school staff remained inconsistent. Post-intervention he had been in less trouble and performed well on his report card, but had been rude to teachers: “I’ve had a few blips. But other than that, I’ve been doing quite well.”

Two students mentioned academic success. Joshua explained his teachers had noticed that he was putting in more effort, particularly in Food Technology, while Danny reported completing homework more promptly. Danny and Joshua also noted improved grades. Danny had performed well on recent tests, particularly in French (previously a difficult subject for him), while Joshua reported being on target to meet end of year grades and improved homework scores: “the last test we’ve done, I’ve been getting Bs and As and in like my homework I’ve been getting Cs and Bs so yeah… I was getting like Ds, Es and Fs.”

Joshua and Danny had received positive feedback from both teachers and parents after completing the MI intervention. At follow-up, Joshua explained he had received
positive attention from teachers and certificates, which pleased his parents, while Danny’s parents liked that he was getting fewer detentions. Joshua explained that: “getting positive feedback from my mum and the teachers. It motivates me to keep on going.”

All of the students referred to strategy use, with two continuing to use a strategy at follow-up. Danny mentioned he found it helpful to use breathing techniques, provided by the EP, when he was feeling angry. Joshua had also been using a successful strategy, which allowed him to express his opinions to a teacher at an appropriate time.

**Using the language of change**

Each student discussed the wheel of change* during the interviews and used change language, although this was most obvious within Danny’s interviews. In referring to the wheel of change, all three students described progress around the wheel as a result of participating. Danny, who could describe his position in relation to readiness to change using the wheel, explained post-intervention: “Well first they got me thinking about it. And on the stage I am now – I’m preparing, so she’s helped to prepare me with some strategies.”

The students could identify their readiness to change at the start of the intervention. Joshua and Taio felt that they were at the thinking and preparing stages [on the wheel of change*], respectively. However, Danny acknowledged that he was at an earlier stage of change initially, “I was at stage 1, pre-thinking. I was not ready to change.”

Use of commitment language was evident throughout Danny’s interviews. Post-intervention, he was still engaging in self-injurious behaviours, but expressed desire to reduce these, “Well it’s trying to help me to stop me hitting myself. So hopefully that’s going to be better. And I hope I will be on level 4 [Action] and 5 [Maintenance] soon.”

At follow-up, Danny identified successful changes and spoke confidently about not wanting to relapse: “I just think like, I’ve gone all the way here now, I better not go to stage 6 [Relapse]… because it’s like, if I do it once, I’ll want to do it more and stuff.”

The students felt that they had made positive changes, although maintaining the change varied between the students. At follow-up, Danny had ceased hitting himself, stating “Well, I’ve stopped doing it so I’ve actually been making a change and I’ve just been maintaining it.” Post-intervention, Joshua felt he had stopped answering back to teachers for a while, although he had relapsed after an incident in school. However, at follow-up, he had overcome this and maintained change, although in other areas, such
as fighting with peers, he still experienced difficulties. Taio felt he had initially made progress, but at follow-up explained that he had “gone back to zero”, after an incident that had led to his permanent exclusion.

In applying the wheel of change, Danny’s follow-up interview revealed he was transferring the model to other situations. He mentioned how his parents’ attempts to stop smoking linked to the wheel of change.

At follow-up, all three students were identifying future changes they hoped to make. Danny wanted to improve his attitude towards completing schoolwork he did not enjoy, whilst Joshua wished to stop fighting with his peers. Following permanent exclusion, Taio hoped for a “fresh start” at his new school and wanted to change and maintain his behaviour towards teachers.

**Extra-therapeutic factors**

During the interviews it became apparent that a number of external factors occurred during and following the intervention, which may have impacted on outcomes. Taio and Joshua both attended the *Pupil Referral Unit* (PRU): following the intervention, Taio was permanently excluded from school and attended the PRU. During the intervention, Joshua was excluded which led to a part-time placement at the PRU for half of the school week. Post-intervention he acknowledged he had learnt to control his behaviour and not answer back to teachers and that attending the PRU had led to a desire for behavioural change:

> When I went to the [PRU] I thought, I knew it wouldn’t be that good being there. But when I got there I didn’t know it was going to be like that bad and the people that go there are like really bad and then I thought, I don’t want to stay here and I don’t want to be like them. So that’s when I just stopped really doing it.

*Support from school staff* was mentioned by all three students, but this varied considerably. Danny’s teaching assistant (TA) observed the MI sessions and was offering on-going support with behaviour goal setting. Joshua mentioned difficulties with his mathematics teacher and post-intervention suggested that he did not feel supported when trying to implement changes, “I had an argument with the deputy head and the head teacher and I was excluded so I was like thinking why should I even try and change if no one is even going to say anything.” At follow-up, Taio felt his negative
reputation among staff made change more difficult because he was often blamed for incidents and watched more closely:

I have answered back, but most of the time I answered back because they were shouting at me for something someone else had done so it like really annoys me. Because I did have like a reputation so teachers automatically think it was me so I just started having a go, but I’d still get in trouble so I wouldn’t win either way.

**Discussion**

Unlike most previous studies into student-focused SBMI (Snape & Atkinson, 2016) this research gives equivocal results for the effectiveness of an SBMI intervention for student disaffection. However, given the file drawer effect (Rosenthal, 1979), which suggests poor publication rates of non-significant or null findings, the authors feel that it is important to examine both the findings themselves and their implications for effective future school-based delivery of MI.

While previous research indicated MI to be an effective intervention for improving disaffected students’ school-based motivation (Atkinson & Woods, 2003; Cryer & Atkinson, 2015), data here are inconsistent. While interview findings indicate student-reported examples of improved motivation and behaviour change, these are inconsistent with self-report motivational measures, which gave no indication of preferred outcomes. Additionally, two students experienced partial or permanent placement breakdown around the time of the intervention. This discussion section will start by exploring some of the positive features of the intervention, as reported by the students, before moving on to exploring some of the possible reasons behind its apparent lack of success with respect to motivational measures and observable outcomes.

**Positive features of MI intervention**

All three students reported that they enjoyed taking part in the intervention and named a number of session resources perceived as enjoyable and fun. Student reports of positive engagement are consistent with previous research (Kittles & Atkinson, 2009; Cryer & Atkinson, 2015).

The importance of the therapeutic relationship has been well documented in research (e.g. Asay & Lambert, 1999). Here, students identified helpful aspects of the therapeutic relationship, including feeling comfortable, able to open up and listened to. Joshua
appreciated the EP’s non-judgmental approach, which did not involve lecturing, persuasion or argument, which aligns well with Miller and Rollnick’s (2002) ‘spirit’ of MI. Additionally confidentiality was seen as important. Previous studies have shown that students are more open during counselling sessions when they know information will not be passed on to teachers, parents or peers (Cooper, 2009).

The ‘wheel of change’, based on the TTM, was referred to by the students and used to describe changes made during and after the intervention. The TTM is a common feature of student-focused SBMI studies in the UK, perhaps due to the influential work of McNamara (1992, 2009) although it has not been utilised internationally (Snape & Atkinson, 2016). Previous research on SBMI and disaffection has indicated that the TTM is well received by both students and facilitators (Kittles & Atkinson, 2009; Snape & Atkinson, 2015). It also provides a visual structure for assessing readiness to change that may be helpful for non-specialists to follow (Atkinson, 2014; McNamara, 2009). Danny, who displayed the most favourable outcomes post-intervention, was confident when discussing the wheel of change and used clear commitment language throughout both of the interviews. These findings suggest that role of the TTM in student-focused SBMI is worthy of further study.

**Measures**

Self-reported PFSSW inventory data do not indicate positive changes in the students’ school-based motivation, between pre-, post-intervention and follow-up although student interview data suggest more favourable outcomes. In explaining differences between the datasets, it is possible that students were positive during interviews, to avoid expressing negativity towards the EP or MI programme. However, because the first author, acting as an objective researcher, conducted the interviews this seems unlikely. In addition, questionnaire data appeared inconsistent with interview data, for instance, Danny’s highest score was at pre-intervention, not reflecting positive changes described at the follow-up. Similarly, while Joshua’s highest PFSSW score was post-intervention, interview responses suggested greater motivation for school at follow-up, possibly due to the positive impact of his time at the PRU.

Snape and Atkinson (2015) also reported inconsistent findings when the student-reported PFSSW inventory data were triangulated with paraprofessionals’ views. While the authors questioned whether the PFSSW was a reliable and valid measure for an MI intervention, it was not possible for them to draw conclusions as the study data were
from different sources (staff focus groups and student self-report). Snape and Atkinson (2016) recommended that future student-focused SBMI research should allow for the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. However, findings from this study bring into question the reliability and validity of the PFSSW data, particularly with a small sample and suggest finding alternative instruments for measuring student disaffection is imperative.

**External factors influencing outcomes**

Asay and Lambert (1999) argued extra-therapeutic factors accounted for up to 40% of the changes occurring in therapeutic interventions. In this research a number of external factors may have impacted on student outcomes. In terms of support, Danny’s TA observed all the MI sessions and continued to support him after the intervention ended by helping him to set goals and evaluate his behaviour. Taio and Joshua did not receive the same level of support and both described feeling unsupported by staff and experienced episodes of relapse. Danny received adult support after the intervention had ended, perhaps explaining why he reported the most favourable long-term outcomes. This highlights the importance of school staff involvement in MI interventions and suggested that students may benefit from having a mentor who can help them maintain changes and support relapse. This is supported by Strait, McQuillin, Smith and Englund’s (2012) research, which argues that due to the cognitive and neurodevelopmental demands of MI, students may benefit from having school-based mentors and systems that remind them of their goals.

Towards the end of the MI intervention, Joshua began a part-time placement at a PRU and Taio was permanently excluded after the intervention had ended and received a PRU place. This is particularly interesting, given that one criterion for student recruitment was to be not at risk of exclusion. One possible hypothesis might be that in exploring their disaffection students became disenfranchised with the school they were attending, which led to a significant increase in negative behaviours. However, there is no evidence of this in the student or EP reports. Additionally, there is nothing in the qualitative dataset to indicate that getting excluded or given access to a PRU place was something that made sense to the students, or was seen as a preferable outcome. Similarly no data indicate the students or EPs perceived behaviour as deteriorating significantly during the course of the intervention.
Because the MI sessions were conducted under research conditions, to reduce the influence of extraneous variables on the success of the intervention, EP involvement did not arise from authentic casework, which would usually involve initial consultations with staff and parents. Instead, EPs were reliant on school staff suggesting suitable students who might benefit from taking part in the intervention. It is possible that the exclusionary criteria may not have been strictly adhered to and that two of the students, Joshua and Taio, may have been at least notionally at risk of exclusion prior to commencement of the intervention. This leads to questions about whether MI was a suitable intervention for these students, as a systematic and possibly multiagency approach may have been more appropriate for preventing exclusion.

In fact, this hypothesis is supported by both EP and student data. In the present study, Taio felt that his ‘reputation’ among staff meant that he was treated differently to other students and Joshua also spoke about experiencing a difficult relationship with his mathematics teacher. This suggests wider systemic factors were impacting on behaviour and school-based motivation and was supported by EP interview data, which also highlighted the importance of systemic factors in both cases. Although Taio and Joshua’s EPs assumed a therapeutic role in the current study, the EP interview data indicates that both EPs moved towards a caseworker role towards the end of the intervention, by offering feedback consultations and person-centred meetings in order to address systemic factors. This suggests that, although the goal of the MI intervention was addressing student disaffection rather than preventing exclusion, in some cases, MI alone may be insufficient in supporting students if systemic factors are not considered and addressed (Wilding, 2015).

**Limitations and areas for future research**

A number of limitations have been identified in the current research. The study was small scale, which limits generalisability, as does the fact that all participants were male, because the research relied on an opportunity sample. As previously mentioned, PFSSW data did not reflect the student interview data, which perhaps brings into question its reliability and validity for measuring change in this context. Additionally, available support and placement change were notable variables across the three cases. Finally, the way the work was contracted is another possible limitation, as the therapeutic work did not arise from authentic casework and as a result some of the participants may not have been suitable candidates for taking part in an MI intervention.
Future research within a single context may be beneficial, to reduce the staff support variable observed in this research. Alternatively, it may be helpful to repeat the design with three EPs, but with each working with two students in a single school, where patterns across the data may offer greater insight to the mechanisms required to maximise the effectiveness of MI intervention. Additionally, in undertaking MI in the absence of a school commitment to a wider support network for the student and systemic response to understanding and addressing student disaffection, EPs might wish to consider establishing through consultation whether this sort of therapeutic work represents best use of EP time. Alternatively, future studies may investigate MI interventions using retrospective authentic case studies. Finally, while the present study has focused on student disaffection, the wider use of SBMI (e.g. to improve academic achievement) is a potentially exciting new area of research for UK EPs.
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Paper 3: The dissemination of evidence to professional practice

Introduction

Evidence-based practice (EBP) first originated in the medical sector and can be defined as “the conscientious, explicit, and judicious use of current best practice evidence in making decisions about the care of individual patients” (Sackett, Rosenberg, Gray, Haynes & Richardson, 1996, p. 71). It is argued that practitioners should use methods and approaches that have been researched systematically and which have clear demonstrable outcomes, as opposed to basing intervention decisions on unsubstantiated judgments (Dunsmuir, Brown, Iyadurai & Monsen, 2009). More recently, evidence-informed practice has begun to spread to the wider helping professions, such as, social services and indeed, educational psychology.

A central component of EBP is the research hierarchy. ‘Best evidence’ is based on good quality research and within health and medical fields the following research hierarchy, shown in Figure 4, can be used to judge the quality of research (Frederickson, 2002). The ‘gold standard’ in research is considered to be systematic reviews of a number of randomised controlled trails (RCTs) and studies which use a single randomised controlled design are also considered to be good quality evidence. RCTs involve the random allocation of participants to either an experimental group that take part in an intervention or treatment, or a control group that receives no treatment or intervention (Robson, 2011). According to the research hierarchy, qualitative research, such as case studies are considered to be weaker forms of evidence.

| 1. | Several systematic reviews of randomised controlled trials |
| 2. | Systematic review of randomised controlled trials |
| 3. | Randomised controlled trials |
| 4. | Quasi-experimental trials |
| 5. | Case control and cohort studies |
| 6. | Expert consensus opinion |
| 7. | Individual opinion |

Figure 4: Traditional hierarchy of evidence (adapted from Frederickson, 2002)

The purpose of the current paper is to review the concept of EBP in educational psychology. Discussion about how research evidence can be effectively disseminated
will also be outlined. Finally, both these areas will be illustrated with reference to recent research undertaken by a trainee educational psychologist (TEP) in the area of Motivational Interviewing (MI) in educational settings. A summary of the implications of the research will be provided and a strategy for promoting and evaluating the dissemination and impact of the research will be described.

An overview of the concepts of evidence-based practice and practice-based research in educational psychology

According to the American Psychological Association (APA) (2006), “EBP in psychology is the integration of the best available research with clinical expertise in the context of patient characteristics, culture and preferences” (p.273). In the United Kingdom (UK), educational psychologists (EPs) are encouraged to use EBP, as this is a current standard professional requirement of the Health Care and Professions Council (HCPC) (2012). This means that there should be a clear link between EP professional practice and research evidence (Fox, 2003).

There has been some debate within the profession about the use of EBP, with some EPs highly critical of the approach. Fox (2003) outlined a number of reasons why some EPs may be skeptical of the concept of EBP. For instance, one argument is that the research hierarchy that is used for medical evidence is not appropriate in the field of educational psychology. Frederickson (2002) suggests that whilst RCTs are seen as the ‘gold standard’ in evidence, they may not always be the most appropriate design to answer some research questions in educational psychology contexts, as they are not always feasible or ethically sound. In addition, van Daal (2015) argues that there are benefits of single case study designs to educationalists: whilst experimental studies using large participant samples are useful for informing causal relationships about variables, single case study designs are advantageous as they provide a more detailed view. It is also suggested that in educational research, it can be difficult and at times impossible to find equivalent groups of participants to act as a control group, thus making experimental designs more difficult to implement.

In addition, Dunsmuir et al (2009) suggest that there are difficulties in embedding EBP in the day-to-day practice of EPs. Some EPs may feel that they do not have the right skillset to critically analyse research studies, as they see their role as a practising psychologist and not a researcher (Fox, 2003). Other EPs may not feel that they have the time to commit to keeping up to date with newly published research or may prefer to
use professional experience over research as a guide to good practice (Dunsmuir et al, 2009; Fox 2003).

There is evidence to support the assumption that many EPs fail to apply EBP in their day-to-day work. For instance, 83% of school psychologists in the United States (US) reported relying on personal experience to inform their intervention practice, compared to 62% using reference books and just 47% using journal articles (Bramlett, Murphy, Johnson, Wallingsford & Hall, 2002). In a further study, 56% of school psychologists surveyed felt that their knowledge of scientific research-based reading interventions for students with reading problems was either ‘low’ or ‘moderately low’ (Nelson & Machek, 2007). Similarly, in a study conducted in the UK, Burnham (2013) found that EPs who participated in a focus group admitted that much of their work lacked scientific rigour as their practice was not based on peer reviewed research and was more likely to be based on situational or improvised methods. Salvin (2002) also argued that the field of education has avoided adopting a traditional scientific approach and instead there seems to be a more haphazard approach to adopting interventions in schools that are not typically scientifically verified. In their review of the use of scientific thinking within school psychology, Lilienfield, Ammirati and David (2012) concluded that there is a dearth of literature on school psychologists’ use of EBP, however, the literature that does exist gives cause for concern as it suggests that practitioners are not basing their practices on well evidenced techniques.

Although, historically there have been objections to the use of EBP in the field of educational psychology, recent research has argued that there is a need for greater scientific thinking among practitioners. For instance, Lilienfield et al (2012) argued that there is a wide gap between science and practice in educational psychology, meaning that there is little consensus between scientific ‘best evidence’ and what practitioners do in their day-to-day practice. The authors argue that rigorous scientific thinking is needed in order to ensure that EPs do not adopt pseudoscience practices. Reynolds (2011) has also argued for an increase in EBP within educational psychology, but alongside this also called for EPs to develop skills that allow them to review and critique papers within the field:

It is not enough to read the literature or to attend in-service or continuing education seminars. We must read and listen carefully. Just because a paper is published in a peer-reviewed journal does not mean the science is accurate or necessarily strong (p. 5).
Finally, Norwich (2005) suggested that a move towards using EBP within educational psychology would strengthen the role of the EP. He argued that the profession could be filled by teachers trained in psychology, if appropriate psychological theory and practice was not applied. Therefore, in order to be more effective Norwich (2005) suggested that EPs need to keep up to date with knowledge of contemporary psychological research evidence, which can then be shared with teachers and school staff.

The use of EBP in educational psychology is congruent with the concept of 'practice-based evidence'. Practice-based research involves the safe trialling of innovative and novel techniques by practitioners, with the aim of building a practitioner-led evidence base (Woods, McArdle & Tabassum, 2014). The APA (2006) support the use of practice-based evidence, arguing that it is important that practitioners do not assume that interventions are ineffective, just because there is a lack of evidence base. In the area of MI, there is a large evidence base, particularly in relation to the use of MI in medical and clinical settings. However, the evidence base is limited in areas such as school-based MI. For instance, there are fewer than five research studies that have investigated MI when used as an intervention for disaffected students. Therefore, the research described in the current paper, may be better described as contributing to a practitioner-led evidence base.

The effective dissemination of research: outcomes and impact

Recently there has been greater interest in the use of EBP in educational psychology (e.g. Lilienfield et al, 2012; Reynolds, 2011). Researchers have advocated that EPs should develop and share their knowledge of evidence-based approaches in order to enhance the reputation of the profession. Given the recent interest in EBP, it is important to consider strategies that narrow the gap between research and practice. The transfer of research knowledge to practice can be described using different terminology, including dissemination, diffusion, knowledge transfer and implementation. For the purpose of this paper, the term ‘dissemination’ will be used. Wilson, Petticrew, Calnan and Nazareth (2010) described dissemination as “a planned process that involves consideration of target audiences and the settings in which research findings are to be received” (p.2). Meanwhile, Harmsworth and Turpin (2001) explained that dissemination can be best described as “the delivering and receiving of a message, the engagement of an individual in a process and the transfer of a process or product” (p.3).
Harmsworth and Turpin (2001) also argued that there are three main purposes of dissemination: dissemination for awareness; dissemination for understanding; and dissemination for action. Dissemination for awareness targets audiences that do not necessarily require a detailed knowledge of the research outcomes, although it is helpful for them to have some awareness of the research project. Dissemination for understanding involves targeting specific groups and audiences that would benefit from having a deeper understanding of the outcomes of the research. Dissemination for action refers to changes in practice that might arise from the research outcomes. Therefore, the audience in this case would need to have the right skills and knowledge of the research to be in a position to achieve real change.

When ensuring that research is disseminated to the maximum effect, it may be useful for researchers to adopt a dissemination plan. Wilson et al (2010) conducted a systematic review of studies that had outlined a framework that could be used to guide dissemination activity, in areas such as nursing, social work and education. Twenty frameworks were included in the review and were based on a number of different theoretical foundations. The most popular was the Persuasion Communication Matrix (McGuire, 1969); which suggests that in order for communications to be more persuasive, consideration should be given to five key variables: the source of the communication, the message to be communicated, the channels of communication, the characteristics of the receiver or audience and the destination or setting in which the communication is received. Wilson et al (2010) found that thirteen of the included dissemination frameworks were grounded in this approach and included three, four or five of McGuire’s (1969) key attributes.

Other theoretical approaches were referred to, such as the Diffusions of Innovations theory (Rogers, 1962; 2003), which was cited by eight frameworks, and two of the included frameworks mentioned Social Marketing (Kotler & Zaltman, 1971). The Diffusions of Innovations theory indicates that the adoption of new practices occurs over time and is based on a five-phase innovation decision process (knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation and confirmation). Social Marketing approaches focus on the potential application of marketing and advertising principles in the promotion of research-based knowledge.

Within Wilson et al’s (2010) review, twenty dissemination frameworks were presented and each contained different dissemination elements. It is beyond the scope of the current paper, to outline all of the elements described in the dissemination strategies.
and instead this article will focus on the features of Harmsworth and Turpin’s (2001) framework, which was theoretically based on McGuire’s (1969) Persuasion Communication Matrix. Harmsworth and Turpin (2001) outlined a ten-step process to guide the dissemination of educational development projects. This framework seemed particularly relevant given that the current paper is interested in the dissemination of research in the field of educational psychology. The ten-step framework is outlined in Figure 5.

When describing their dissemination strategy, Harmsworth and Turpin (2001) argued that there should be a clear plan in place for dissemination, which should be outlined in advance. The authors explained that the planning and development of the dissemination strategy must have equal importance placed on it as the research itself. In relation to selecting the most effective methods of disseminating research, Harmsworth and Turpin (2001) suggested that a multi-strand approach is needed, as disseminating using just one method is less likely to be successful. A number of different dissemination methods are described, including: briefings, conferences, journal articles, websites, workshops and newsletters. Harmsworth and Turpin (2001) also explained that it is important that the chosen methods of communication are the most appropriate for meeting the needs of the stakeholders.

1. What is dissemination?
2. What do we want to disseminate?
3. Who are our stakeholders and what are we offering them?
4. When do we disseminate?
5. What are the most effective ways of disseminating?
6. Who might help us disseminate?
7. How do we prepare our strategy?
8. How do we turn our strategy into an action plan?
9. How do we cost our dissemination activities?
10. How do we know we have been successful?

Figure 5: Harmsworth & Turpin's (2001) ten-step dissemination strategy

It is also important to consider who might help to disseminate research findings. Harmsworth and Turpin (2001) suggested identifying whether existing channels exist which can be utilised. For example, the target audience is likely to already have events, conferences and journals that they engage with and therefore the research has a greater
chance of being successful if it is implemented through an established channel. The authors also suggested approaching researchers who are carrying out projects in the same subject area, with a view to collaborating on projects or working together to disseminate findings.

Finally, Harmsworth and Turpin (2001) argued the importance of good evaluation and suggested that there is a need to review progress and the extent to which the dissemination strategy is meeting its objectives. In order to effectively evaluate the dissemination plan, it is important to set targets and criteria for success so that outcomes can be measured.

**Policy, practice and research implications of the current research**

The following section will outline the findings of a recent research project, which was carried out by a TEP, as part of a doctorate programme in Educational and Child Psychology. The research focused on exploring the use of MI in educational settings and the findings have been summarised in two separate papers.

The first paper was a systematic literature review (SLR), which sought to determine the effectiveness of student-focused school-based MI (SBMI) in educational settings. Eleven studies met the inclusion criteria, although just eight were considered 'best evidence' and included in the final synthesis. Overall, there was emerging evidence that student-focused SBMI is an effective intervention for improving student outcomes in the areas of academic achievement, behaviour and school-based motivation. However, a number of methodological weaknesses were identified in the studies and these provided clear pointers for future research.

The second paper, reported on the findings of an empirical study, which aimed to establish students’ views on an MI intervention for challenging disaffection. Three students took part in five or six individual sessions of MI, which were delivered by three EPs, working in two local authorities. Students were interviewed by an independent researcher at post-intervention and again at three months follow-up and their views were triangulated with student self-report measures of school-based motivation and EP interview data. The qualitative interview data suggested that students enjoyed taking part in the MI interventions and perceived that there had been positive improvements in their behaviour. However, this was not necessarily supported by the quantitative self-report data. It also emerged that two of the students experienced permanent or partial placement breakdown around the time that the intervention took
place, suggesting that the interventions had not necessarily resulted in desirable outcomes, although it should be noted that the intervention was not about preventing exclusion, but improving motivation. The authors concluded that there were a number of contextual factors, which may have impacted on the results of the study, including the level of staff involvement in MI interventions and wider systemic factors affecting student behaviour and motivation for school.

One of the first steps in Harmsworth and Turpin’s (2001) dissemination strategy is to identify the main stakeholders and decide what to disseminate. A stakeholder can be described as, “Any group or individual who can affect, or be affected by the achievement of the projects objectives - or can influence these objectives” (Harmsworth and Turpin, 2001, p.6). In relation to the current research project, it is possible to identify stakeholders at three different levels: the research site; organisational level; and professional level.

➢ Research implications at the research site

At the research site, there are implications for the participants who took part in the empirical study outlined in the second paper. For instance, it would be important for the three students who participated in the MI intervention to be made aware of the positive features of MI that they identified in their interviews. The students identified a number of positive features of MI interventions, such as the session resources, relationship with the EP and the use of the ‘wheel of change’, which is a child-friendly version of the Transtheoretical Model (TTM) (DiClemente & Prochaska, 1982).

Similarly, there are also implications for the EPs who delivered the MI interventions. It would be useful to provide direct feedback to the EPs to inform them about what worked well for the students who took part in the MI sessions. In addition, the EPs would also benefit from having an awareness of some of the contextual factors that may have impacted on the success of the MI interventions. For instance, there were positive long-term outcomes for a student who received support from school staff after the intervention, in relation to goal setting and evaluation of his behaviour. This suggests that students may benefit from having a mentor in school that can help them to maintain changes and prevent relapse. In addition, two of the students experienced placement breakdowns around the time that the intervention took place, which suggests that MI alone may be insufficient for students who are already at risk of permanent exclusion in the absence of a systemic and coherent response to the student’s needs, experiences and
potential change plans. Finally, there was evidence that systemic factors were impacting on the behaviour and school-based motivation in the students who were excluded, indicating that MI alone may not be a suitable intervention for supporting students if systemic factors are not considered and addressed. This suggests that it may be useful for EPs to conduct initial consultations with school staff in order to determine whether a student is a suitable candidate for taking part in the MI intervention.

➢ Research implications at an organisational level

At an organisational level, it will be necessary to provide feedback to the two teams of EPs at the local authorities who participated in the second research paper. It is likely that the EP teams would be interested in the findings and implications of the empirical research project, particularly the impact of the extra-therapeutic factors, as this should be helpful for developing EP practice in relation to carrying out future MI interventions with disaffected students. For instance, there is a need to consider whether schools have the capacity to provide further support and input once the EP therapeutic involvement has ceased. In addition, if the EP feels that there are wider systemic factors impacting on students’ motivation or behaviour, it may be that an MI intervention alone will be unsuccessful for promoting tangible and observable change.

The findings of the SLR, described in the first paper, will also have equal importance for the EP teams. It would be helpful for EPs to know that there is a small, but emerging evidence base suggesting that MI is an effective intervention for supporting students in two distinct areas: disaffection and academic achievement. Some of the themes that were identified in the included studies may also be of interest to EPs and should support them when making decisions about how to implement future SBMI interventions. For instance, the evidence base for student-focused SBMI is mainly focused on high school students and there is also evidence to suggest that MI may be less suitable for certain groups of students, such as those with social communication difficulties or low levels of emotional literacy.

➢ Research implications at a professional level

There are also research implications at a wider, professional level. For instance, the findings of the SLR are likely to be of interest to qualified EPs and school psychologists, both in the UK and internationally. The first paper provides an overview of current literature in the area of student-focused SBMI and identifies two main areas where MI has been found to be effective: disaffection and academic achievement.
Whilst, research indicates that solution focused brief therapy is the most popular therapeutic intervention used by EPs in the UK (Atkinson, Bragg, Squires, Muscutt & Wasilewski, 2011), the first paper suggests that there is emerging evidence for effectiveness of SBMI in educational settings. This may encourage more EPs to use MI as a therapeutic intervention in schools. The first paper also identifies that there are international differences in the use of SBMI: MI has typically been used to challenge student disaffection in the UK, whereas, US research has focused on the use of MI for improving academic achievement. This is likely to be of interest to EPs in the UK and school psychologists in the US, as it would broaden their awareness of the potential applications of MI.

The second paper is the first study on student-focused SBMI that has focused on obtaining the students’ views on an MI intervention to challenge disaffection. The positive aspects of the intervention identified by the students, including the importance of the EP relationship and the use of the ‘wheel of change’, adapted from the TTM (DiClemente & Prochaska, 1982), will be important for qualified EPs to bear in mind when completing future MI interventions. The external factors that were identified as having impacted on students outcomes, will also be useful for EPs to consider when deciding which students are most likely to benefit from participating in MI interventions.

It would be useful for TEPs, who are enrolled on doctoral training courses, to be provided with information from the SLR on MI in educational settings. The first paper provides an up-to-date overview of the current research in the field of student-focused SBMI and would be useful for TEPs who are interested in finding out more about how MI is used in schools. The recommendations for future research may also be helpful for TEPs who are considering carrying out doctoral research in MI, as a number of clear pointers for future research emerged from the review. For instance, it is suggested that larger scale research studies are needed that included both qualitative and quantitative measures. In addition, it is argued that future MI studies should incorporate follow-up measures and independent researchers.

The recommendations for future research outlined in the second paper, may also be of interest to TEPs and researchers who are interested in carrying out further research on MI. It is suggested that future studies on MI and disaffected students may wish to utilise retrospective, authentic case studies. It is also argued that the use of MI in the area of academic achievement is a potentially exciting new area of research for EPs in
the UK and would be worthy of further study. In addition, the validity and reliability of the student self-report measures are brought into question and it is suggested that there is a role for researchers in developing alternative instruments that are suitable for measuring disaffection.

**Promoting and evaluating the dissemination and impact of the research**

In order to promote the main research findings to stakeholders, it is advisable to devise a dissemination plan. Table 7 outlines a dissemination strategy for the current research project, which is based on the framework provided by Harmsworth and Turpin (2001). There are three main aims to the current dissemination strategy: increasing the awareness of the study participants; developing the understanding of qualified EPs and TEPs in order to improve practice in relation SBMI; and increasing action and promoting new research in the field of SBMI among MI researchers and doctoral students.

A number of different dissemination methods were selected in order to achieve the aims, such as participant letters, presentations, attendance at conferences, published journal articles and book chapters and attendance at a university research commissioning day. Harmsworth and Turpin (2001) argued that using a variety of dissemination methods that are matched to the target audiences will increase the chance of success.

Letters were selected as the medium to achieve the first aim and increase the awareness of student and EP participants. A multi-strand approach was used to achieve the second aim of developing TEPs’ and qualified EPs’ understanding of the research project. Firstly, to provide feedback to the two teams of EPs that took part in the research project, the TEP plans to deliver a presentation outlining the main research findings. In order to reach a wider audience of EPs, it is hoped that the research will be published in journal articles and book chapters. The first paper has already been published in the journal, Advances in School Mental Health Promotion (Snape & Atkinson, 2016) and it is hoped that the second paper will be published in Educational Psychology in Practice. See Appendix G1 for a copy of Snape and Atkinson’s (2016) journal article. The author has also been invited to contribute two book chapters, for inclusion in a new book on SBMI edited by Eddie McNamara, which further develops ideas about using MI in school-based practice from two previous publications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissemination target</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Dissemination method</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility of</th>
<th>Costing considerations</th>
<th>Success criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student participants will be aware of the main study findings (paper 2)</td>
<td>Student participants</td>
<td>To increase awareness</td>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>By July 2016</td>
<td>LS - TEP</td>
<td>Printing materials, stamps, envelopes</td>
<td>Students will be able to describe the aspects of the MI intervention that worked well for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP participants will be aware of the main study findings (paper 2)</td>
<td>EP participants</td>
<td>To increase awareness</td>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>By July 2016</td>
<td>LS - TEP</td>
<td>Printing materials, stamps, envelopes</td>
<td>EPs will be able to describe the aspects of the MI intervention that were positively received by students They will also show an awareness of some of the external factors, which impacted on the study findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP Teams at two local authorities will demonstrate an understanding of the main study findings (paper 2)</td>
<td>EP teams</td>
<td>To develop understanding and improve EP practice</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>By August 2016</td>
<td>LS - TEP</td>
<td>Equipment, printing materials, refreshments, travel costs</td>
<td>EPs will be able to describe some ways in which the study findings might influence their future MI practice e.g. when making decisions about student/ school suitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP teams at the two local authorities will demonstrate an understanding of the SLR findings (paper 1)</td>
<td>EP teams</td>
<td>To develop understanding and improve EP practice</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>By August 2016</td>
<td>LS - TEP</td>
<td>Equipment, printing materials, refreshments, travel costs</td>
<td>EPs will be able to describe some ways in which the SLR findings might influence their future MI practice e.g. when making decisions about which groups of students may benefit from taking part in MI interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPs will demonstrate an understanding of the main study findings (paper 2)</td>
<td>Qualified EPs, both nationally and internationally</td>
<td>To develop understanding and improve EP practice</td>
<td>Journal article Book chapter Conference presentations Key MI researchers to promote within the field</td>
<td>By August 2017</td>
<td>LS - TEP CA – co-author/ UK MI researcher EM – book editor ISPA conference Local authority EP team day GS – US MI researcher</td>
<td>Venue, Equipment, printing materials, travel costs, publicity</td>
<td>EPs will be able to describe some ways in which the study findings might influence their future MI practice e.g. when making decisions about which groups of students may benefit from taking part in MI interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPs will demonstrate an understanding of the SLR findings (paper 1)</td>
<td>Qualified EPs, both nationally and internationally</td>
<td>To develop understanding and improve EP practice</td>
<td>Journal article Presentation Conference presentations Key MI researchers to promote within the field</td>
<td>By August 2017</td>
<td>LS - TEP CA – co-author/ UK MI researcher ISPA conference Local authority EP team day GS – US MI researcher</td>
<td>Venue, Equipment, printing materials, travel costs, publicity</td>
<td>EPs will be able to describe some ways in which the SLR findings might influence their future MI practice e.g. when making decisions about which groups of students may benefit from taking part in MI interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEPs will demonstrate an understanding of the use of MI in educational settings (paper 1)</td>
<td>TEPs studying at initial training courses</td>
<td>To develop understanding and improve EP practice</td>
<td>Journal article Course tutor MI presentations at universities</td>
<td>By August 2017</td>
<td>LS - TEP CA – co-author/ course tutor Manchester University SEED conference</td>
<td>Equipment, venue, printing materials, travel costs</td>
<td>TEPs will be able to summarise the main research findings on the effectiveness of student-focused SBMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEPs will use the recommendations in the papers to conduct further research on student-focused SBMI (papers 1 and 2)</td>
<td>TEPs studying at initial training courses</td>
<td>To increase action and promote new research in SBMI</td>
<td>Journal articles Attendance at Manchester University research commissioning day</td>
<td>By August 2017</td>
<td>LS - TEP CA – co-author/ course tutor Manchester University SEED conference</td>
<td>Equipment, venue, printing materials, travel costs</td>
<td>Future doctoral research on MI will be linked to the recommendations made in the research papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI researchers will use the recommendations in the papers to conduct further research on student-focused SBMI (papers 1 and 2)</td>
<td>MI researchers</td>
<td>To increase action and promote new research in SBMI</td>
<td>Journal articles Conference presentations Book chapter Key MI researchers to promote within the field</td>
<td>By August 2017</td>
<td>LS - TEP CA – co-author/ UK MI researcher EM – book editor ISPA/ Manchester University SEED conference Local authority EP team day GS – US MI researcher</td>
<td>Equipment, venue, printing materials, travel costs</td>
<td>Future research on MI will be linked to the recommendations made in the research papers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McNamara, 2009; 2014). One of the book chapters will focus on EPs’ views on the effectiveness of MI as an intervention for challenging disaffection. This will be based on the EP interview data that was generated as part of the thesis data collection, but was not included in the second paper due to word count limits. The TEP also hopes to attend a number of conferences to further disseminate the research to practitioners, for instance, it is hoped that the research will be presented at a number of conferences in 2016 and 2017, such as the International School Psychology Association (ISPA) conference, Manchester University School of Environment, Education and Development (SEED) conference and at a local authority EP team day. A number of key researchers in the field of SBMI have also been recruited to support the dissemination process, in both the UK and US. For instance, Cathy Atkinson, the co-author of the research papers has already begun to disseminate the SLR findings to first-year TEPs studying at universities across the UK. In addition, Gill Strait, a key SBMI researcher in the US has expressed an interest in the SLR paper and it is hoped that this awareness will lead to greater dissemination internationally.

The third aim of the dissemination strategy is to promote action and encourage researchers in the field of SBMI and doctoral students to take part in new research projects, which build on the recommendations listed in both papers. In order to achieve this aim, the TEP plans to attend the Manchester University research commissioning day in 2017 and pitch a new SBMI project, which links to the areas identified for future research in the two papers. Future research in this area might consider:

- **How MI might be adapted for working with certain groups of students, such as students with autistic spectrum condition;**
- **How SBMI might be used to promote academic achievement;**
- **The use of retrospective case studies to identify the facilitators and barriers involved in MI interventions targeting disaffection,**

**Conclusions**

Whilst there have been previous objections to the use of EBP in educational psychology, recently there has been a surge of interest in this area and EPs are currently being encouraged to develop their use of EBP in order to strengthen their own practice and the reputation of the profession. The transfer of research knowledge to practice is dependent on the effective dissemination of research and there are numerous frameworks available to support researchers to disseminate their findings. The current
paper has outlined the implications of a recent research project on MI in educational settings and has described a dissemination plan for promoting the research. By following the dissemination strategy, it is hoped that the research will have an impact at three levels: increasing awareness of the study participants; developing understanding and improving the practice of EPs and TEPs; and encouraging the development of new research projects in the field of SBMI. The process of dissemination is currently ongoing and will be monitored and evaluated accordingly, using the targets and success criteria outlined within the plan.
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Appendix B1: Methodological quality (quantitative evaluation research)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Use of a randomised group design</th>
<th>Focus on a specific, well defined disorder or problem</th>
<th>Comparison with treatment-as-usual, placebo, or less preferably, standard control</th>
<th>Use of manuals and procedures for monitoring and fidelity checks</th>
<th>Sample large enough to detect effect at .05 (from Cohen, 1992).</th>
<th>Use of outcome measure(s) that has demonstrated good reliability and validity*</th>
<th>Total (/7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enea &amp; Dafinou (2009)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓ (1)</td>
<td>2/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait et al. (2012)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (2)</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Smith, Strait &amp; McQuillin (2013)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓ (1)</td>
<td>4/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Strait, McQuillin &amp; Smith (2014)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓ (2)</td>
<td>5/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheftel, Lindstrom &amp; McWhirter (2014)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (2)</td>
<td>5/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(2 points if more than one measure used, 1 point deducted if measures lack reliability and validity)*

Low = 0-2; Medium = 3-4; High = 5/7
Appendix B2: Methodological quality (qualitative evaluation research)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Appropriateness of the research design</th>
<th>Clear sampling rationale</th>
<th>Well executed data collection</th>
<th>Analysis close to the data</th>
<th>Emergent theory related to the problem</th>
<th>Evidence of explicit reflexivity</th>
<th>Comprehensiveness of documentation</th>
<th>Negative case analysis</th>
<th>Clarity and coherence of the reporting</th>
<th>Evidence of researcher-participant negotiation</th>
<th>Transferable conclusions</th>
<th>Evidence of attention to ethical issues</th>
<th>Total (/12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson &amp; Woods (2003)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson &amp; Amesu (2007)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittles &amp; Atkinson (2009)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channon, Marsh, Jenkins &amp; Robing (2013)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryer &amp; Atkinson (2015)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snape &amp; Atkinson (2015)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>10/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low = 0-4; Medium = 5-8, High = 9-12.
Appendix B3: Methodological appropriateness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Use of objective outcome measure(s)</th>
<th>Clearly defined participant sample</th>
<th>Clear description of MI process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson &amp; Amesu (2007)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enea &amp; Dafinou (2009)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait et al. (2012)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Smith, Strait &amp; McQuillin (2013)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channon, Marsh, Jenkins &amp; Robing (2013)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Strait, McQuillin &amp; Smith (2014)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheftel, Lindstrom &amp; McWhirter (2014)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low = 0-1; Medium = 2; High = 3
Appendix B4: Focus of study – relevance to review questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Key MI elements e.g. OARS/ spirit and principles</th>
<th>School-based MI</th>
<th>Student-focused MI sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson &amp; Amesu (2007)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittles &amp; Atkinson (2009)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enea &amp; Dafinou (2009)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait et al. (2012)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Smith, Strait &amp; McQuillin (2013)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channon, Marsh, Jenkins &amp; Robing (2013)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Strait, McQuillin &amp; Smith (2014)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheftel, Lindstrom &amp; McWhirter (2014)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryer &amp; Atkinson (2015)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low = 0-1; Medium = 2; High = 3
### Appendix B5: Overall weight of evidence ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methodological quality</th>
<th>Appropriateness of research method</th>
<th>Focus of evidence for the review method</th>
<th>Overall weight of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson &amp; Woods (2003)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson &amp; Amesu (2007)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittles &amp; Atkinson (2009)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enea &amp; Dafinou (2009)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait et al. (2012)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Smith, Strait &amp; McQuillin (2013)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channon, Marsh, Jenkins &amp; Robing (2013)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Strait, McQuillin &amp; Smith (2014)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheftel, Lindstrom &amp; McWhirter (2014)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryer &amp; Atkinson (2015)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snape &amp; Atkinson (2015)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix C1: Student interview schedules

Student post-intervention semi-structured interview schedule

1. Can you tell me a little bit about the sort of things have you been working on during the sessions?
2. Can you tell me about what you most enjoyed doing?
3. Is there anything that could have been better?
4. To what extent have you enjoyed working with [EP] over the last few weeks? [Use Likert scale].
5. Can you tell me about how you been getting on at school since working with [EP]?
6. Have you noticed anything different since working with [EP]? Has anything changed?
7. Can you think of anything your teachers/parents/friends might notice which is different?
8. Is there anything particular you can think of which has stayed the same? [Do not ask if nothing has changed].

Student follow-up semi-structured interview schedule

1. Can you tell me a little bit about how you have been getting on at school since the sessions with [EP] ended?
2. When I last spoke to you, you told me that you were at [X] on the wheel of change. Where do you think are you now? Why do you think that?
3. Has anything been different since the sessions ended? Has anything changed at school?
4. Can you think of anything that your teachers/parents/friends think has changed?
5. Is there anything in particular you can think of which has stayed the same?
6. To what extent do you feel that working with [EP] was helpful? [Use Likert scale].

91
Appendix C2: EP interview schedule

EP post-intervention interview schedule

1. Can you tell me about the pupil that you have been working with?
2. How did the pupil respond to the programme?
3. Have you or anyone else noticed any changes in the pupil’s motivation for school since taking part in the MI programme?
4. Were there any other changes that you or others have noticed?
5. How manageable and convenient was it to run the intervention?
6. Can you tell me about how you used the Facilitating Change 2 resources? Which were most helpful when working with the child? Which could be developed?
7. Can you give me some information about how your structured the sessions, and how you decided which activities to use/prioritise?
8. Did you find yourself using any other techniques, approaches or resources alongside the MI programme?
9. Did you face any difficulties when running the programme?
10. If so how were these difficulties overcome?
Appendix C3: Pupils’ Feelings about School and School Work (PFSSW) Inventory

SCHOOL AND SCHOOL WORK INVENTORY

Please read these instructions carefully.

Instructions: This questionnaire, in two sections, contains comments made by pupils about their school and school work. To what extent do you agree or disagree with their comments? As the comments are feelings based on personal experience, there can be no right or wrong answers. We are interested in your opinion or experience.

Read each comment carefully and then immediately show how closely you agree or disagree with that comment by circling one of the letters at the right-hand side.

Choose the letters according to the answer you want to give.

a – definitely agree
b – agree a bit
c – not sure or not understood
d – disagree a bit
e – definitely disagree

For example, if you disagree a bit with the following item, circle D

I enjoy the practical work at school.

Try to avoid the ‘not sure’ answer if you possibly can.
It is important that you give an answer to every question.
Please fill in the details below:

Name .......................................................... School ..........................................................
Class .......................................................... Date of birth ............................................
Sex male or female ................................................ Identification number ..................................
Part A

1. I enjoy talking to my parents about what happens at school.
2. Most teachers are fair to all their pupils.
3. Being friendly with other pupils is more important to me than competing with them.
4. When I'm absorbed in something, my parents don't interrupt me.
5. I get so involved in some topics at school that I try to follow them up on my own.
6. School is a boring place.
7. When I don't do well at school, I feel ashamed of myself.
8. I want teachers to know that they can depend on me.
9. Punishment in schools is always unfair.
10. Adults demand too much from young people and give little help in return.
11. My parents are really happy when I do well at school, and that makes me feel good too.
12. It would make me feel bad if I disappointed the teacher.
13. I enjoy helping other pupils with their school work.
14. I don't feel happy having to work on my own.
15. I generally leave my homework until the last minute.
16. Many school lessons are dull and uninteresting.
17. I would rather admit something I have done wrong than try to cover it up.
18. If teachers would let pupils do whatever they want to do, I would enjoy school much more.

19. I would rather be corrected than left to do something wrong.

20. My teachers never seem to be satisfied with what I've done, even when I've tried hard.

21. My parents don't seem to be all that interested in what I've done at school.

22. There are very few teachers that I can really admire.

23. I feel really good when my friends can see that I've done well.

24. You can't expect pupils to come up with good ideas of their own.

25. School provides a great deal of useful knowledge about life.

26. I spend a lot of my spare time finding out about things on my own.

27. If I'm given something to do, I always try to do it as well as possible.

28. School rules are sensible. I always try to follow them.

29. If I have done something wrong, I'm always ready to take the consequences.

30. I rather resent the amount of pressure the teachers put us under.

31. My parents are always helpful and encouraging about my school work.

32. Most teachers never bother to explain things well enough.

33. I don't really care what other people think about me.
34. My parents always value my opinion.
35. The things we learn at school are not of any real use to me.
36. I feel happy and excited when a new topic is introduced.
37. I always find a good excuse if I haven't done my homework.
38. When school work is hard, I usually give up.
39. I find I am often having to make excuses.
40. My parents demand too much of me and put me under a lot of pressure.
41. Adults are not really interested in trying to understand young people's feelings.
42. It is often the teacher's fault when you get into trouble at school.
43. People seem to find it difficult to get on well with me.
44. I always prefer to work things out for myself.
45. I quickly lose interest if new topics are difficult.
46. There are a lot of lessons which I find exciting and challenging.
47. If I am expected to do something, I do it.
48. I always put a lot of effort into what we're asked to do in school.
49. I am ready to take responsibility for all my actions, no matter what.
50. My parents seem to be totally unrealistic in what they expect me to achieve at school.

51. If I do well at school, my parents always show that they are pleased with me.

52. Most teachers try hard to help all the pupils.

53. There's a really good feeling among the pupils in this school.

54. I'm expected to work out too many things on my own.

55. I don't mind working hard if I learn something in the process.

56. I find school work really very interesting.

57. I always try to live up to my parents' trust.

58. Only weak people like rules and need order.

59. A feeling of guilt is worse even than severe punishment.

60. Adults always seem to be expecting too much of young people.
## Appendix C4: EP diary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pupil Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session Number</td>
<td>Session Length</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Session Plan

### Key areas covered

### MI processes and techniques used

### Pupil response

### Outcomes and plans for next session
Appendix C5: EP self-assessment sheet

The spirit of MI

1. **Collaboration** – did you work in collaboration with the young person to explore and support them rather than persuade and argue?
   Yes/ No (please circle)

On a scale of 1-10 (10 being collaborative at all times and 1 not being collaborative at all) where do you think you were?

1 ---------------------------------------------------------- 10

Please provide a brief sentence to explain your answer
........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

2. **Evocation** – did you evoke information and concerns about change from the young person, without imparting information?
   Yes/ No (please circle)

On a scale of 1-10 (10 evoking change without imparting information and 1 advising and imparting information at all times) where do you think you were?

1 ---------------------------------------------------------- 10

Please provide a brief sentence to explain your answer
........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

3. **Autonomy** – did you allow the young person to be autonomous and present their own arguments for change?
   Yes/ No (please circle)

On a scale of 1-10 (10 allowing the young person to be autonomous at all times and 1 not being autonomous) where do you think you were?

1 ---------------------------------------------------------- 10

Please provide a brief sentence to explain your answer
........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
Principles of MI

4. **Expressing empathy** – did you show that you understood the young person’s feelings and perspectives in a non-judgmental manner?
   Yes/ No (please circle)

On a scale of 1-10 (10 expressing empathy at all times and 1 not expressing empathy at all) where do you think you were?

1------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- 10

Please provide a brief sentence to explain your answer

...........................................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................................................................................

5. **Developing discrepancy** – did you develop discrepancy between how things currently are and how they might like things to be?
   Yes/ No (please circle)

On a scale of 1-10 (10 developing discrepancy at all times and 1 not developing discrepancy at all) where do you think you were?

1------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- 10

Please provide a brief sentence to explain your answer

...........................................................................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................................................................................

6. **Rolling with resistance** – did you roll with the young person’s resistance to change and not argue or persuade them to change?
   Yes/ No (please circle)

On a scale of 1-10 (10 rolling with resistance at all times and 1 not rolling with resistance at all) where do you think you were?

1------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- 10

Please provide a brief sentence to explain your answer
7. **Supporting self-efficacy** – did you support the young person’s beliefs in his or her ability to carry out and succeed with a task?

On a scale of 1-10 (10 supporting self-efficacy at all times and 1 not supporting self-efficacy at all) where do you think you were?

1 ----------------------------------------------- 10

Please provide a brief sentence to explain your answer

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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EPs’ use of Motivational Interviewing in improving school-based motivation in disaffected secondary school pupils.

Laura Snape
Background

Introduction to MI

Motivational Interviewing (MI) was originally used within medical settings, particularly to help people with addictive behaviours, such as drug use, smoking and alcohol addiction (Miller & Rollnick, 1991). Rollnick and Miller (1995), who were the first proponents of MI describe it as:

‘a directive, client-centered counselling style for eliciting behaviour change by helping clients explore and resolve ambivalence.’ (p.326)

MI aims to support a client in increasing his or her intrinsic motivation to change their behaviour. It is based on the assumption that although others may perceive their behaviour to be problematic, clients may not always be immediately ready to change (Rollnick & Miller, 1995).

A number of meta-analyses have investigated the effectiveness of MI across clinical settings and have found that MI can lead to significant improvements in adults’ behaviour (Rubak, Sandbeck, Lauritzen, & Christensen, 2005; Lundahl, Tollefson, Kunz, Brownell, & Burke, 2010). Furthermore, recent evidence has supported the efficacy of MI with children and young people for behaviours such as smoking, eating disorders and obesity, substance use and depression (e.g. Feldstein & Forcehimes, 2007; Brody, 2009).

What is MI?

Miller and Rollnick (2002) propose that there are two key elements to MI, the spirit and principles of MI.

The spirit of MI is based on three components:

- Collaboration
- Evocation
- Autonomy

The four key principles of MI provide guidance for how to deliver the ‘spirit’ in practice (Miller & Rollnick, 2002):

- Expressing empathy
- Developing discrepancy
- Rolling with resistance
- Supporting self-efficacy

Rollnick, Heather and Bell (1992) devised the Menu of Strategies as a brief MI intervention. It is designed to help people to explore their ambivalence to change and to move towards making a behavioural change (Atkinson, 2013).
The Menu of Strategies

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Opening discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A Typical day/ my lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The good things and the less good things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Providing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The future and the present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Exploring concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Helping with decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Model of the Stages of Change, also referred to as the Trantheoretical Model (TTM), was developed by Prochaska and Di Clemente (1982) and reflects the path that individuals go through when they engage in behaviour change, regardless of the type of therapy that they engage in. Although, MI and TTM are two distinct entities, it has been suggested that many practitioners use the TTM model alongside MI techniques (McNamara, 2009).

MI aims to help clients to move from a situation where they have no desire to change their problematic behaviour to one in which they have achieved successful behaviour change. The TTM is useful for MI practitioners as it allows them to determine where the client is regarding their readiness to change and from this it is then possible to identify the most appropriate stage to move clients on to (McNamara, 2009).

Model of Stages of Change (adapted from McNamara, 1992)
**MI in educational settings**

McNamara (1992) first proposed that MI could be used with disaffected young people in educational settings. It was suggested that MI may be a useful intervention for pupils engaging in disruptive and challenging behaviour because in such cases, it is often a third party, such as a teacher or parent that desires behaviour change, whereas the young person themselves may not share the same concerns. As a result, these pupils may lack the motivation and commitment to change their behaviours. McNamara proposed that MI techniques could be used to guide pupils through the stages of change from a position of having no desire to change, to a positive, self-motivated commitment to behaviour change.

In the USA, Frey et al. (2011) have reported a number of ways in which MI can be adapted and used in schools, for example, to increase parental involvement, improve links between home and school and address mental health problems. MI has also been successfully applied to school-based consultations and more recently a peer support programme that was based on MI principles was positively received (Blom-Hoffman & Rose, 2007; Channon, Marsh, Jenkins, & Robling, 2013). Manthey (2011) found that MI was an effective approach for increasing pupil retention in supported education programmes and Strait, Terry, McQuillin and Smith (2014) reported that participating in MI could have a positive impact on academic achievement; when pupils received two sessions of MI, their grades improved in maths, science and history.

There have been three published studies in the UK that have investigated the use of MI with secondary school pupils who were described as disaffected or as having behavioural concerns (Atkinson & Woods, 2003; Atkinson & Amesu, 2007; Kittles & Atkinson, 2009). These studies reported a number of benefits of participating in MI, such as, improved attendance and punctuality; increased motivation; positive reports from teachers and improved attitudes towards school.

It is important to note that in each of these studies, the researchers have also acted as the MI facilitators, which is a limitation of the research. Furthermore, although all studies involved the collection of qualitative case study information, just Atkinson and Woods (2003) study provided quantitative data. Kittles and Atkinson (2009) investigated pupil’s views about the MI process; whereas, previous studies did not include measures of the pupil voice and instead measured effectiveness in terms of pupil outcomes or teachers’ views.

**The knowledge gap**

The study intends to inform EPs professional practice by increasing the evidence base for the efficacy of MI with disaffected pupils. The current study is interested in whether participating in an MI programme can improve school-based motivation in pupils who are described as disaffected. Furthermore the study intends to collect both qualitative and quantitative data; obtain the views of pupils’ that take part in the intervention; as well as the views of the EPs’ that deliver the programme. It will also be the first study to use an independent researcher, as trained EPs will deliver the intervention, and the researcher will analyse the impact. The intervention will be useful in supporting EPs in the selection and implementation of MI as a therapeutic intervention for disengaged students.

**Aims/ objectives**

The study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of an MI programme, delivered by EPs, for improving school-based motivation in disaffected CYP.
The aims can be outlined as follows:

1. Quantitatively assess the efficacy of MI as an intervention for improving school-based motivation in disaffected pupils.
2. Provide qualitative information on the pupils’ and EPs’ responses to the MI programme.

Having outlined the aims above, the research questions are as follows:

**Research Question 1:** To what extent can a MI programme, delivered by EPs, improve young people’s reported school-based motivation?

**Research Question 2:** What are the pupils’ views on the MI programme and do they feel that it has helped to improve their school-based motivation?

**Research Question 3:** What are the EPs’ views on the MI programme and do they feel that it has helped pupil’s to improve their school-based motivation?

**Research Question 4:** How do EPs adapt and implement MI to address the needs of pupils?

**Procedure**

**Participants**

Each EP should identify one pupil to take part in the MI intervention.

Pupils will be recruited based on the following criteria:

- They are currently studying at secondary school (Year 7- Year 9);
- EP, parents and school believe that the MI programme is appropriate for the pupil;
- The pupil is not experiencing any extenuating circumstances outside school e.g. bereavements, parental separation etc.;
- The pupil can be described as ‘disaffected’ from school. McNamara (2009) defines disaffection as: ‘an integrated set of negative attitudes, beliefs and behaviours with respect to the demands of school life generally and with respect to academic demands in particular’. (p.8). Indicators of disaffection from school could include: non-compliance; disruptive behaviour; lack of interest during lessons; arriving late to lessons; unauthorised absences; not completing homework tasks etc.;
- There are some exceptions to the inappropriate behaviour to ensure that the pupil is able to portray appropriate behaviours and the pupil is not at risk of permanent exclusion;
- The EP and school believe that the pupil is capable of meeting the language demands of the MI sessions; it is likely that this will mean that pupils with a diagnosis of autistic spectrum condition or those who are experiencing social and communication difficulties will be excluded from the sample.

EPs will speak to head teachers and school staff in order to gain their verbal consent to carry out the research. Once pupils have been identified as potential participants for the study, information letters and consent forms should then be sent home with pupils, explaining the purpose of the intervention to their parents. The researcher’s contact details are provided on the information sheet to ensure that any questions or queries can be answered directly by the researcher.
Parents should be provided with the consent forms at least two weeks prior to the proposed start date of the intervention. They will also be made aware that there will still be an opportunity for pupils to take part in the intervention, even if they do not want their data to be included in the research study.

Once parental consent has been gained, pupils should be informed of the content and purpose of the research. EPs will explain the study in a way that is appropriate for the pupil’s age and stage of development. Pupils will also be given the opportunity opt out if they do not want to take part and will be made aware that they can withdraw from the research at any point, even after they have provided consent.

**MI Sessions**

Pupils will take part in approximately five hour-long sessions of MI, over five weeks. It would be helpful if the sessions were completed over a half term.

The MI sessions should be based on the Facilitating Change 2 resource pack (Atkinson, 2013), which has been distributed to services. The Facilitating Change 2 resources are based on the Menu of Strategies. The pack should be used flexibly in order to meet the needs of the pupils. EPs should select appropriate activities from the pack depending on the pupil’s stage of change; therefore the number of sessions delivered and the content of each session may vary according to pupil requirements. Although the session content may vary, it is important that all sessions adhere to the spirit and principles of MI. Although EPs will be responsible for planning the MI sessions, these can be planned in consultation with the researcher.

**Data Gathering**

*Pupils’ Feelings about School and School Work Inventory*

All pupils should complete the Pupils’ Feelings about School and School Work Inventory (PFSSW) before they begin the MI intervention in order to establish a baseline representation of the pupils’ views in relation to their motivation and general attitude towards school. It would be helpful if this were completed prior to the first MI session. The same PFSSW should be competed again once the intervention has finished. Students will also complete the PFSSW inventory again three months after the intervention.

*Audio-recordings*

All MI sessions should be audio-recorded by the EP. This will ensure that the fidelity and replicability of the study can be monitored. Audio-recording devises will be made available to services. All EPs will also be provided with CD-ROMs to store the audio-recordings.

It is possible that due to the presence of the audio recorder, some students may feel uncomfortable talking about certain issues. Pupils should be informed that when the researcher listens to the tape, the focus would be on the skills of the EP and not on what the young person says. The recording device should be positioned out of sight of the young person during the MI sessions, in order to reduce anxiety.

*EP Diary*

EPs should complete a short diary at the end of each session to outline the focus of the session and the main activities that were completed. It is anticipated that this should take no more than 10 minutes to complete.
**EP self-assessment sheet**

EPs should complete a short self-assessment form at the end of each session. This will determine whether the spirit and principles of MI were adhered to appropriately. This is based on the spirit and aims of MI, outlined by Miller and Rollnick (2002). It is anticipated that this should take no more than 10 minutes to complete.

**Interviews**

Interviews with the pupils and EPs will take place after the MI intervention has ended. The aim of the interviews is to establish the EPs’ and pupils’ views on the MI programme and whether they feel it has been helpful. The interviews are likely to last no longer than one hour. A follow up interview with the pupil will also take place three months after the intervention has ended.

**Ethical Issues**

It will be important to ensure the anonymity of all participants. Pupil initials should be used on the PFSSW questionnaires and in any other documentation, such as the EP diary.

Due to the therapeutic nature of the MI sessions, there is a possibility that the sessions could cause some upset or distress for pupils, depending on the topics discussed. If this was to occur the EP conducting the MI session will stop the sessions immediately and inform the child’s parents. A key member of staff should also be identified for the pupils to speak to if they feel upset or distressed following an MI session.

EPs should contact the researcher if they have any questions or require supervision.
Appendix D2: EP refresher training

Facilitating Change 2

Aims of the session
- To look at the skills involved in MI.
- To consider ways in which you might 'do' a Motivational Interview.
- To look at the Facilitating Change 2 resources.
- To look at an example of MI in practice.

Facilitating Change 2

Key Elements of MI
- The Spirit and Principles of MI (Miller & Rollnick, 2002).
- The Model of Stages of Change (McNamara, 1998; Prochaska and DiClemente, 1982).
- The Goals of MI (McNamara, 1992; 1998).
- Menu of Strategies (Heather, Rollnick and Bell, 1992).

The Spirit of Motivational Interviewing
Motivational interviewing is based on three key components:
1. Collaboration
2. Evocation
3. Autonomy

The Principles of Motivational Interviewing
Motivational interviewing sessions should be delivered with the following principles in mind:
1. Expressing empathy
2. Developing discrepancy
3. Raising with resistance
4. Supporting self-efficacy
The Good Things and the Less Good Things

Referenced concerns: being, poor attendance and literacy difficulties

Behaviour - playing out late with older mates

- Good Things
  - "Having a good time and a laugh"
  - "You don't miss out on anything because everyone else is out"
  - "I like doing things that my other mates at school do that I really do"

- Less Good Things
  - "I worry and think... "Oh if I'm late go home now"
  - "Mom will worry"
  - "I might have to lie... I might get in more trouble"
  - "I get tired"

Providing Information

Rollnick, Heather and Bell (1992) suggest that providing information should be dealt with in a sensitive manner and advocate using the permission of clients before offering information.

Ways of providing Information

- Interventions: e.g. anger management
- Support for specific issues: e.g. substance use, imprisonment, counselling
- Information about social, educational, vocational and leisure opportunities
- Examples of what helped other young people
- Resources that may be helpful to the young person (e.g. books, leaflets, telephone numbers)

The Future and the Present

Looking to the future: now what patterns do the trends in to

- Work
- Weather
- Income
- Stress
- Money
- Health
- Family
- Education
- Leisure
- Other

Exploring Concerns

Scaling

- Thinking about change

Willing to change: On a scale of 1 to 10 with 10 representing you, being truthful, not wanting to change and 0 representing you really wanting to change, where are you today?

- Being able to change: On a scale of 1 to 10 with 10 representing it being very hard to change and 0 representing it being very easy, where do you see yourself today?
Explore the pack!

Session Outlines – An Example
- See example from Snape & Atkinson (in press).
- Based on Cryer & Atkinson (2014).

Thank you for listening
Appendix D3: Facilitating Change 2 (Atkinson, 2013) session outlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Possible stages of the change at which activities might be useful</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 - Opening discussion</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Activity 1a – Skills profile – an opportunity for the facilitator to develop rapport with the young person through finding out about the skills they have. Activity 1b – Opening discussion – allows the facilitator the opportunity to find out more about the young person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 - A typical day/my lessons</td>
<td>Precontemplation/Contemplation/Preparation</td>
<td>Activity 2a - A typical day – allows the young person and the facilitator an opportunity to explore what happens on days when problem behaviours do and do not occur. Activity 2b - My lessons – allows the opportunity for school-based professionals to identify which lessons may be problematic for the young person. Activity 3a – The good things and the less good things – this allows the young person to identify some of the pros and cons of any behaviours identified. Activity 3b – Weighing things up – offers the young person an opportunity to weigh up the pros and cons identified above. Activity 3c – Scaling – allows the young person to think about their motivation to change and how feasible change might be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 - The good things and the less good things</td>
<td>Contemplation/Preparation</td>
<td>Activity 4 – Providing information – a protocol for recording information to be located by the facilitator or young person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 - Providing Information</td>
<td>Contemplation/Preparation/Action/Relapse</td>
<td>Activity 5a – The future and the present – provides the young person with an opportunity to map out how their life might look, with or without behaviour change. Activity 5b – Looking to the future – offers the young person the chance to identify their preferred lifestyle at a point in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 - Exploring concerns</td>
<td>Contemplation/Preparation/Relapse</td>
<td>Activity 6a – Exploring concerns – the young person is introduced to the notion of readiness for change by placing statements on a scale. Activity 6b – Scaling concerns – the young person is given an opportunity to explore their own feelings about potentially problematic behaviours as well as the feelings of others. Activity 6c – The Wheel of Change – this activity, involving a number of different tasks, allows the young person to evaluate their own readiness for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 - Helping with decision making</td>
<td>Preparation/Action/Acrtion/Relapse</td>
<td>Activity 7a – Using my skills – allows the young person to revisit their identified skills and to develop these into competencies for supporting behavioural change. Activity 7b – Setting goals – enables the young person to think about what they want to achieve and to break the goal down into steps to maximise chances of success. Activity 7c – My strategy – helps the young person to identify a strategy for achieving their goal. Activity 7d – How am I doing? – allows the young person to review their behavioural progress. Activity 7e – Just in case (a plan) – helps the young person anticipate relapse and to put contingencies in place. Activity 7f - Stopping and Thinking (dealing with relapse) – offers the young person an opportunity to think rationally and systematically in the event of relapse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D4: Examples of students’ completed activities

Examples of activities completed by Danny

- ‘Words that describe me’ activity
- ‘My skills profile’ activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity (My Skills Profile)</th>
<th>Then you are</th>
<th>Which means you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you tick?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Picture Smart</td>
<td>See things clearly in your mind. Use pictures to get ideas across. Can imagine what something would look like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good sense of direction</td>
<td>Logic Smart</td>
<td>Like to put things in order. Have a logical mind. Plan things carefully. Need things to make sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembers things in pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Sound Smart</td>
<td>Work out patterns in sounds. Play with sounds, compose songs, sing or play instruments. Listen to music when working and to feel good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice sounds around me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of rhythm</td>
<td>Nature Smart</td>
<td>Enjoy being outdoors and feel comfortable there. Interested in animals, plants and trees. Think about issues that affect the planet, such as pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>People Smart</td>
<td>Enjoy contact with people. Good with others. Understand and notice other people’s feelings. Good communicator and team member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Self Smart</td>
<td>Enjoy quiet thinking time alone. Understand your own reasons for doing things. Like to daydream about new ideas. Think about your own feelings and thoughts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to be part of a group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team player</td>
<td>Body Smart</td>
<td>Learn best by doing. Like to use your hands. Good balance while running, walking and doing sport. Hobbies involve being active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Word Smart</td>
<td>Good at explaining things. Like writing and reading. Like word games and new words. Speak or write well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of my feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy being by myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good with my hands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn by tying things out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good at explaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good with words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
'Favourite and least favourite lessons’ activity

Favourite lesson

It is very fun.

Nice teacher.

Other students don’t really like.

Fun activities.

Least favourite lesson

It sucks.

Teacher is nice.

Other students rock.

Boring.
Imagine someone was secretly videoing you in your favourite lesson and then in your least favourite lesson. When the DVD was played back, what would you see?

**Good lesson**

- Work

**Not-so-good lesson**

- Not much work

Activity sheet 2b(iii) © Atkinson 2013
Examples of activities completed by Joshua

- ‘The good things and less good things’ activity
‘Looking to the future’ activity
- ‘The future and the present’ activity
• ‘My strategy’ activity

Activity sheet 7c
My strategy
Sheet 1

Goal... Not having so many detentions

Strategy (for achieving my goal)
What happens when I use it?

→ 1 detention
→ get my point across

Rating for this strategy: 🙄 😞 😞 😞 😞 😞

Strategy Not get involved when other people are getting in trouble.
What happens when I use it?

→ 1 detention

Rating for this strategy: 😞 😞 😞 😞 😞 😞

Strategy Do as I’m told the first time I’m asked.
What happens when I use it?

Rating for this strategy: 🙄 😞 😞 😞 😞 😞
Examples of activities completed by Taio

- 'The good things and less good things' activity
• *Weighing things up*’ activity
- ‘Looking to the future’ activity
‘The future and the present’ activity

Activity sheet 5a
The future and the present

Behaviour stays the same

- ISO
- Isolation
- Suspended
- Kicked out

Behaviour changes

- Not saying anything bad to teachers e.g. lazing off or being rude, answering back
- Teachers like a nice person towards you
- Get a good job when you're older
- Get better grades
- Be known as a nice person, like teachers
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Appendix E1: Parent consent form

Parent Information Sheet

It has been identified that your child may benefit from taking part in some Motivational Interviewing sessions. These sessions are being undertaken as part of a university research project. This information sheet will explain what Motivational Interviewing is and will outline why the research is being undertaken. It is your decision whether you would like your child to participate in the programme. Before you decide it is important for you to understand 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. Take time to decide whether or not you wish your child to take part. Thank you for reading this.

Who will conduct the research?

Laura Snape.

Manchester Institute of Education
School of Environment, Education and Development (SEED)
Ellen Wilkinson Building
The University of Manchester
Oxford Road
Manchester
M13 9PL

Title of the Research

EPs’ use of Motivational Interviewing in improving school-based motivation in disaffected secondary school pupils.

What is the aim of the research?

I am a Trainee Educational Psychologist, currently studying at the University of Manchester. As part of my training I am required to carry out research. In my research, I am planning to explore whether a Motivational Interviewing intervention, which is delivered by an educational psychologist, can lead to positive outcomes for the young people that take part.

What is Motivational Interviewing?
Motivational Interviewing is a technique that is often used by educational psychologists. The aim of Motivational Interviewing is to help young people to develop a better understanding of themselves and is designed to improve outcomes for those who take part.

**What are the possible benefits of taking part?**

Motivational Interviewing has been used around the world with many young people and the results have been very positive. It is hoped that by taking part in the Motivational Interviewing programme, your child will develop skills that will have a positive impact on his/her motivation, self-efficacy, self-esteem and behaviour in school.

**Which Motivational Interviewing programme will be used?**

A Motivational Interviewing programme called ‘Facilitating Change 2’ will be used. This programme aims to help children to explore and challenge their behaviour. It has been created by an Educational Psychologist who has vast experience of using motivational interviewing techniques with children and young people.

**Why has my child been chosen to take part?**

Your child has been selected to participate in the sessions, as school staff believe that they will benefit from taking part in the programme.

**What happens if my child takes part?**

If you would like your child to participate in the programme, please complete the consent form and return it to school by XXXX. An educational psychologist will then meet with your child and ask for his/her permission to include him/her in the programme. If he/she is happy to take part, they will attend one Motivational Interviewing session per week over approximately 5 weeks. During the sessions, your child will complete some activities and will have chance to talk to the educational psychologist. The sessions will take place during school time and, therefore, your child will miss some lessons, but staff will support your child in catching up with his/her work. Each session will be recorded using an audio-recording device. I will listen to the recordings to find out how the sessions were delivered by the educational psychologist.

Your child will be asked to complete a questionnaire at the beginning of the programme and will complete the same questionnaire again once the programme has ended. The questionnaire will also be carried out three months later, in order to see if any change is long lasting. After the intervention has ended and again three months later, I will also come into school to speak to your child to find out their views about the intervention. The interviews will be audio-recorded and transcribed.

**Where will the research be conducted?**

The programme will take place at XXXX and will be delivered by an educational psychologist. The interviews will be conducted by myself and will take place at XXXX.

**What happens to the data collected?**

The questionnaires will be analysed to see if there is any change in terms of your child’s level of school-based motivation during the study. The interview transcripts will also be analysed to determine whether the intervention has been effective, and if any changes were long-lasting. All name details in the data collected will be anonymised in order to maintain confidentiality.

**How is confidentiality maintained?**

Questionnaires and audio-recordings will only be kept as long as necessary and the data on them will then be destroyed. Any written records will be anonymised – all name details including people, schools and local authorities will be changed.
What happens if I do not want my child to take part or if I change my mind?

It is your decision whether your child takes part in the Motivational Interviewing sessions and they do not need to take part if you are not happy for him/her to do so. If you would like your child to participate in the Motivational Interviewing sessions, you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form. If you sign the consent letter, you are giving permission for your child to take part in the programme. If you agree to allow me to gather information and include this in my research report, please initial the box on the consent form. If you would like your child to participate in the sessions, but would not like them to be part of the research study, you just complete the slip at the bottom of the form and you do not need to initial any of the boxes on the consent form. Your child can still access the Motivational Interviewing sessions, without being part of the research. If you agree to allow me to gather information and include this in my research report, please initial the box on the consent form. If you decide to withdraw your child from the programme or if he/she no longer wants to participate, you can withdraw your child from the programme at any point. Any information that has already been collected about your child will be destroyed.

Will my child be paid for participating in the research?

There will be no payment for participating in this research.

What is the duration of the research?

The Motivational Interviewing programme will take place during approximately 5 sessions over a 5-week period. Your child will also be asked to complete a questionnaire at the beginning of the programme and again after the programme has ended. They will then complete the same questionnaire again three months later to see if any change is maintained. Your child will also be interviewed on completion of the programme and again three months later.

What will happen after the research project?

When the Motivational Interviewing programme has finished, I will write to you to tell you about the results. I will also be available to discuss this with you further if you wish.

Will the outcomes of the research be published?

The research will be assessed as part of the researcher’s professional doctorate. There is possibility that it may also be published in a scientific journal.

Criminal Records

The researcher has a fully enhanced DBS disclosure and can therefore conduct research on school premises.

Contact for further information

If you would like more details about this research project, please contact Laura Snape at the following email address: laura.snape@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk.

What if something goes wrong?

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 275 7583 or 275 8093
EPs’ use of Motivational Interviewing in improving school-based motivation in disaffected secondary school pupils.

CONSENT FORM

If you are happy to allow your child to participate please complete and sign the consent form below.

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.

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

I understand that their questionnaire responses and interview transcripts will be anonymised.

I agree that any information collected can be used in the research study and this data may be passed to other researchers.

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

I agree that my child may take part in a Motivational Interviewing programme run by an educational psychologist.

Name of child: ____________________________ Date: ______________ Signature: ____________________________

Name of parent/carer: ____________________________ Date: ______________ Signature: ____________________________
Appendix E2: Student consent form

Dear Pupil,

Your teachers have identified that you may benefit from taking part in some Motivational Interviewing sessions. In these sessions you would work with an educational psychologist. You would talk to them and complete some activities. These would take place every week, for about 5 weeks and will last about an hour. These sessions would be audio-recorded so that I can listen to how the Educational Psychologist delivers the sessions.

The aim of the sessions is to help you to understand yourself better. If you choose to take part, you will think about what things are like now and how you would like things to be in the future. The educational psychologist would work with you to help you to get to where you would like to be.

You would complete some questionnaires during some of the sessions. I would also come and speak to you after you have finished the sessions and again three months later to find out your views. The interviews will be recorded and this information would be used in a research project that I am doing. The research would not use your name or the name of your school so no one will know that it is you.

You do not need to take part in the research project. There will be no consequences if you do not wish to take part and you do not need to give a reason. However, if you choose to take part, you will need to sign the form. If you sign the form but then decide you no longer want to continue with the sessions, that is OK, you can change your mind at any time.

Best wishes,

Laura Snape,
Trainee Educational Psychologist
If you are happy to come out of class and take part in the Motivational Interviewing sessions please tick the boxes if you agree with them and then sign on the line below.

| I have read the information sheet and have had the chance to think about the information. |
| I have had chance to ask questions and these have been answered fully. |
| I would like to take part in the motivational interviewing sessions and I understand that these will be audio-recorded. |
| I know that I can decide that I don’t want to take part at any time and that I don’t have to give any reasons when I do. |
| I will complete some questionnaires and two recorded interviews and I agree that this information can be used when the study is written up, as long as my name is not used. |

Name of participant: ..............................................................................................................................
Signature: .......................................................... Date: ..................................................

Name of educational psychologist taking consent: ............................................................
Signature: .......................................................................................................................... Date: ..................................................
Appendix E3: EP consent form

EPs’ use of Motivational Interviewing in improving school-based motivation in disaffected secondary school pupils.

Educational Psychologist Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a research study, which is being undertaken as part of a student project on a doctorate course. Before you decide if you wish to participate is important for you to understand 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. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.

Who will conduct the research?

Laura Snape.

Manchester Institute of Education

School of Environment, Education and Development (SEED)

Ellen Wilkinson Building

The University of Manchester

Oxford Road

Manchester

M13 9PL

Title of the Research

EPs’ use of Motivational Interviewing in improving school-based motivation in disaffected secondary school pupils.

What is the aim of the research?

I am a Trainee Educational Psychologist, currently studying at the University of Manchester. As part of my training I am required to carry out research. I am currently researching Motivational Interviewing. In my research, I am interested in investigating whether a Motivational Interviewing intervention, delivered by educational psychologists, can lead to positive outcomes for the young people that take part.

Why have I been chosen?
As you have received training on Motivational Interviewing and have experience of using it, I am interested to find out your views on the use of Motivational interviewing interventions.

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

If you choose to take part, you will deliver a Motivational Interviewing intervention in a school, which will last approximately 5 weeks. You will work with a Year 7-9 pupil who can be described as disaffected from school and a Motivational Interviewing programme called ‘Facilitating Change 2’ will be used to structure the sessions. After you have completed the intervention, I would be interested to hear your views about the experience. I would like to find out more about your experience of delivering the intervention and your thoughts on the impact it has had.

**What happens to the data collected?**

All names in the data collected will be anonymised in order to maintain confidentiality. The information collected at the interview will be recorded and the researcher will transcribe this in order to look in detail at your views on the effectiveness of the intervention. The Motivational Interviewing sessions will be recorded and the researcher will listen to the recordings in order to improve the fidelity and replicability of the study.

**How is confidentiality maintained?**

The interview will be audio-recorded and transcribed. However, all identifying features such as the local authority's name, the school's name, the child’s name and your name will be kept anonymous and codes will be used when evaluating the data. The researchers will check the session recordings and no other persons will have access to the tapes. Tapes containing the audio-recorded interview and session recordings will only be kept as long as necessary and the data on them will be destroyed.

**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 do decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and 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.

**Will I be paid for participating in the research?**

There will be no payment for participating in this research.

**What is the duration of the research?**

The motivational interviewing intervention is likely to take place over five one-hour sessions. It is expected that the interview will last no longer than one hour.

**Where will the research be conducted?**

The interview will take place at XXXX.

**What will happen after the research project?**

When the findings of the results have been analysed, I will write to you to tell you about the findings. I will also be available to discuss this with you further if you wish.

**Will the outcomes of the research be published?**
The research will be assessed as part of the researcher’s professional doctorate. There is possibility that it may also be published in a scientific journal.

**Criminal Records**

The researcher has a fully enhanced CRB disclosure and can therefore conduct research on school premises.

**Contact for further information**

If you would like more details about this research project, please contact Laura Snape at the following email address: laura.snape@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk

**What if something goes wrong?**

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 275 7583 or 275 8093
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CONSENT FORM

If you are happy to participate please complete and sign the consent form below

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.

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

I understand that the motivational interviewing sessions and interview will be audio-recorded

I agree to the use of anonymous quotes

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

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

I agree to deliver and audio-record the motivational interviewing sessions and take part in the post programme interview.

Name of participant

Date

Signature

Please Initial Box
Appendix E4: Ethics forms

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 (RREA) 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 places 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-contentious1.

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/tutor respectively.

How to complete the Research Risk and Ethics Assessment (RREA) 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 exists2. A separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment form must be completed as indicated in this RREA, in order to plan how safety issues will be responded to during fieldwork visits. The Fieldwork Risk Assessment form is available on the MIE ethics intranet. For all projects where this does not apply, a LOW Risk Fieldwork Declaration (Section D) must be completed. Instructions on this and subsequent stages of the RREA process are provided at the end of each following sections.

There are six main sections to this document, with three additional sections for UG/PGT research, PGR Pilots or Prof Doc Research Papers seeking ethical approval for LOW risk studies from a supervisor/tutor:

ANY student
Section A – Summary of Research Proposal (page 1)
Section B – Description of Research (page 2)
Sections C.0-C.1 – Criteria for HIGH risk research (page 4)
Section C.2 – Criteria for MEDIUM risk research (page 6)
Section C.3 – Criteria for LOW risk research (page 8)

Where indicated
Section D – LOW risk Fieldwork Declaration (page 9)

LOW Risk UG/PGT/PGR Pilot/Prof Doc Research Papers only
Section E.1 – Criteria for LOW risk ethical approval (page 11)

Supervisors and tutor approvals of LOW risk student research
Section E.2 – Supervisor confirmation that research matches LOW risk criteria (page 12)
Section E.3 – Minor Amendments to LOW risk study and supervisor approval (page 13)

It may be appropriate for supervisors and students to review and discuss responses to these questions together.

---

1 A reasonable person would agree that the study includes no issues of public or private objection, or of a sensitive nature.
2 http://www.education.manchester.ac.uk/intranet/ethics
3 For courses with approved templates see: http://www.education.manchester.ac.uk/intranet/ethics
### RESEARCH RISK AND ETHICS ASSESSMENT
Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester

To be completed by AEF administrator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIA reference</th>
<th>Date received</th>
<th>Date approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### SECTION A - SUMMARY OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL
This section should be completed by the person undertaking the research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1. Name of Person/Student:</th>
<th>Laura Snape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2. Student ID (quoted on library/swipe card):</td>
<td>5814289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laura.snape@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk">laura.snape@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4. Name of Supervisor:</td>
<td>Cathy Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5. Supervisor email address &amp; contact phone no.:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Cathy.atkinson@manchester.ac.uk">Cathy.atkinson@manchester.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6. Programme (PhD, ProfDoc, MEd, PGCE, MSc, BA etc):</td>
<td>ProfDoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7. Year of Study</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9. Course Code</td>
<td>D.Ed.Ch.Psychol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10. Title of Project:</td>
<td>Educational Psychologists’ (EPs’) use of Motivational Interviewing in improving school-based motivation in disaffected secondary school pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11. Participant Recruitment Start Date:</td>
<td>On approval of application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12. Project Submission Date:</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13. Proposed Fieldwork Start Date:</td>
<td>On approval of application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14. Location(s) where the project will be carried out:</td>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15. Student Signature:</td>
<td>Laura Snape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following section to be completed by the SUPERVISOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A15. Assessed Risk Level</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>X Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>NRES reqd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A16. Supervisor Signature</td>
<td>Cathy Atkinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17. Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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).

Principle Research Question(s):
Research Question 1: To what extent can a MI programme, delivered by EPs, improve young people’s reported school-based motivation?
Research Question 2: What are the pupils’ views on the MI programme and do they feel that it has helped to improve their school-based motivation?
Research Question 3: What are the EPs’ views on the MI programme and do they feel that it has helped pupil’s to improve their school-based motivation?
Research Question 4: How do EPs adapt and implement MI to address the needs of pupils?

Academic justification:
Although some research has been carried out into the use of Motivational Interviewing (MI) with young people, the majority of this work has been carried out within clinical settings and there is a need for further research in an educational context. This research is designed to be an extension of previous research because it will investigate EPs’ use of MI in improving school-based motivation in disaffected secondary school pupils. At present, just three published studies in the UK have investigated the use of MI with disengaged students and in each of these studies there were a number of methodological weaknesses. The present study intends to build upon this research by collecting both qualitative and quantitative data; obtaining the views of pupils that take part in the intervention; as well as the views of the EPs that deliver the programme. It will also be the first study to use an independent researcher, as trained EPs will deliver the intervention, and the researcher will analyse the impact.

B2. The principal research methods and methodologies are (250 words max):

Project Design: This research will take the form of a multiple embedded exploratory case study and will involve the collection of both qualitative and quantitative data.

Data Collection Methods: Five EPs will be recruited to deliver an MI intervention to five pupils. The pupils that take part in the MI intervention will complete the Pupil’s Feelings about School and School Work inventory (PFSSW) at three points during the study: before the intervention begins, after the intervention has ended and at follow-up three months later. To address research questions 2 and 3, the data gathering method will be semi-structured interviews. Interviews with the pupils and EPs will take place after the MI intervention has ended. In order to ensure fidelity and replicability of the study, EPs will be asked to keep a diary. This will contain details of the focus of each session and the activities that were completed. They will also complete a self-assessment sheet after each session, which will determine whether the spirit and principles of MI were adhered to appropriately. In addition, all MI sessions will be audio-recorded. These sources of information will be used to address research question 4.

Sampling: The five EPs will be recruited on the basis that they are already trained in MI and have previous experience of using MI as a therapeutic intervention. EPs will then recruit five students, from their caseload to take part in the intervention. Pupils described as ‘disaffected’ from school will be recruited to take part. Parental and pupil consent will be gained prior to the commencement of the intervention. After the intervention has been carried out, the EPs involved in delivering the MI intervention and the pupils will be asked to attend semi-structured interviews to discuss their experiences.

Method(s) of Analysis: Descriptive statistics will be presented to summarise the data that has been collected from the PFSSW inventory. The semi-structured interviews will be audio-recorded and the data collected will be transcribed and then analysed using thematic analysis.

NB: If your research methods include collection of image or video data, you must complete the VASTRE document (regardless of research risk).
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

X None of the above groups are involved in this study

B4. Number of expected research participants. 10 participants – 5 EPs and 5 pupils.

B5. Will you conduct fieldwork visits?

Yes X Complete either the Declaration in Section D1 or the Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA) form if indicated in your RREA by criteria marked by an asterisk.

No Complete the Declaration in Section D2

B6. The research will take place (tick all that apply):

X within the UK

within the researcher’s home\(^1\) country if outside the UK

wholly or partly outside the UK and not in the home country of the researcher* 

* You must complete a separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment form

---

\(^1\) The person with learning difficulties has appropriate support within the setting from accredited support workers or family members.

\(^2\) 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 resident 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.
SECTION C – RESEARCH RISK ASSESSMENT

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

C.0 – Criteria for research classified as HIGH RISK – National Research Evaluation Service

- 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 NRES application. See your supervisor for further guidance.

Supervisors - Forward this RREA form to ethics.education@manchester.ac.uk when you are satisfied that the project requires approval through the Integrated Research Application Service (IRAS).

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

I/we 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 researcher and/or participants at personal risk*
- requires participant informed consent and/or withdrawal procedures which are not consistent with accepted practice
- addresses an area where access to personal records (e.g. medical), in collaboration with an authorised person, is not possible
- involves primary 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.
- will involve direct contact with participants in countries on the Foreign and Commonwealth Office warning list* *
- involves face to face contact with research participants outside normal working hours7 that may be seen as unsocial or inconvenient*
- will take place wholly or partly without training or qualified supervision*
- requires appropriate vaccinations which are unavailable*
- will take place in locations where first aid and/or other medical support or facilities are not available within 30 minutes*
- may involve the researcher operating machinery, electrical equipment, or workplace vehicles, or handling or working with animals at the research location(s), for which they are not qualified, and where a qualified operative or handler is not available to act as supervisor. *

* IF YOU HAVE TICKED these HIGH risk criteria you must also complete a separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment form
* IF YOU HAVE ONLY TICKED HIGH risk criteria NOT marked (*) you MUST complete the LOW Risk Fieldwork Declaration on page 9 of this form

7 For example, in the UK, normal working hours are between 8am-6pm, Mon-Fri inclusive.
A. PGR research / PGR Pilots

If ONE OR MORE of the HIGH risk criteria have been selected ethical approval must be sought from a UREC committee. The person undertaking the research and their supervisor should agree this risk assessment and submit:
- Completed RREA form
- Completed the UREC form.
- Completed Fieldwork Risk Assessment form where indicated
- Supporting documents

NB: Supporting documents include recruitment advertisements, data questionnaires / interview topic guides, information sheets and consent forms.

The documents listed above should be submitted to:

A. Mrs. Debbie Kubiena, Room B3.10 along with your PhD Research Plan for consideration at the PhD/Prof Doctorate Review Panel

B. The Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork (AEF) via Ethics.Education@manchester.ac.uk by your supervisor. In doing so, supervisors confirm that they have agreed the assessed risk level and that the documents are complete and correct. The AEF will arrange authorisation for your documents to be submitted to UREC.

C. The Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork (AEF) via Ethics.Education@manchester.ac.uk by your supervisor. In doing so, supervisors confirm that they have agreed the assessed risk level and that the documents are complete and correct. The AEF will forward your completed documents to a member of the MIE RIC committee for approval.

If no HIGH risk items are ticked supervisors and students should continue to section C.2 on the next page
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C.2 – Criteria for research classified as MEDIUM RISK (tick any that apply)

I/we confirm that this research:

- [X] is primary research involving children or other vulnerable groups which involves direct contact with participants.
- [X] 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 primary research which involves substantial direct contact with adults in non-professional roles.
- is primary research which focuses on data collection from professionals responding to questions outside of their professional concerns.
- is primary research involving data collection from participants outside of the EU or the researcher’s home country via direct telephone, video, or other linked communications.
- [X] involves visits to site(s) where a specific risk to participants and/or the researcher has been identified, and the researcher may not be closely supervised throughout.
- requires specific training and this is scheduled to be completed before fieldwork starts, or, training will not be undertaken but the research will be closely supervised by an academic advisor with appropriate qualifications and skills.
- requires vaccinations which have been received, or are scheduled to be received in a timely fashion.
- requires face to face contact with research participants partly outside normal working hours that may be seen as inconvenient.
- takes place in, or involves transport to and from, locations where the researcher’s lack of familiarity may put them at personal risk.
- may require the operation of machinery, electrical equipment, or workplace vehicles, or handling or working with animals at the research location(s), for which they are not qualified, but such operation or handling will be undertaken under close supervision from a qualified operative or handler.

→ * IF YOU HAVE TICKED these MEDIUM risk criteria you must also complete a separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment form

→ IF YOU HAVE ONLY TICKED MEDIUM risk criteria NOT marked (*) you MUST also complete the LOW Fieldwork Risk Declaration on page 9 of this form

---

8 This does not include research in locations where children are present if they are not the focus of the research.
9 For example in focus group or one to one interview in private locations, and not ‘market research’ which is characterised by brief interaction with randomly selected individuals in public locations.
10 In the UK normal working hours are between 8am-6pm, Mon-Fri inclusive.
If ONE OR MORE of the MEDIUM risk criteria have been selected, ethical approval must be sought from the Manchester Institute of Education (MIE) Research Integrity Committee (RIC) and so you should complete the MIE Ethical Approval Application form (available on the Manchester Institute of Education Ethics Intranet).

The supervisor and student should agree this RREA assessment and submit:

- Completed RREA form
- Completed Manchester Institute of Education Ethical Approval Application form
- Completed Fieldwork Risk Assessment form where indicated
- Supporting documents.

NB: ‘Supporting documents’ include recruitment adverts/emails, draft questionnaires / interview topic guides, information sheets and consent forms.

Document should be submitted for review as indicated below:

A. **PGR Thesis** - Mrs. Debbie Kubiena, Room B3.10 along with your PhD Research Plan for consideration at the PhD/Prof Doctorate Review Panel.

B. **All other cases** - to the Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork (AEF) via Ethics.Education@manchester.ac.uk by your supervisor. In doing so, supervisors confirm that they have agreed the assessed risk level and that the documents are complete and correct. The AEF will forward your completed documents to a member of the MIE RIC committee for approval.

---

**If none of the HIGH or MEDIUM risk criteria have been ticked, supervisors and students should continue to section C3 on the next page**

---

11 This document and guidance for completion can downloaded from [http://www.education.manchester.ac.uk/intranet/ethics](http://www.education.manchester.ac.uk/intranet/ethics)
C3 – Criteria for research classified as LOW RISK

C 3.1 NO human participants
If we confirm that this research (tick as appropriate):

- is not of high nor medium risk to the researcher, in accordance with the criteria provided in sections C.1 and C.2 respectively.
- 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 C.3.1 above, and C.3.2 does not apply, you should now complete section C.3.3

C 3.2 Human participants
If we confirm that this research (tick as appropriate):

- is not of high nor medium risk to the researcher, or participants, in accordance with the criteria provided in sections C.0, C.1 and C.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\textsuperscript{12}
- is Practice review (i.e. the research involves data collection from participants on issues relating to the researcher’s professional role, in a setting where the researcher is employed or on a professional placement)
- is Practice evaluation (i.e. the research involves data collection on a student’s professional role, in a setting where the researcher is employed or on a professional placement. The data collected will be used for comparison against national or other targets or standards).
- is Primary research on professional practice with participants in professional roles conducted in their work setting.
- is 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).
- is Primary research using a questionnaire completed and returned by participants with no direct contact with the researcher.
- is part of a research methods course and participant groups are limited to peers, colleagues, family members and friends.
- is a Pilot Study

C 3.3 Research context
If we confirm (tick as appropriate):

- the location(s) of the research are not listed on the Foreign and Commonwealth Office warning lists\textsuperscript{15}
- the researcher is not in a position to coerce potential participants/secondary data owners
- Primary or practice research involves no vulnerable group (as indicated in question B3).
- Primary or practice research will be conducted in a public space or building (e.g. the high street, the University campus, a school building, etc)

\textsuperscript{12} A reasonable person would agree that the study includes no issues of public or private objection, or of a sensitive nature.

D. LOW Risk Fieldwork Declaration

Students not directed to complete the separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment in Section C should tick the items in D.1 or D.2 to confirm the LOW risk nature of their fieldwork visits. Then sign the Declaration in D.3.

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

I/we confirm:

[ ] the researcher will not travel outside the UK or their home nation.

[ ] 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 the researcher and offer no discernable risk.

[ ] the researcher will not travel through, or work in research locations which may have unit areas, derelict areas, cliffs, or local endemic diseases

[ ] the researcher will carry only necessary personal items when travelling to, and within, research locations.

[ ] no specific vaccinations are required to undertake this research

[ ] first aid provision and a trained first aider are available where appropriate

[ ] the researcher will only operate machinery, electrical equipment, or workplace vehicles, or handle or work with animals at the research location(s) if they are qualified to do so

[ ] the fieldwork will be carried out within normal working hours14 at a time convenient to participants.

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

[ ] the researcher is fully aware of and sensitive to cultural and religious practices of participant groups, and will act accordingly.

[ ] primary or practice research will not involve fieldwork visits to private homes.

[ ] the researcher will provide a regularly updated fieldwork visit schedule to a nominated University contact.

[ ] the researcher will carry a Manchester Institute of Education Emergency Contact Information Card during all fieldwork visits.

If you are unable to tick all items above, you must complete a separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment form.

D.2 No Fieldwork visits

I/we confirm:

[ ] this research does not involve fieldwork visits of any kind

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

D.3 Researcher Declaration:

By signing this completed document, I declare that the information in it is accurate to the best of my knowledge and that I will complete any actions that I have indicated I will complete.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ______________
Laura Snape 22.9.14

Name (in capitals): ___________________________ Student ID: __________
LAURA SNAPE 5814289

---

14 For example, in the UK normal working hours are between 8am and 6pm Mon-Fri inclusive.
PGR Panel Students ONLY

If ONE OR MORE of the LOW risk criteria above have been selected, ethical approval must be sought from the Manchester Institute of Education Research Integrity Committee. The supervisor and student should agree this research risk assessment and submit:

- Completed RREA form
- Completed the Manchester Institute of Education Ethical Approval Application form\(^\text{15}\).
- Completed Fieldwork Risk Assessment form where indicated
- Supporting documents

NB: ‘Supporting documents’ include recruitment adverts/emails, draft questionnaires / interview topic guides, information sheets and consent forms.

Documents should be submitted to:
Mrs. Debbie Kubienska, Room B3.10 along with your PhD Research Plan for consideration at the PhD/Prof Doctorate Review Panel.

UG, PGT, PGR Pilot studies, PROF DOC Research Papers involving ONLY LOW RISK CRITERIA

\(^{15}\) This document and guidance for completion can downloaded from [http://www.education.manchester.ac.uk/intranet/ethics](http://www.education.manchester.ac.uk/intranet/ethics)
SECTION E  UG/PGT/PGR Pilot/PROF DOC Papers
Ethical Approval Application for LOW risk research

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/we confirm:

Codes of Practice

- I/we have read and understood the Manchester Institute of Education Ethical Practice and Policy Guidelines
- the researcher will abide by the Manchester Institute of Education’s Ethical Protocol detailed therein
- the researcher is 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 Secondary research
- all relevant enhanced DBS or other checks have been completed
- I will inform the AEP if my DBS (or related) status changes
- written permission to be on the site to conduct primary research has been received

Rights of participants

- participant information sheets (PIS), consent forms, questionnaires, and all other documentation relevant to this research have been discussed with supervisor/tutor named in A.5
- PIS and consent forms have been confirmed by the supervisor named in A.5, as covering required headings illustrated in the MIE Participant Information and consent templates, AND as accessible to proposed participant groups.
- the researcher understands the Data Protection Act and the University Data Protection Policy and all data will be handled confidentially and securely, including storage on encrypted devices.

Research Integrity

- no data will be collected before approval of the study by the supervisor/tutor
- the student researcher will immediately report any issues arising during the course of the study that conflict with the Manchester Institute of Education protocol, to the supervisor who has signed the ethics approval and suspend data collection pending advice from that supervisor/tutor
- the researcher will report any proposed deviation from the research specification outlined in this assessment to the supervisor/tutor to update the current assessment or clarify any need for further approvals BEFORE such changes are made

Research output

- the only publication/output from this research will be the assignment or dissertation unless consent has been obtained from participants for further dissemination
E.2 Supervisor confirmation that research matches LOW risk criteria above.

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

For ‘low risk’ research approval relevant items in bold must be ticked or marked as NA if not applicable to this research and one or more of the specific research criteria as appropriate

The supervisor confirms:
- The submission has been discussed and agreed with the person(s) undertaking the research.
- The student has had appropriate training and has the skills to undertake this study, or has 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:
- Primary or Practice 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 do not correspond to all items in the LOW Risk Fieldwork Declaration, a separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment form has been completed and approved.
- Secondary research assignment/project has appropriate resource or database access permissions.
- They will act as custodian for data used for any study that results in a publication (Masters dissertation or otherwise) and will arrange for archiving of data within the Manchester Institute for a minimum period of 5 years.

I confirm that the proposed research matches low risk criteria and that the documents supplied are complete and correct. I submit the items below in support of this Low Risk Ethical Approval:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed RREA form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Fieldwork Risk Assessment form where indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student research proposal, or equivalent, on which the assessment is based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting documents including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft questionnaire/interview topic guide/other data collection tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment email/advertisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sheet for each participant group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent form (or alternative) for each participant group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervisor’s signature: ____________ Date: ____________

Documents should be submitted electronically for archiving and audit purposes, to the Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork (AEF) via Ethics.Education@manchester.ac.uk by the supervisor. The AEF can only provide formal confirmation of ethical approval via email to both student and supervisor when a complete set of documents are supplied. Copies of all documents should be retained by the supervisor.

---

10 For audit purposes, a person unfamiliar with the research outlined in Section B must be able to ascertain the full details of the student project from this RREA form and/or supporting documents appended.
E.3 Amendments to proposed research design for LOW risk research

Any minor\textsuperscript{17} amendment to low risk approved research submissions should be recorded and signed-off by the supervisor as necessary below. Substantial changes to research will require a reassessment and revised ethical approvals. A revised copy of the RREA showing the approved amendments, and any amended supporting documents, should be forwarded electronically to The QA administrator via ethics.education@manchester.ac.uk. The QA administrator will provide formal acknowledgement of approval of the change by email. A copy should be retained by the supervisor.

To be completed if/when applicable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor\textsuperscript{18} amendment to assessed research agreed (1):</th>
<th>Details of amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This section will record any applications made during the life time of the Project regarding minor changes from what was approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor’s signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\textsuperscript{17} Minor amendments are those that do not alter the character of the research or the participant groups

\textsuperscript{18} Minor deviations from previously approved research submissions are defined as those which neither change the nature of the study nor deviate from any participatory research groups previously identified. Supervisors should contact a member of the MIE Research Integrity Committee for advice if in doubt.
**Manchester Institute of Education**  
**Ethical Approval Application Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIA reference</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date received</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 approvals, 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>Laura Snape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student ID (quoted on library/swipe card):</td>
<td>5814289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laura.snape@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk">laura.snape@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Supervisor:</td>
<td>Cathy Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Cathy.atkinson@manchester.ac.uk">Cathy.atkinson@manchester.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme (PhD, Prof Doc, MEd, PGCE, MSc, BA etc):</td>
<td>ProfDoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Study</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full/Part-time</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title of Research Project:** Educational Psychologists’ (EP’s) use of Motivational Interviewing in improving school-based motivation in disaffected secondary school pupils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment and Data Collection</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Date:</strong></td>
<td>On approval of application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End Date:</strong></td>
<td>May 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Location(s) where the project will be carried out: | Secondary Schools |

| Student Signature: | Laura Snape |

| Supervisor Signature: | Cathy Atkinson |
| **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 Question 1**: To what extent can a MI programme, delivered by EPs, improve young people’s reported school-based motivation?
- **Research Question 2**: What are the pupils’ views on the MI programme and do they feel that it has helped to improve their school-based motivation?
- **Research Question 3**: What are the EPs’ views on the MI programme and do they feel that it has helped pupils to improve their school-based motivation?
- **Research Question 4**: How do EPs adapt and implement MI to address the needs of pupils?

#### 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?)

Although some research has been carried out into the use of Motivational Interviewing (MI) with young people, the majority of this work has been carried out within clinical settings and there is a need for further research in an educational context. This research is designed to be an extension of previous research because it will investigate EPs’ use of Motivational Interviewing in improving school-based motivation in disaffected secondary school pupils. At present, just three published studies in the UK have investigated the use of MI with disengaged students and in each of these studies there were a number of methodological weaknesses. The present study intends to build upon this research by collecting both qualitative and quantitative data; obtaining the views of pupils that take part in the intervention; as well as the views of the EPs that deliver the programme. It will also be the first study to use an independent researcher, as trained EPs will deliver the intervention, and the researcher will analyse the impact.

### 2. Methodology

#### 2.1 Project Design:

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

This research will take the form of a multiple embedded exploratory case study (Yin, 2009) and will involve the collection of both qualitative and quantitative data. The present case study design will be embedded, as there are multiple units of analysis within the case study. Five EPs will be recruited to deliver an MI intervention to 5 pupils who can be described as disaffected from school. Although this is a potentially large sample, involving 10 participants, the researcher believes that the data set will still be manageable. It is also necessary to have a larger sample in order to counteract the risk of attrition or incomplete data e.g. due to EPs leaving the service or pupils moving schools. Although there are some limitations to undertaking case study research, for example, there is limited basis for generalising the findings (Yin, 2009), it is hoped that the results of the proposed study will contribute to the literature on the use of MI in education.

#### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>If Yes, describe how these are to be conducted (Append your interview guide):</strong></td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews with the pupils and EPs will take place after the MI intervention has ended. During the interviews pupils and EPs will discuss their views about the intervention and whether they feel it has been useful. EPs will also be asked questions about the implementation of the intervention. Pupils will be informed of the nature of the interviews by the EPs prior to the interviews taking place and will be asked to complete a consent form. Similarly, EPs will also be asked to complete a consent form before taking part in the interview and the researcher will provide them with further information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2.2. Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>If Yes, how will these be delivered to and collected from participants? (Append your draft questionnaire(s)):</strong></td>
<td>In order to establish a baseline representation of the pupils’ views in relation to their motivation and general attitude towards school, participants will complete the Pupil’s Feelings about School and School Work Inventory (PFSSW), which was designed by Entwistle and Kozäki (1985). The PFSSW has been chosen as a measure of school-based motivation as it has been designed and standardised for use with secondary school aged pupils. The PFSSW consists of 120 items that are rated on a five-point scale and provides a measure of a student’s school-based motivation. The inventory consists of two separate parts. Part A, which assesses the pupil’s motivational style and Part B, which measures the pupil’s study orientation. Pupils will just be asked to complete Part A. The pre-test PFSSW will be completed in a session prior to the commencement of the MI based intervention and will be carried out by the EP. At the end of the MI intervention, participants will be asked to complete the same PFSSW inventory and this will provide a post-test measure of the student’s school-based motivation and attitude. Three months later, students will complete the PFSSW a final time, in order to provide follow-up data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2.3. Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>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):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2.4. Diary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>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):</strong></td>
<td>In order to ensure fidelity and replicability of the study, EPs will be asked to keep a diary. This will contain details of the focus of each session and the activities that were completed. The information contained in the EP diary will be checked against the audio-recordings of the MI sessions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2.5. Intervention

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

---
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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):

Five pupils will take part in a Motivational Interviewing Intervention. Five EPs will deliver approximately 5 sessions to each participant, on a 1:1 basis. Each session should last approximately 60 minutes. The sessions will be based on the programme ‘Facilitating Change 2: Motivational Interviewing using the Menu of Strategies’ (Atkinson, 2013), however the sessions will be tailored to the needs of the pupils. EPs will be asked to select appropriate activities from the pack depending on the pupil’s stage of change, therefore the number of sessions delivered and the content of each session may vary according to pupil requirements.

2.2.6. Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

EPs will also complete a self-assessment sheet after each session, which will determine whether the spirit and principles of MI were adhered to appropriately. This will be based on the spirit and aims outlined by Miller and Rollnick (2002).

In addition, all sessions of MI will be audio-recorded. The researcher will listen to the sessions in order to further monitor the fidelity of the programme.

2.2.8. Does data collection use video or still image?  Yes  No

If Yes, complete the VASTRE documentation - Available from:
http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentitmits/thesis/integrityethics/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).

The researcher is a first year student on the Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology course. As part of the course the researcher has attended seminars on Motivational Interviewing and research methods, such as interviews and questionnaires. The researcher has also had some experience of conducting a similar investigation as part of previous research e.g. Assignment 1.

2.3 Sampling

What type of sampling method do you propose to use?

2.3.1. Statistical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2.3.2. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Analysis method

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4.1. Quantitative analyses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**If Yes, please give details:**

Descriptive statistics will be presented to summarise the data that has been collected from the PFSSW inventories. It is hoped that the results from the pre-test, post-test and follow-up PFSSW inventories will provide information to show whether or not the MI programme has been successful in improving participants’ school based motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4.2. Qualitative analyses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**If Yes, please give details:**

The semi-structured interviews with EPs and pupils will be audio-recorded and the data collected will be transcribed and then analysed using Braun and Clarke’s (2006) thematic analysis framework. Member checking will take place, which will involve the interviewee checking a section of the interview transcript to ensure that it is an accurate representation of their views. Another Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP) will analyse a section of the transcript to establish inter-rater reliability.

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

The researcher will ensure that parents, pupils and EPs involved in the study all receive the consent and information forms relevant to their part in the study and will be provided with opportunities to ask questions and clarify information, if necessary.

The pupils’ parents will be made aware that they can withdraw their child from the intervention at any point and all data that has already been collected will be discarded. Pupils will also be informed that they can withdraw from the research at any time.

Parents will also be made aware that their child can still participate in the Motivational Interviewing sessions, without being part of the research. This will be made clear on the parent information sheet. If parents wish for their child to participate in the intervention, but would not like their data to be included in the research study, they will be made aware that their child will be put on a wait list and will be given the opportunity to access the intervention after the research has ended.

There is a possibility that the intervention might elicit feelings and emotions for the young person. A key member of staff will be identified for the pupils to speak to if they feel upset or distressed following an MI session. In addition, all EPs are regulated and will have access to supervision. The EP may choose to discontinue the intervention and inform parents, if they do not feel that further participation is in the best interests of the young person. This decision will be made in accordance with statutory regulations/professional codes of practice.

It is also possible that due to the presence of the audio recorder, some students may feel uncomfortable talking about certain issues. Pupils will be informed that when the researcher listens to the audio recording, the focus will be on the skills of the EP and not on what the young person says. The recording device will be positioned out of sight of the young person during the MI sessions, in order to reduce anxiety.

Pupils will be asked to complete some PFSSW questionnaires and it will be explained that these may be discussed in the researcher’s report. They will be made aware that identifying features will not be used and the data collected will remain anonymous.

EPs and pupils taking part in the semi-structured interviews will be informed that the interviews will be audio-recorded and transcribed. They will also be informed that all identifying features will be removed and all data will remain confidential.

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>10 participants – 5 EPs; 5 pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>Male and Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age group(s)</td>
<td>EPs – various ages; Pupils - 11-14 years (Year 7-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>EPs – Educational Psychology Service; Pupils - High Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Vulnerable groups

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

- [x] 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
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>Source</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBS*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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 [X]

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)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

If NA, please explain why permission is not applicable.

At this point, schools have not yet been identified so it is not possible to seek permission from head teachers at this time. Once the EPs have been recruited they will have their regular termly meetings with school heads/SENCOs and pupils requiring support will be discussed. If any pupils are suitable for the MI intervention and would benefit from taking part, EPs will explain the intervention and research project to schools and will ask their permission to complete the research with pupils in their school.
4.2 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.

Educational Psychology Services that have received training in motivational interviewing will be approached and 5 EPs will be recruited from these services. As part of their caseload, the 5 EPs will identify 5 young people that may benefit from participating in the motivational interviewing intervention, and will discuss with schools.

4.2.2. Who will the potential participants be?

- [x] Persons unknown to the researcher
- [x] Client groups (students, etc) within an organisation known by the researcher
- [x] Persons accessed through networks and recommendations
- [x] 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.

There is no existing relationship between the researcher and the participants.

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

- [x] Letter
- Email
- Website/internet (including Facebook/other social media site)
- [x] 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.

The researcher will visit Educational Psychology Services and will discuss the study with EPs. Once EPs have agreed to take part, they will complete a consent form and identify suitable pupils from their caseload. After parental consent has been gained, pupils will be provided with a child-friendly letter that will explain what the Motivational Interviewing intervention will involve. It will also provide information about the recorded interviews and questionnaires. Pupils will be informed that this information will be used in a research project, as the researcher is interested in their views. EPs will read the forms to pupils...
and explain them further if necessary. Pupils will then be asked to complete a consent form if they are willing to participate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Append text of letters / emails / posters / advertisements / presentation etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.2.4 How will you ensure those interested in the research are fully informed about the study and what will be expected of them if they take part?

Information giving will be undertaken through:

- [X] Letter
- [ ] Email
- [ ] Website/internet (including Facebook/other social media site)
- [ ] Telephone
- [X] Information sheet (covering headings in University template)
- [ ] Presentation at meeting or similar
- [ ] Other (describe here):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Append text of recruitment letters / emails / information sheet to this application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Information giving will be undertaken by:

- [X] the researcher
- [X] 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:

The study will be discussed with EPs at a team meeting. If they are interested in taking part, EPs will be provided with an information sheet and consent form to complete. Once pupils have been identified, their parents will be informed through an information sheet and consent form. Pupils will be provided with a child friendly letter, explaining the intervention, questionnaires and interviews. Pupils will be given an opportunity to ask questions or clarify any information, before deciding whether to sign the consent form. The EP will explain the study to pupils and should have the information required to answer any queries. The researcher will also be available to answer further questions, if necessary.

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 MI activities can be adapted to make them accessible for students with learning or literacy difficulties. Student information sheets have been written in child-friendly language; however, where access may be an issue these will be read through and explained verbally to pupils by the EPs.

Please confirm:
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4.2.6 Decision period

How long will the participant have to decide whether to take part in the study? If you are proposing a decision period of less than 2 weeks, full justification for this approach should be given.

Once EPs have identified potential participants, parents will be contacted with an information letter and consent form. Parents will be given two weeks to respond to the letter and agree to the pupil’s participation in the study. If parental consent is gained, the pupil will be provided with a consent form and an information sheet that is age appropriate and provides an explanation of the study. EPs will also be provided with an information sheet and consent form. They will also be given two weeks to decide whether they wish to participate.

4.2.7 Incentives

State any payment or any other incentive that is being made to any study participant. Specify and state the level of payment to be made and/or the source of the funds/gift/free service to be used and the justification for it.

n/a

4.2.8 Avoiding coercion

How will your recruitment methods avoid putting any overt or covert pressure on vulnerable individuals to consent (children, junior colleagues, adults with learning disabilities)?

Pupils will be informed that they are under no obligation whatsoever to participate in the research and that they will experience no prejudice or preference as a result of decision to participate or not. EPs will also be made aware that they are not obliged to take part.

4.3 Consent

4.3.1 How will participants’ consent to take part be recorded?

- [X] Implied consent - return/submission of completed questionnaire
- [X] Written consent form matching University template
- [X] Verbally (give details of how this will be recorded)
- [X] Other method (give details here): Pupils will complete a child friendly written consent form. The EP will read this to the pupil and will be available to answer any questions.

Append text of consent forms/consent taking procedure to this application.

Please confirm:

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

4.3.2 Special arrangements

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

n/a
5. **Participation in the research**

5.1 **Duration**

How long will each participant be expected to take part in activities?

The Motivational Interviewing intervention will last for approximately five weeks and each pupil will participate in one session per week that will last approximately 1 hour. The intervention will be tailored to the needs of the pupil and therefore the session content and length of sessions could vary between pupils. EPs will complete a short EP diary and self-assessment form after each MI session. It is anticipated that the pupil and EP semi-structured interviews will last no longer than one hour.

5.2 **Benefits to participation**

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

Motivational Interviewing has been used around the world with many young people and the results have been very positive. It is hoped that by taking part in the Motivational Interviewing programme, pupils will develop skills that will have a positive impact on their school-based motivation, self-efficacy, self-esteem and behaviour in school. It is also hoped that taking part in the study will be a useful professional development opportunity for the EPs that take part.

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?

The Motivational Interviewing sessions and interviews will take place during school time and, therefore, the pupils will miss some lessons, but school staff will support the pupils in catching up with their work. Conducting the intervention and attending the semi-structured interview could potentially disrupt the work of the EPs. Therefore, it is hoped that EPs will be able to carry out the intervention as part of their caseload. In addition, the researcher will be flexible and offer a number of dates and times for the EP semi-structured interviews. The interviews will be rearranged if necessary and back-up dates will be scheduled.

6. **Risks and Safeguards**

Please outline any adverse effects or risks for participants in respect of the methods you have indicated in Section 2B [Interview; Questionnaire; Interventions; Assessments; Observation; Diary keeping; Other activity]

6.1 **Physical risks**

6.1.1 **Potential**

What is the potential for adverse effects of a physical nature; risks or hazards, pain, discomfort, distress, inconvenience, or change in lifestyle / normal routine for participants?

None.

6.1.2 **Safeguards**

What precautions or measures have been taken to minimise or mitigate the risks identified above?

n/a

6.2 **Psychological risks**

6.2.1 **Potential**
6.2.2 Safeguards

What precautions or measures have been taken to minimise or mitigate the risks identified above?

Pupils will be made aware that they have a right to withdraw from the intervention at any point. EPs will be asked to terminate a session if they feel that proceeding would not be in the pupil’s best interest, in accordance with the professional stipulation to maintain a duty of care to the pupil. EPs can also contact the researcher at any time and will receive supervised support.

6.3 Risks for you as researcher

It is important that the potential for adverse effects, risks or hazards, pain, discomfort, distress, or inconvenience, of a physical or psychological nature to you as the researcher have been assessed. **This is a requirement by law.** Risks to you are identified as part of the RREA/FRA process. Ensure this assessment has been completed by either:

a. a completed and approved Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA), or
b. a signed Low Risk Fieldwork Declaration in Section D of RREA form.

Briefly state here the conclusions of your assessment and append a copy of your approved FRA form (if required), in addition to your RREA, to this application:

See RREA.

6.4 Early termination of the research

6.4.1 Criteria

What are the criteria for electively stopping the research prematurely?

The research will be terminated early if there is an adverse participant reaction, however this is not predicted. Researcher indisposition will also terminate the research.

6.4.2 Please confirm, by ticking here, that:

X any adverse event requiring radical change of method/design or abandonment will be reported in the first instance to your research supervisor and then to the MIE RIC Chair

7. Data Protection and confidentiality

7.1 Data activities and storage of personal data

Will the study use any of the following activities at any stage?
7.2 Confidentiality of personal data

What measures have been put in place to ensure confidentiality of personal data? *Give details of whether any encryption or other anonymisation procedures have been used and at what stage?*

Paper copies of the PFSSW inventories will be stored in a locked drawer and data that is stored electronically e.g. transcript of the interviews, audio-recordings of sessions, will be stored on an encrypted storage device. Questionnaires will contain pupil initials, rather than their full names, to ensure anonymity.

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 (UDP)?

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

- [X] Fairly and lawfully processed
- [X] Processed for limited purposes as outlined in this application
- [X] Adequate for the purpose, relevant and not excessive
- [X] Accurate
- [X] Not kept longer than necessary
- [X] Processed in accordance with the participant’s rights
- [X] Secure – on an encrypted storage device
7.5 Privacy during data analysis Please confirm:

- [X] Analysis will be undertaken by the student researcher
- [X] Analysis will take place in a private study area

*If other arrangements apply please describe:*

7.6 Custody and control of the data Please confirm:

- [X] The student researcher’s supervisor will have **custody** of the data
- [X] The student researcher will have **control** of the data

*If other arrangements apply please describe:*

7.7 Access to the data

- [X] The student researcher will have access to the data
- [X] 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 [X]  
*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)*

- [X] Peer reviewed scientific journals
- [X] Book / Chapter contribution
- [X] Published review (ESRC, Cochrane)
- [X] Internal report
- [X] Conference presentation
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
- [X] 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>
<tr>
<td>Amount</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)

- [X] The University of Manchester
- [ ] Other organisation

If not UoM, provide details of who will act as sponsor of the research and their insurance details

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:

X 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>Appended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection instruments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft copy of each data collection instrument named in Q2.2 (Questionnaire, Interview guide, etc)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and Still Image Recording Declaration (VASTRE)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant recruitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter(s) of permission to conduct research within each organisation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment advertisement(s) specified in Q4.2.1 (poster/email/letter/presentation)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Information giving – one for each participant type specified in Q3.1 (Information sheet/letter/email/script)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent taking – one for each participant type specified in Q3.1 (Consent form or alternative procedure)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fieldwork risk assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork Risk Assessment Form (approved)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RREA form Low Risk Fieldwork Declaration (Section D) completed</td>
<td>X</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)

It has become apparent that it would be useful to complete a follow-up interview with pupils approximately three months after the intervention has ended. This would be in addition to the pupil interview that currently takes place straight after the intervention has ended. The follow-up interview would establish whether behavioural change occurred after the intervention ended and if so, whether the change has been maintained at the three-month follow-up.

In addition, due to the high risk of attrition or incomplete data collection, the number of participants recruited will be increased to 6-8 EPs.

Furthermore, it has also been decided that pupils will be recruited from across the secondary age range (Y7-Y11), if school, parents and the EP are all in agreement that the pupil is a suitable candidate to take part in the MI intervention.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor’s signature*</th>
<th>Cathy Atkinson</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.06.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Minor amendments are those that do not alter the character of the research or the participant groups

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 RIC member who authorised the original application wherever possible.
Appendix E5: Emails confirming ethical approval

---

**Charlotte Woods**  
To: Laura Snape  
Cc: Cathy Atkinson

**RE: ME - Ethical Approval Application Ref: PGR-5814289-A1 Laura Snape**

Hi Laura

Yes, that’s clear. Thank you. I am pleased to confirm that the RI application is approved and that recruitment can go ahead.

Could you countersign the revised documentation and forwarded it to me, Cathy, and I’ll fwd and confirm with the Ethics Committee? Thanks.

I wish you all the best with your study, Laura.

Charlotte

---

**Charlotte Woods**  
To: Cathy Atkinson

**RE: Laura Snape - amendment to ethics form**

Hi Cathy

Yes - these documents seem to address the points raised. I am happy to confirm that Laura’s fieldwork can go ahead.

Charlotte

---

**Charlotte Woods**  
To: Cathy Atkinson

**RE: Laura Snape - ethical amendment part 2**

Dear Cathy

Assuming that all other details of the application remain the same, I am happy to approve the change. The change in age range appears to be to include older, rather than younger, pupils than originally intended, and the proposed amendments do not represent any change in terms of the ethical questions raised.

Charlotte
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Appendix F1: Inter-rater reliability checking

Table showing coded agreement – from an extract of Danny’s follow-up interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interrater codes</th>
<th>Researcher codes</th>
<th>Agreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the wheel of change – relapse</td>
<td>Thinking about relapse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding wheel of change</td>
<td>Describing the wheel of change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating to the wheel of change - maintaining</td>
<td>Maintaining the change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating to the wheel of change - maintaining</td>
<td>Maintaining the change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour which has changed</td>
<td>Behaviour change – stopped hitting head</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure why changed happened</td>
<td>Strategy use – thinking back to sessions helps to calm down</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying learnt skills/ using strategies to calm down</td>
<td>Use of commitment language - not wanting to relapse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using wheel of change - relapse</td>
<td>Use of commitment language - not wanting to relapse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants to maintain positive change</td>
<td>Use of commitment language - not wanting to relapse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using strategies/ applying skills - breathing</td>
<td>Strategy use - breathing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using strategies/ applying skills - relaxation</td>
<td>Strategy use – close eyes/ relax</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalls stories from session</td>
<td>Session resources – reading stories</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying to wider situation</td>
<td>Applying the wheel of change – parents making a change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and applying wheel of change</td>
<td>Applying the wheel to parents</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 agreed codes
1 not agreed
= 93% reliability
Appendix F2: Photographic representation of the outline of the thematic analysis process

After transcription and familiarisation with the data, NVivo was used to complete the thematic analysis process. Each of the student interview transcripts were analysed and initial codes were generated. At this stage, a section of one of the interview transcripts was analysed by an independent researcher and inter-rater reliability was at 93%. In the example above, the highlighted data extract was coded as ‘EP confidentiality’.
After all of the data had been coded, the extracts were grouped together if they had similar meanings. At this stage initial themes began to emerge. In the example above, the code of ‘EP confidentiality’ was grouped together with other codes to create the initial theme called ‘confidentiality and privacy’.
Once initial themes had been generated, they were reviewed and re-named and redefined, as necessary. This led to the development of main themes and subthemes. At this stage in the process, there were discussions with the co-author about the suitability of the themes and some names were reworked. In the example above, the initial theme of ‘confidentiality and privacy’ remained as a subtheme within the main overarching theme of ‘relationship with EP’.
Appendix F3: Thematic maps for Danny, Joshua and Taio

**Danny's thematic maps**

Student enthusiasm

- Session enjoyment
- Helpful sessions
- Session resources

- Stories
- Identifying skills

**Experienceing positive outcomes**

- Behavioural changes
- Academic success
- Positive feedback
- Strategy use

- Fewer detentions
- Improved grades in French
- Parental approval
- Breathing techniques

- Improved behaviour in French
- Homework completion
- Teacher praise
- Counting to 10

- Stopped self-harming
- French teacher praise
- Help to calm down

- Feeling calmer

**Using the language of change**

- Referring to the wheel of change
- Readiness to change
- Use of commitment language
- Maintaining the change
- Applying the wheel of change
- Identifying future changes

- Initially pre-thinking
- Hopes for change (post-intervention)
- No episodes of relapse
- Parents changing smoking habits
- Attitudes towards school work

- Identified changes at follow-up
- Desire to prevent relapse

**Relationship with EP**

- Feeling comfortable and able to open up
- Feeling of shame

- Able to admit mistakes to EP

**Extra-therapeutic factors**

- Support from school staff
- TA support
- Support with goal setting

**Academic success**

- Improved grades in French
- Homework completion
- Teacher praise

- French teacher praise

- Strategy use
- Breathing techniques

- Counting to 10

- Help to calm down
Joshua's thematic maps

Student enthusiasm
- Session enjoyment
- Helpful sessions
- Session resources
- Better than lessons
- Focus on future
- Reflecting on behaviour
- Working in construction

Using the language of change
- Referring to the wheel of change
- Readiness to change
- Maintaining the change
- Identifying future changes
- At thinking stage initially
- Maintaining at follow-up
- Desire to stop fighting

Experiencing positive outcomes
- Behavioural changes
- Academic success
- Positive feedback
- Strategy use
- Reduced answering back
- Improved grades
- Positive teacher attention
- Taking deep breaths
- Fewer detentions
- Improvements in food technology
- Praise from parents
- Having his voice heard
- Certificates/letters
- Fighting still an issue
- Exclusion
- Praise is motivating

Relationship with EP
- Feeling comfortable and able to open up
- Unable to open up during previous counselling
- Valued taking to someone
- Would not want to talk to teachers
- Felt more comfortable over time

Extra-therapeutic factors
- Lack of support from school staff
- Pupil referral unit
- Difficult relationship with maths teacher
- Part-time placement at PRU
- Changes not recognised by staff
- No desire to attend PRU
- PRU helped him to control behaviour
- Did not want to be like other PRU students

EP discussed confidentiality
- EP did not argue for change
- Personal qualities of EP
- Confidentiality and Privacy
- Lack of support from school staff
- Pupil referral unit
- Difficult relationship with maths teacher
- Part-time placement at PRU
- Changes not recognised by staff
- No desire to attend PRU
- PRU helped him to control behaviour
- Did not want to be like other PRU students
Taio's thematic maps

Student enthusiasm
- Session enjoyment
  - Better than lessons
- Helpful sessions
  - Helpful in short-term
- Session resources
  - Looking to the future
- Weighing up behaviour

Using the language of change
- Referring to the wheel of change
  - At preparing stage initially
- Readiness to change
- Maintaining the change
  - Change had not been maintained
- Identifying future changes
  - Hopes for 'fresh start' at new school

Extra-therapeutic factors
- Lack of support from school staff
- Pupil referral unit
  - Full-time placement at PRU
- Feels he is treated differently by teachers
- Feels he has a 'reputation'
- Positive aspects of PRU
  - Identified improvements since attending PRU
- Often 'blamed' for incidents

Relationship with EP
- Feeling comfortable and able to open up
  - Felt he could explain issues to EP
- Confidentiality and Privacy
  - EP not a teacher
- Personal qualities of EP
  - EP had good listening skills
- Student agency
  - Valued 1:1 time with EP
  - Attendance is sign of his enjoyment
  - His choice to attend sessions
- Teachers don't listen to him

Experiencing positive outcomes
- Behavioural changes
- Strategy use
  - Improved behaviour in geography
- Breathing techniques
  - Counting to 10
- Fewer detentions
- Improvements on report card
  - Strategies initially successful
- Feeling calmer
  - Exclusion
  - Some answering back to teachers
  - Some answering back to teachers
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Appendix G1 – Snape and Atkinson (2016) published paper
The evidence for student-focused motivational interviewing in educational settings: a review of the literature

Laura Snape and Cathy Atkinson
Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

**ABSTRACT**
The current systematic literature review sought to determine the effectiveness of Motivational Interviewing (MI) in educational settings. Student-focused school-based MI (SBMI) studies were assessed using qualitative and quantitative assessment frameworks and data were reported using PRISMA guidelines. Eleven studies met the inclusion criteria, although just eight were classified as ‘best evidence’ and included in the final synthesis. Seven of the included studies yielded positive findings and one study was neutral. Although there are methodological weaknesses in existing literature on student-focused SBMI, there is emerging evidence of its effectiveness for improving student outcomes in relation to academic achievement, behaviour and school-based motivation. Clear pointers for future research emerge from the review.

**Introduction**

**Background to motivational interviewing (MI)**

MI is described as a ‘collaborative conversation style for strengthening a person’s own motivation and commitment to change’ (Miller & Rollnick, 2012, p. 12). When using MI, the emphasis is on using effective language about change to allow individuals to explore and challenge their own patterns of behaviour, so that people talk themselves into change, based on their own values and interests’ (Miller & Rollnick, 2012, p. 4). The skills and processes central to MI offer a framework and guidance to support client autonomy and assess perceived importance of and confidence in approaching change. Furthermore, MI is based on person-centred principles (cf. Rogers, 1965); has the therapeutic alliance at its core; and explicitly seeks to avoid behaviours which can lead to client disengagement, such as persuasion and confrontation. MI has been used extensively and often effectively in medical and clinical settings to support behaviour change in adults across numerous areas including alcohol, drug and tobacco use, diet, exercise, safe sex, gambling and engagement in treatment (Lundahl, Kunz, Brownell, Tollefson, & Burke, 2010).

Since its emergence in the 1980s, MI has been adapted and changed. Indeed, there have been significant changes to the central structure of MI across the three editions of the core
text produced by Miller and Rollnick (1991, 2002, 2012). Much of the existing evidence base relates to the work of Miller and Rollnick (2002) within which the central tenets of MI were three aims that formed the ‘spirit’ of MI (autonomy, collaboration and evocation) and the four overall ‘principles’ (expressing empathy, developing discrepancy, rolling with resistance and supporting self-efficacy). More recently, Miller and Rollnick (2012) reconceptualised MI in response to its ongoing development within practice, further emphasizing the processes of MI and the underlying premise of demonstrating a genuine desire to promote the well-being of the client. To this effect, they redefined the spirit as having four dimensions (acceptance, collaboration, compassion and evocation) and changed the focus to processes (engaging, focusing, evoking and planning) rather than principles. Differences between the central elements of MI as defined by Miller and Rollnick (2002, 2012) are summarized in Table 1.

A fundamental set of skills are also used throughout MI to promote ‘active listening’ described by the acronym ‘OARS’, which reminds practitioners to use open-ended questions, affirmations, reflections and summaries (Miller & Rollnick, 2002). Demonstration of OARS is fundamental to assessments of MI competence (e.g. Moyers, Martin, Manuel, Hendrickson, & Miller, 2005) and therefore an important feature in ensuring MI fidelity.

In the past, a number of frameworks have been developed to support the use of MI as an intervention, including the Menu of Strategies (Rollnick, Heather, & Bell, 1992), Motivation Enhancement Therapy (Miller, Zweben, DiClemente, & Rychtarik, 1994) and FRAMES (Miller & Sanchez, 1994). These may have arisen from the needs of practitioners who requested greater direction in using MI (Rollnick et al., 1992). While such models and frameworks have proved popular, Rollnick and Miller (1995) questioned whether MI might be weakened or simplified when used in this way. However, structured or manualized approaches to MI continue to be popular, particularly in domains where MI might be practised by non-specialists. In some cases, frameworks have continued the historic link with the Transtheoretical Model (TTM) (DiClemente & Prochaska, 1982) with the aim of improving client agency and empowering non-specialist professionals with a visual framework for assessing and accounting for readiness to change (Atkinson, 2013, 2014; McNamara, 2009).

### Use of MI in educational settings

Kaplan (2014) argued that MI may work particularly well with children and young people (CYP), as the underlying principles, including valuing an individual’s autonomy and using a collaborative approach, align well with the needs of adolescents for independence and identity formation. There is evidence that MI has been used successfully with CYP in a range of different clinical areas such as substance abuse (Barnett, Sussman, Smith, Rohrbach, & Spruijt-Metz, 2012), depression (Brody, 2009) and self-harm (Kamen, 2009). Strait, McQuillin,

### Table 1. Changes to the central components of Motivational Interviewing (Miller & Rollnick, 2002, 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller and Rollnick (2002)</td>
<td>Three elements – collaboration, evocation and autonomy</td>
<td>Four principles: express empathy; develop discrepancy; roll with resistance; support self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principles not explicitly defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller and Rollnick (2012)</td>
<td>Four elements – acceptance, collaboration, compassion and evocation</td>
<td>Four processes – engaging, focusing, evoking, planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Smith, and Englund (2012) cautioned, however, that the use of MI with CYP is at an early stage of evaluation and that there may be limits to its transferability, particularly to work with younger children, given the cognitive and neuropsychological demands of the MI process. To provide a tangible example of this, Miller and Rollnick (2012) emphasized that exploring and understanding client values can play a key role in MI. When working with CYP, it is likely to be more challenging to explore and resolve ambivalence through contrasting behaviour with values, as these are still very much in emergence.

Although, more frequently used with CYP in medical and health settings, there is emerging evidence that MI is increasingly being used in schools and educational establishments. Frey et al. (2011) reported on the promise of MI in educational settings due its flexibility and supporting evidence base. A survey indicated that MI was the fourth most popular therapeutic intervention used by educational psychologists in the United Kingdom (UK) (Atkinson, Bragg, Squires, Muscutt, & Wasielowski, 2011). Furthermore, in a recent editorial, Strait, McQuillan, Terry, and Smith (2014) proposed two approaches to using MI in schools: student-focused SBMI and consultative-focused SBMI. Student-focused SBMI involves carrying out MI directly with CYP, whereas consultative-focused SBMI involves using MI with teachers and parents, for instance, to enhance teachers’ motivation to implement new learning programmes and increase implementation fidelity of existing interventions (e.g. Frey et al., 2011, 2013; Lee, Frey, Herman, & Reinke, 2014). This paper focuses on student-focused SBMI.

**Rationale and aims of the current review**

Given the promise of SBMI and recent interest in using MI with young people in educational settings, the current review aims to (1) establish the evidence for the effectiveness of student-focused SBMI and (2) determine the features of MI that have been used to date in student-focused SBMI interventions. Although, systematic literature reviews are common in other areas of MI, Woods, Mc Ardle, and Tabassum (2014) published the only literature review on SBMI, however, this was small scale, restricted to UK-based studies and limited to studies published before 2011. Given the recent interest and research in SBMI, this paper aims to provide an up-to-date, international literature review on the effectiveness of SBMI. The current review focuses solely on student-focused SBMI as, although, there is emerging evidence for the use of consultative-focused SBMI, to date published research is mainly descriptive, and currently, there are insufficient empirical data to warrant the undertaking of a separate systematic literature review.

**Method**

**Search strategy**

A systematic search of the literature was conducted to include all studies relevant to the review questions using the following databases: Psycinfo, Education Resources Information Centre (ERIC) and the British Education Index (BEI). Literature searches were completed between January and August 2015 and the following search terms were used: ‘MI’, ‘school’, ‘young people’ and ‘education’, as well as exclusions for ‘drug’, ‘smok’ and ‘alcohol’. Pertinent journals and article reference lists were also manually searched. Inclusion criteria were devised and all of the included studies met the following criteria:
(1) participants must include CYP ranging in age from 5- to 21-years old; (2) interventions must take place within a school or educational setting; (3) interventions are based on MI techniques; (4) studies are empirical (given the relative dearth of research into student-focused SBM), the decision was taken to include studies which involved the collection of quantitative and/or qualitative data; (5) written in English; and (6) subjected to peer review in an academic journal.

Data classification

All studies that met the inclusion criteria were coded for quality using the framework developed by Bond, Woods, Humphrey, Symes, and Green's (2013) systematic literature review on the effectiveness of solution-focused brief therapy (SFBT). The papers were read by both authors, and rated by the first author as part of a professional doctoral assignment. Thereafter, all ratings were discussed with the second author (in the role of academic supervisor) and moderated accordingly, with discussions taking place to achieve a consensus view. Descriptive and evaluative information were obtained for each included study. Information was also obtained about the MI techniques that were used in the different research studies.

Quantitative studies were evaluated using criteria drawn from the American Psychological Association (APA, 2006), which gave credit for use of a randomized group design; focus on a specific, well-defined disorder or problem; comparison with treatment-as-usual, placebo, or less preferably, standard control; use of manuals and procedures for monitoring and fidelity checks; sample large enough to detect effect (Cohen, 1992) and use of outcome measure(s) that has demonstrated good reliability and validity. One point was awarded for the presence of each of the criteria listed above. Quantitative studies were classified as ‘low’–quality research if a score of 0–2 points was achieved; ‘medium’–quality research scored 3–4 points and ‘high’–quality research achieved 5–7 points. Quantitative evaluation research ratings can be found in Appendix 1.

Qualitative studies were evaluated using criteria drawn from Spencer, Ritchie, Lewis, and Dillon (2003) and Henwood and Pidgeon (1992). This checklist included the following criteria and one point was awarded for the presence of each: appropriateness of the research design; clear sampling rationale; well-executed data collection; analysis close to the data; emergent theory related to the problem; evidence of explicit reflexivity; comprehensiveness of documentation; negative case analysis; clarity and coherence of the reporting; evidence of researcher–participant negotiation; transferable conclusions and evidence of attention to ethical issues. A qualitative study was categorized as ‘low’–quality if a total point score of 0–4 was achieved; ‘medium’–quality studies were rated at 5–8 points and ‘high’–quality achieved 9–12 points. Qualitative evaluation research ratings can be found in Appendix 2. Mixed methods studies were dual coded using both the qualitative and quantitative frameworks and were then awarded the highest point rating. Both qualitative and quantitative evaluations were based only on the information available within the academic journals.

Each study was also rated in terms of ‘methodological appropriateness’ and ‘focus of the study’ (Gough, 2007). Methodological appropriateness ratings took into account having an objective outcome measure; a clear rationale for participant selection and a clear description of the MI process. Scores of 1, 2 and 3, respectively, were awarded for studies of low,
medium and high appropriateness. Methodological appropriateness ratings can be found in Appendix 3. The focus of the study ratings was whether the study contained key MI elements (e.g. reference to OARS and/or spirit and principles); was school-based and student-focused. Scores of 1, 2 or 3 were awarded depending on whether studies were of low, medium or high focus. Focus of the study ratings can be found in Appendix 4. Once a ‘high’, ‘medium’ or ‘low’ judgement had been made on each of the components, a combined score was created for each study. This score demonstrated the ‘overall weight of evidence’. See Appendix 5 for overall weight of evidence ratings.

Results

A Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flowchart (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff, & Altman, 2009) illustrates the number of articles at each stage of the review (Figure 1). The process yielded 11 studies, which met the criteria, 5 of which were qualitative, 5 quantitative and 1 mixed methods. A description of the studies can be found in Table 2.

Quality of the included studies

From the 11 studies, an initial pool of current ‘best evidence’ was drawn. However, given that the status of research literature in this area is still underdeveloped, and only a small sample of studies met review criteria, definitive conclusions about the effectiveness of SMI must be made with caution. In the present review, a study was included as best evidence if it was evaluated as being at least medium quality in the overall weight of evidence judgement and at least medium in terms of methodological quality. Of the 11 studies, 3 were excluded due to low-quality ratings. Of the remaining studies, six were high-quality studies and two were medium-quality studies. All quality ratings can be found in Appendix 5 and best evidence studies are highlighted in Table 2.

Figure 1. PRISMA Flowchart.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Follow-Up</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
<th>Deliverers</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson and Woods (2007)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1 x male sixth-grade student</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Number of sessions not specified</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Improved attendance and teacher reports</td>
<td>Teacher reported improvements in attendance and punctuality, attitude towards school and confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittles and Atkinson (2009)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3 x students aged 13 to 15 years old</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>MI used as a consultation and assessment tool</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews with students</td>
<td>School psychology intern</td>
<td>Two out of three young people were positive about the MI</td>
<td>In the experimental group, there was a significant drop in truancy rates from pre- to post-intervention. No difference was observed for the control group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enea and Definis (2009)</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>18 adolescents aged 16-17 years from one high school</td>
<td>Non-randomized pilot study</td>
<td>19 experimental students undertake motivational stimulation techniques, including MI, solution-focused counselling and systemic methods</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>School psychologists</td>
<td>Truancy decreased by 61% in the experimental group (from 13% at the beginning to 5% at the end); No change was observed in the control group (13% at both times)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Follow-Up</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
<th>Deliverers</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brittany et al. (2012)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>49 sixth-, seventh- and eighth-grade students</td>
<td>Randomized controlled study</td>
<td>Students randomly assigned to a MI intervention (n = 25) or waitlist control (n = 24)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Two-level hierarchical linear model</td>
<td>Three graduate clinical psychology students and two bachelor’s level research specialists</td>
<td>The MI intervention significantly improved homework completion and overall academic self-efficacy compared to the waitlist control group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall et al. (2012)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>150 ninth, seventh, and eighth-grade students</td>
<td>Randomized controlled study</td>
<td>Students randomly assigned to a MI intervention (n = 75) or waitlist control (n = 75)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Two-level hierarchical linear model</td>
<td>Five trained school or clinical psychology graduate students</td>
<td>The MI intervention significantly improved academic performance compared to the waitlist control group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones et al. (2013)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>100 sixth, seventh, and eighth-grade students</td>
<td>Randomized controlled study</td>
<td>Students randomly assigned to a MI intervention (n = 50) or waitlist control (n = 50)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Two-level unconditional individual growth model</td>
<td>Five trained school or clinical psychology graduate students</td>
<td>The MI intervention significantly improved academic performance compared to the waitlist control group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
### Table 2. (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Follow-Up</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Deliverance</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chassin et al. (2013)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>6th grade students (number not specified)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Peer support programme was developed based on the principles of MI and delivered in one high school setting</td>
<td>6th-grade students supported by eighth-grade students with the aim of promoting well-being and academic achievement and reducing behavioral problems</td>
<td>Observations of key peer support programme activities</td>
<td>Qualitative data analysis of interview and focus group transcripts</td>
<td>Eighth-grade students (up to 48)</td>
<td>A logical model framework summarized the resources, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact of the programme</td>
<td>There was a goodness of fit between the ethos, the programme and the training model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tery et al. (2014)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>42 sixth- and seventh-grade students</td>
<td>Randomized controlled study</td>
<td>Students randomly assigned to either a one session or two sessions of MI group with performance feedback (n = 21 per group)</td>
<td>45-minutes single session MI intervention developed by Strick et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Students in the two-session MI group participated in an MI session identical to the single-session MI group, but also received a performance feedback goal worksheet (designed to elicit change talk via written format and to develop discrepancy every two weeks between the first session and second session)</td>
<td>Pre- and post-intervention academic grades for maths, ELA, history and science</td>
<td>One-way analysis of variance tests</td>
<td>Three graduate clinical doctoral students and three bachelor level research specialists</td>
<td>Participants who received two sessions of MI demonstrated significantly higher grades in maths, science and history at post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Follow-Up</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Deliveries</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheftall et al. (2014)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>135 high school students, aged 12-26 years, in six schools</td>
<td>Pre-post test one-group research design</td>
<td>Sessions were an MI based group career intervention called Motivational Enhancement Group Intervention (MEGI)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Demographic questionnaire, Adaptable version of the Vocational Skills Self-Efficacy Scale (VSSSE), Doren, Lombardi, &amp; Guo, 2012</td>
<td>Latent Change Score Model (LCM) was used to analyse the change in pre-test and post-test scores</td>
<td>Nine interventions, which included special education teachers, transition specialists and a vocational rehabilitation counsellor</td>
<td>Participants reported a positive and significant change in vocational skills, self-efficacy, self-determination and vocational outcome expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cray and Atkins (2015)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1 x male elementary student aged 10 years (Although the case study is part of a larger data set of three participants)</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Four weekly sessions of MI</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Session evaluation, Researcher diary, Self-facilitated assessment form, Student and teacher interviews</td>
<td>Thematic analysis</td>
<td>School psychology intern</td>
<td>Teacher reports of improved behaviour, engagement and confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snape and Atkins (2015)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>5 students at a mainstream high school (approximately 15-16 years old)</td>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>Five MI sessions, based on Atkins (2013)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Pre- and post Intervention Psychosocial Inventory (PSI), Staff focus group</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics reported for PSI, Staff focus group responses</td>
<td>High school pastoral staff, including student inclusion manager, assistant SENCO, attendance officer and two special teaching assistants</td>
<td>Quantitative data indicated mixed but overall minimal impact on students’ school-based motivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table continues with additional entries.
Study characteristics

The eight best evidence studies consisted of: three randomized control studies (RCTs), three case studies, one quasi-experimental design and one mixed methods design. Four of the studies were conducted in the United States (US), while four were conducted in the UK. All studies were published between the years 2003 and 2015.

Sample

Sample sizes ranged from single cases to 135. Most studies reported on the use of MI with middle- or high-school students, although one study described an intervention with an elementary school child and another study’s sample ranged from 12- to 20-years old. Across the 8 studies, the MI interventions were delivered by 12 different professionals, including school psychology interns and graduate students, clinical psychology graduate students, clinical community doctoral students, bachelor-level research specialists, assistant special educational needs coordinator (SENCO), student inclusion manager, attendance officer, specialist teaching assistants, special education teachers, transition specialists and a vocational rehabilitation counsellor.

Intervention

Most of the best evidence studies applied MI directly with individual CYP, with just one study using group delivery. Four studies targeted disaffected students with emotional, behavioural and attendance concerns, three were focused on improving academic outcomes and one aimed to enhance career development in young people with disabilities. Intervention length varied from 10 sessions, to just one session of MI. The intervention duration also varied considerably. In most studies, the sessions were completed weekly; therefore, the longest duration was 10 weeks.

In order to support the delivery of the MI interventions, facilitator training was mentioned in five of the studies. One of the studies described an extensive training programme, which took place over 8 hours and was delivered by an experienced MI practitioner, whereas facilitators in other studies received only 90 min of training. MI interventions were manualized in five studies and fidelity monitoring was carried out in six. This ranged from facilitators completing self-report fidelity checklists (n = 4) to scheduled session observations (n = 2).

A number of MI process elements were described in the included studies (see Table 3). Most of the best evidence studies referred to the spirit and principles of MI (n = 6) and one study mentioned the use of OARS. Reference was made to the use of the TTM in all four of the UK-based studies, although this was not a described feature of the US interventions. Other aspects included the Menu of Strategies (Rollnick et al., 1992) (n = 4), active listening techniques (n = 1) and change talk (n = 2). Six of the studies used other techniques alongside MI including consultation (n = 2), personal construct psychology (PCP) (n = 1) and SFBT (n = 1).

Outcome measures

A number of different outcome measures were used in the included studies. This included qualitative outcome measures, including interviews (n = 2), focus groups (n = 1) and
### Table 3. Features of MI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/year</th>
<th>Spirit of MI</th>
<th>Principles of MI</th>
<th>OARS</th>
<th>TTM/Model of Stages of Change</th>
<th>Menu of Strategies</th>
<th>Active Listening Techniques</th>
<th>Change Talk</th>
<th>Fidelity Monitoring</th>
<th>Other Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson and Woods</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCP, SFIT, consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson and Amesu</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittles and Atkinson</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFIT</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enea and Dafoeui</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action planning, summary letters, consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait et al. (2012)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structured interview protocol, self-report fidelity checklist</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Normative feedback worksheet, Graphical feedback sheet, Public commitment poster, Goal sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry et al. (2013)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As Strait et al. (2012)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channon et al. (2013)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>As Strait et al. (2012)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry et al. (2014)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>As Strait et al. (2012)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheftel et al. (2014)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>As Strait et al. (2012)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryer and Atkinson</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>As Strait et al. (2012)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snape and Atkinson</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-formulated MI assessment sheet</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
transcribed sessions \((n = 3)\). Quantitative outcome measures ranged from pre- and post-intervention academic grades to self-report checklists, some of which had known validity and reliability and others were designed for the purpose of the intervention. Two studies relied solely on subjective assessments based on student self-reports, whereas other studies triangulated student data by obtaining more objective information from other sources, such as teachers, parents and school data. None of the studies included follow-up assessments.

**Findings**

Of the eight studies included in the pool of best evidence, seven provide positive evidence for MI and one study was neutral. The four UK-based studies report on the effectiveness of MI in relation to improving school-based motivation in disaffected students. Atkinson and Woods (2003) found improvements in attendance and punctuality, confidence with schoolwork and general attitude towards school after a ninth-grade student took part in five sessions of MI. Kittles and Atkinson (2009) used MI as part of an initial consultation and found that two out of three students were positive about the MI process. Additionally, useful assessment information was obtained from a single session of MI to support future interventions. In Cryer and Atkinson’s (2015) study, a fourth-grade student displayed improvements in his behaviour and showed greater confidence after four, weekly sessions of MI. Snape and Atkinson’s (2015) study yielded mixed findings. Although facilitators expressed positive views about the effectiveness of the MI intervention, this was not necessarily supported by quantitative student self-reported data.

Three studies conducted in the US used MI as an intervention to improve students’ academic outcomes. In a RCT, Strait et al. (2012) found students who participated in a single MI session demonstrated significant improvements in their post-test maths scores, when compared to a control group. In a replication study, Terry, Smith, Strait, and McQuillin (2013) observed the same positive impact on students’ maths grades, in comparison to a wait-list control condition. Terry, Strait, McQuillin, and Smith (2014) then found that students who were randomly assigned to take part in two sessions of MI, combined with a performance feedback goal worksheet, demonstrated significantly higher grades in maths, science and history at post-intervention, than students who had participated in one MI session, indicating that two sessions of MI might have a larger and broader impact on academic grades. Effect sizes across the three studies can be found in Table 4 (adapted from Terry et al., 2014), where it is clear that the double-dosage effect improved effect sizes in maths and most notably in science. While meta-analytic techniques comparing the three studies are beyond the scope of this review, this is a potential focus for further review, particularly if more RCT studies are conducted in the area of student-focused SBMI.

A further US study looked at the impact of MI on career development. Sheftel, Lindstrom, and McWhirter (2014) found that students with disabilities, who took part in 10 sessions of a group-based MI and Motivational Enhancement Group intervention (MEGi) programme, demonstrated a positive and significant change in vocational skills self-efficacy, self-determination and vocational outcome expectations at post-intervention.
Table 4. Effect sizes in RCT studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Strait et al. (2012)</th>
<th>Terry et al. (2013)</th>
<th>Terry et al. (2014)</th>
<th>Average effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall behaviour</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math grades</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.55*</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA grades</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science grades</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05

Source: Adapted from Terry et al., 2014.

Discussion

The present study aimed to review the literature on the effectiveness of student-focused SBMI in educational settings. It extended the review conducted by Woods et al. (2014) on the same topic, due to the inclusion of an extended and updated search period, reflecting a recent surge in published papers focusing on SBMI. Additionally, this review included international studies, whereas the previous study was solely focused on UK-based research. In the present review, 11 studies were identified as meeting the inclusion criteria. Although, this is a small sample, it was an improvement on the Woods et al. (2014) review, which included just three studies. In the present review, six studies were rated as high-quality research, three studies were rated as medium-quality and two as low-quality. It is encouraging that over two-thirds of the studies were rated at least medium-quality overall, given that previous, larger reviews evaluating the effectiveness of other therapeutic approaches have reported difficulties in identifying high-quality research (Bond et al., 2013).

A pool of best evidence generated a total of eight studies as both low-quality studies were removed from the sample (Atkinson & Amesu, 2007; Channon, Marsh, Jenkins, & Robling, 2013) and one medium-quality study was excluded due to a low rating on the ‘methodological quality’ scale (Ennea & Dafinou, 2009). The best evidence studies indicate that overall there is evidence for the effectiveness of student-focused SBMI in different contexts and provide preliminary support for its use in educational settings.

A number of additional themes have emerged from the present review. Firstly, it highlighted a relationship between the focus of the intervention and the country in which the research took place. To date, US student-focused SBMI studies have sought to improve academic achievement and student outcomes, while UK studies have aimed to improve behaviour and school-based motivation. It seems likely that UK research has been heavily influenced by the influential work of McNamara (cf 1992, 2009) who first described how MI could be adapted to support disaffected students. Publication dates also indicate that the US-based research is in its infancy, with the first empirical paper on student-focused SBMI, published by Strait et al. (2012) maybe stemming from interest generated by Frey et al’s (2011) seminal paper.

RCTs (Strait et al., 2012; Terry et al., 2013, 2014) and case studies (Atkinson & Woods, 2003; Cryer & Atkinson, 2015; Kittles & Atkinson, 2009) were the most popular research designs used in the best evidence studies. RCTs have traditionally been seen as the ‘gold standard’ in research design and the American Psychological Association (APA, 2006) has identified RCTs as the most favourable design for drawing causal inferences about the effectiveness of
interventions. It is especially encouraging that RCTs are being used in student-focused SBMI research, as the robust research design helps to ensure that differences between groups are a result of the MI intervention. Given that all of the RCT studies were conducted in the US, international findings could be strengthened by more widespread use of RCTs. Case studies are considered as a lower ranked form of evidence, as the small-scale findings lack statistical generalizability and the findings may be specific to the CYP that took part in the intervention. However, the detail and richness of the presented data can illustrate potential causal relationships between the observed outcomes and the MI intervention (Woods et al., 2014).

The measures used in the best evidence studies ranged from the administration of standardized pre- and post-intervention measures (Sheftel et al., 2014; Strait et al., 2012; Terry et al., 2013, 2014) to qualitative data gathering measures, such as interviews and session audio recordings (Cryer & Atkinson, 2015; Kittles & Atkinson, 2009). Studies that employed a mixture of both qualitative and quantitative measures (Atkinson & Woods, 2003; Snape & Atkinson, 2015) were useful for ensuring triangulation of findings.

Across the eight best evidence studies, participants were mostly of middle- or high-school age, although one study suggests MI could be adapted for use with elementary school students (Cryer & Atkinson, 2015). Sheftel et al’s (2014) study suggests the usefulness of MI for supporting students with learning difficulties, although some studies suggest that MI may not be a suitable intervention for students with social and communication difficulties or low levels of emotional literacy (Kittles & Atkinson, 2009; Snape & Atkinson, 2015).

The duration of the MI sessions varied between the best evidence studies, ranging from one single session of MI in some studies (Kittles & Atkinson, 2009; Strait et al., 2012; Terry et al., 2013) to 10 1-hour weekly sessions in Sheftel et al’s (2014) research. Encouragingly, there were positive outcomes in the studies that delivered just one session of MI, suggesting this may be a cost-effective method of delivering student-based SBMI in schools. However, Terry et al. (2014) found that two sessions of MI were superior to one in terms of improving students’ academic performance in a range of different curriculum areas. Interestingly, none of the eight best evidence studies used a follow-up, which would have strengthened the design and allowed for the exploration and evaluation of the longer term impact of MI.

In three of the best evidence studies, the facilitator was also the researcher (Atkinson & Woods, 2003; Cryer & Atkinson, 2015; Kittles & Atkinson, 2009) which has possible limitations in terms of the student not wishing to express negativity towards the researcher (Kittles & Atkinson, 2009). Furthermore, a number of different facilitators are reported to have delivered the MI interventions. While school psychology interns were the most common facilitators, others were paraprofessionals or non-specialists, without a background in counselling or psychology. Snape and Atkinson’s (2015) study was conducted by paraprofessionals who had participated in a 90-min MI training session. The fact that this study yielded neutral results leads to questions about who is best qualified to deliver SBMI interventions. Rollnick et al. (1992) suggested one-time training in MI might be insufficient, while Miller and Rollnick (2009) highlighted the complexity of MI and need for competency training. Despite this, Sheftel et al’s (2014) study employed the MI Treatment Integrity (MITI) 3.1.1 scale (Moyers et al., 2005), adapted to incorporate conceptual changes to MI (Miller & Rollnick, 2012) for the purpose of fidelity checks. These indicated that there was a reasonable level of MI proficiency among facilitators – nine school staff, including special education teachers, transition specialists and one rehabilitation counsellor. Only one other study (Snape & Atkinson, 2015) reported fidelity monitoring via direct observation. It should be noted, however, that Sheftel
et al. (2014) measured the quality of MI delivered, including whether the MI spirit and core OARS skills were in evidence, rather than just adherence to the intervention (as reported by Snape & Atkinson, 2015). While fidelity and quality are different concepts, both are key to improving the strength of evidence for the effectiveness of MI applications in school.

Another aim of the current review was to determine the features used in student-focused SBMI. All four of the UK best evidence studies, but none of those conducted in the US refer to using the TTM. In the UK, McNamara (1992) first proposed that the TTM could be used with MI to identify students’ readiness for change and appropriate intervention strategies (Atkinson, 2014). Since then, MI and the TTM have often become synonymous within UK-based educational practice (Atkinson & Amesu, 2007). It should be noted, however, that these differences may only exist between the studies in this review, and further research would need to be undertaken to establish whether there is international variation in student-focused SBMI practice.

Although, the TTM was a central concept in Miller and Rollnick’s (1991) early theory of MI, more recently, they have distanced MI from the TTM (Miller & Rollnick, 2009). This has coincided with some criticisms of the TTM, due to the limited evidence base for its effectiveness as a model of intervention (West, 2005; Wilson & Schlam, 2004). Despite this, research suggests some advantages to using the TTM within SBMI particularly as it provides a structure for non-specialists to follow and has also been positively evaluated by students (Atkinson, 2014; Kittles & Atkinson, 2009).

The use of OARS is a central component and fundamental to MI (Miller & Rollnick, 2002, 2012). However, just one study referred to this approach (Sheftel et al., 2014). The fact that this crucial element was omitted from seven out of eight of the best evidence studies, suggests that the studies may be better described as Adaptations of Motivational Interviewing (AMIs), as they have been specifically adapted for use with non-specialists or incorporate additional non-MI techniques, while retaining the MI principles (Burke, Arkowitz, & Menchola, 2003).

To date, no reported studies have investigated the effectiveness of student-focused SBMI in educational settings, when delivered in its “pure” form. It is possible that adapted and manualized approaches are necessary when conducting student-focused SBMI, as without a structured process, MI may be inaccessible to non-specialists. However, AMIs are not unique to educational settings, as Barnett et al. (2012) found that MI delivered with feedback (MIF) and MI delivered with another intervention (MI+) were common features of studies on MI and adolescent substance abuse.

**Limitations of the review**

The review aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of student-focused SBMI and has successfully provided an overview of the studies in the area. However, there are potential limitations, which require consideration. First, the present review was limited to published studies, which were subjected to peer review in an academic journal. Therefore, there may be a number of noteworthy studies that have been omitted from the review, such as book chapters, masters-level dissertations and doctoral theses. It is also important to consider the ‘file drawer problem’ (Rosenthal, 1979) which suggests that potentially studies with non-significant or null findings remain unpublished, and highlights the need to publish student-focused SBMI studies which yield null findings. Additionally, the search parameters could have been
widened to include other terms (e.g. motivational enhancement therapy, adolescents, academic) and other databases could have been searched (e.g. Google Scholar).

Furthermore, qualitative and quantitative studies were evaluated for methodological quality using the framework developed for Bond et al’s (2013) systematic literature review on the effectiveness of SFBT. While some of the small-scale case study research articles (e.g. Atkinson & Woods, 2003; Cryer & Atkinson, 2015; Kittles & Atkinson, 2009) scored particularly highly on methodological quality, this should be considered objectively against the fact that the RCT design is generally 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 take more account of the research design.

Conclusions and recommendations for future research

This review has built on and added to the review by Woods et al. (2014), which included just three published studies. Seven out of the eleven studies in the present review were published post-2011 succeeding the publication of the seminal paper of Frey et al. (2011). This growing body of evidence suggests that MI is an effective intervention for use in educational settings. The best evidence presented in this review indicates that there are two main areas in which MI has been found to have a positive impact on student outcomes: disaffection and academic achievement. Despite the recent surge of interest, there is still very limited published research on the use of student-focused SBMI and there is a need for further research in this area. MI is a popular intervention used by school psychologists, and therefore, there is a need to identify the most effective and efficient way of using MI for both resource and ethical reasons. It also remains unclear which elements of MI contribute to its effectiveness as an intervention and this would also be an area worthy of further study.

The included studies in the present review are marked by methodological limitations, and these give clear pointers for future research on student-focused SBMI. First, it is necessary to carry out larger scale research studies. It is recommended that mixed methods studies are used, which allow for the collection of both qualitative and quantitative data. It would also be helpful if future studies on student-focused SBMI could include follow-up measures and use independent researchers. Furthermore, given the prominence of OARS in MI, it may be important to establish this as a feature of future MI interventions. Future studies may also wish to investigate the effectiveness of student-focused SBMI when delivered by specialists compared to non-specialists; the effect of session duration on student outcomes and whether MI interventions can be adapted for certain groups of students, such as students with autistic spectrum condition.

Finally, the present review has focused on student-focused SBMI and did not consider the effectiveness of consultative-focused SBMI, which is an emerging and promising area of research. As further, empirical data are published in this area, it would be useful to conduct a systematic literature review to investigate the effectiveness of consultative-focused SBMI.
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### Appendix 1. Methodological quality (quantitative evaluation research)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Use of a randomized group design</th>
<th>Focus on a specific, well-defined disorder or problem</th>
<th>Comparison with treatment-as-usual, placebo or less-preferably, standardized control</th>
<th>Use of manuals and procedures for monitoring and fidelity checks</th>
<th>Sample large enough to detect effect at 80% (from Cohen, 1992)</th>
<th>Use of outcome measure(s) that has demonstrated good reliability and validity*</th>
<th>Total (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enea and Dafnianni (2009)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓ (1)</td>
<td>2/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait et al. (2013)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (2)</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry et al. (2013)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry et al. (2014)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (2)</td>
<td>5/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shefler et al. (2014)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (2)</td>
<td>5/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2 points if more than one measure used, 1 point deducted if measures lack reliability and validity.

Note: Low = 0–2; Medium = 3–4; High = 5–7

### Appendix 2. Methodological quality (qualitative evaluation research)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriateness of the research question</th>
<th>Clear sampling frame</th>
<th>Well-exercised data collection</th>
<th>Analytical depth to the data</th>
<th>Emergent theory related to the problem</th>
<th>Evidence of explicit reflexivity</th>
<th>Completeness of documentation</th>
<th>Clarity and coherence of the reporting</th>
<th>Evidence of researcher-participant negotiation</th>
<th>Evidence of ethical issues</th>
<th>Total (12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alkenson and Weeds (2003)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkenson and Aronson (2007)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittles and Alkenson (2009)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channon et al. (2013)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyry and Alkenson (2015)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snape and Alkenson (2015)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>10/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low = 0–4; Medium = 5–8, High = 9–12.
### Appendix 3. Methodological appropriateness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Use of objective outcome measure(s)</th>
<th>Clearly defined participant sample</th>
<th>Clear description of MI process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson and Amezu (2007)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittles and Atkinson (2009)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enea and Dafniou (2009)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait et al. (2012)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry et al. (2013)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channon et al. (2013)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry et al. (2014)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheftel et al. (2014)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryer and Atkinson (2015)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snape and Atkinson (2015)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low = 0–1; Medium = 2; High = 3

### Appendix 4. Focus of study – relevance to review questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Key MI elements e.g. OARS/six principles</th>
<th>School-based MI</th>
<th>Student-focused MI sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson and Amezu (2007)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittles and Atkinson (2009)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enea and Dafniou (2009)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait et al. (2012)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry et al. (2013)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channon et al. (2013)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry et al. (2014)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheftel et al. (2014)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryer and Atkinson (2015)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snape and Atkinson (2015)</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low = 0–1; Medium = 2; High = 3

### Appendix 5. Overall weight of evidence ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methodological quality</th>
<th>Appropriateness of research method</th>
<th>Focus of evidence for the review method</th>
<th>Overall weight of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson and Woods (2003)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson and Amezu (2007)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittles and Atkinson (2009)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enea and Dafniou (2009)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait et al. (2012)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channon et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry et al. (2014)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheftel et al. (2014)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryer and Atkinson (2015)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snape and Atkinson (2015)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix H1: Epistemological position

**Ontology**
The research adopted a critical realist ontological position. Critical realism developed due to criticisms of other philosophical approaches, such as positivism and relativism. A positivist approach reduces reality to events that can be directly observed, whereas a relativist position is focused at the discursive level and places too much emphasis on the experiences and perspectives of individuals (Danermark, Erkstrom, Jakobson & Karlsson, 2002). Critical realism adopts the stance that science is not only about processes that can be directly measured and observed, but it is also important to consider the entities, structures and individuals that create them (Bhaskar, 2010).

**Epistemology**
As a critical realist stance underpinned the research, this therefore influenced the research methods that were adopted. The researcher chose to use a combination of both qualitative and quantitative data gathering methods. Questionnaires were used to obtain a quantifiable measure of students’ school-based motivation at various time points during the study. Semi-structured interviews were also conducted with both students and educational psychologists in order to gather the experiences and perspectives of those involved in the intervention. It was hoped that by using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods this would allow for triangulation and increase the accuracy and robustness of the study.

**Axiology**
The research was influenced by the researcher’s own values and beliefs. For example, the researcher previously worked as a primary school teacher and worked with many students who could be described as disaffected. As a result, the researcher hoped that motivational interviewing would have a positive impact on disaffected students’ school-based motivation.

In addition, whilst working as a trainee educational psychologist, the researcher has placed high importance on gaining the views of the child. This is also reflected in current legislation, such as the Special Educational Needs and Disability Code of Practice (Department for Education, 2015). Therefore, throughout the research, the researcher ensured that there were opportunities for students to express their views on the motivational interviewing intervention.

**References**


Appendix H2: Reflections on how issues of trustworthiness were addressed in the research

Although, a mixed methods case study design was employed in the current research, the qualitative findings, in particular the student interview data were at the forefront of the research. The trustworthiness of qualitative research has been questioned by positivists, as it is difficult to address concepts such as reliability and validity (Shenton, 2004). Guba (1981) suggested that qualitative researchers should promote the trustworthiness of studies by addressing four criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. In the current study, these four criteria were considered throughout the research process and this is outlined in more detail below.

1. **Credibility**

In qualitative research, credibility refers to the extent to which researchers have accurately recorded the phenomenon under scrutiny and could be compared to the concept of internal validity in quantitative research (Shenton, 2004). In the current research, a number of steps were undertaken to improve the credibility of the study's qualitative findings. Firstly, during the interviews, students were encouraged to give honest and open answers, even if this meant that they were critical of the intervention or educational psychologist. The independent status of the researcher was also emphasised. Once student interview data had been collected, this was then triangulated with information obtained from educational psychologists and quantitative questionnaire data. This was useful for ensuring credibility as it helped to verify particular details that students had supplied.

Finally, the researcher sought opportunities for scrutiny of the research project by colleagues, peers and academic researchers. For instance, paper two was submitted to the journal Educational Psychology in Practice and is currently under peer review. Having a fresh perspective on the research can be useful as it can challenge assumptions made by the researcher and provide new arguments.

2. **Transferability**

In quantitative studies, it is possible to apply the results of research studies to wider populations. In small-scale qualitative research studies this is not possible, as it is likely that the findings are specific to the contexts in which they occurred. Despite this, Shenton (2004) argues that the concept of transferability should not be immediately rejected in qualitative research, as it might be possible to combine the findings of similar, small-scale research projects in order to assist in the generation of theories. In order to promote transferability in the current research, the researcher ensured that sufficient background information was provided about the students and educational psychologists, as well as a detailed description of the motivational interviewing intervention and data gathering methods. In addition, the contextual factors that impacted on the research were also described.

3. **Dependability**

Quantitative studies employ particular techniques that allow for studies to be replicated and similar findings obtained, which addresses the issue of reliability. This is not
possible in qualitative research, as there is far less control over extraneous variables. Instead, qualitative researchers should address the issue of dependability (Shenton, 2004). For instance, in the current study, the research was reported in detail, so that future researchers could repeat the study, although it is acknowledged that they may not get the same results.

4. Confirmability

Confirmability is important in qualitative research as it helps to ensure that the study's findings are as far as possible, the result of the experiences and ideas of the participants and not the preferences or views of the researcher (Shenton, 2004). This could be compared to the concept of objectivity in quantitative research.

In the present study a number of steps were undertaken to promote confirmability. Firstly, the researcher's beliefs and assumptions were clearly stated in a section on ontology, epistemology and axiology. In addition, the data collected during student interviews were triangulated with educational psychologist interview data and questionnaire data, in order to reduce the likelihood of investigator bias.
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Appendix H3: Ethical considerations

The research adhered to the Health and Care Professions Council Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics (HCPC, 2012), as well as the British Psychological Society Professional Practice Guidelines (BPS, 2002). A University Research Ethics Committee also approved the research.

Ethical risks for student and EP participants were carefully considered. At least two weeks prior to any data being gathered, parents were provided with an information sheet and consent form to sign. They were made aware that there would still be an opportunity for students to take part in the intervention, even if they did not want their data to be included in the research study. The researcher’s contact details were also listed on the information sheet to ensure that any questions or queries could be answered directly by the researcher. Once parental consent had been gained, a child friendly information sheet and consent form was shared with students. Students were also given the opportunity to opt out of the intervention and/ or research and were also told that they could withdraw from the research at any point, even after they had provided consent.

All sessions were audio recorded and therefore there was an audio recorder present throughout the intervention. It was possible that due to the presence of the tape recorder, some students may have felt uncomfortable talking about certain issues. As a result, students were informed that when the researcher listened to the tape, the focus was on the skills of the EP and not on what the young person said. EPs were also told to position the audio recorder out of sight of the young person during the MI sessions, in order to reduce anxiety.

Due to the therapeutic nature of the MI sessions, there was a possibility that the sessions could cause some upset or distress for students, depending on the topics discussed. As a result, a key member of school staff was identified for the students to speak to if they felt upset or distressed following an MI session. MI sessions were terminated if it was felt that the young person was not benefitting from taking part, they would benefit more from a different type of intervention, or if they were causing unnecessary upset. EPs could also contact the researcher if they had any questions or required supervision.

It was important to ensure anonymity of all participants. Therefore, initials were used on student worksheets and questionnaires. In addition, the names of people, schools and local authorities were altered in interview transcripts and pseudonyms were used throughout Paper 2.